

[REDACTED]

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 03 July 2026 12:54
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HPK/2026/0228 Site Address: Spring Shopping Centre & Land South of Station Road
Buxton Derbyshire Comments by: Katie Robinson
From:

St Johns Road
Buxton
Derbyshire

Phone:
Email: [REDACTED]
Submission: Objection
Comments: Dear Sir,

I write as a resident of Buxton to formally object to the above application in its current form. While I support the principle of town centre regeneration, the scheme as submitted raises substantive concerns under the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that warrant refusal or, at minimum, significant amendment prior to determination.

1. Affordable housing provision & non-compliance with policy and unmet local need

The application proposes only 5% of the 332 units as affordable rented homes. This falls materially short of policy-compliant levels typically expected under NPPF paragraphs 63&65 and the Council's own emerging Local Plan housing policies, which require developers to meet identified local need unless robust, independently verified viability evidence justifies a lower provision. No such viability assessment has been made publicly available for scrutiny at the point of this consultation. Given High Peak's recognised affordability pressures, an almost entirely market-rent, build-to-rent scheme of this scale fails to deliver the mixed and balanced community required by NPPF paragraph 62 and risks being unsustainable in tenure terms. I request that the Committee require an open-book viability appraisal and a revised affordable housing offer in line with policy before determination.

2. Loss of car parking and inadequate transport assessment

The scheme materially reduces town centre car parking provision around The Springs, with reported reductions of up to 30%, removal of provision at the Waitrose end of the car park, and increased walking distances of up to 300 metres (2&6 times further) for shoppers to reach retail units, including via ramps or lifts & directly engaging accessibility considerations under the Equality Act 2010 and NPPF paragraphs 110&115 on promoting sustainable and accessible transport. The proposed replacement multi-storey car park to the rear, and the separate, as-yet

unconsummated proposal for a 200-space car park on the former railway depot land, are not secured as part of this application and should not be treated as a material benefit unless delivered via a binding Section 106 obligation with a guaranteed delivery timetable ahead of, or concurrent with, loss of existing spaces. The Transport Assessment's modal-shift assumption (50% car ownership among new residents, against 82% car ownership across Buxton households generally) is not robust and is inconsistent with the Council's own evidence base. I request that determination be deferred pending a revised, independently verified Transport Assessment and Parking Strategy.

3. Highways and access to Station Road/Palace Road junction and loss of trees

The proposed new junction arrangements at Palace Road and alterations to Station Road, together with a new access route cutting into the bank behind the railway station resulting in loss of established trees, raise concerns under NPPF paragraph 180 (protection of trees/landscape) and highway safety policy. No adequate arboricultural impact assessment or replacement planting strategy has been made available for public comment. I request these matters be subject to independent highway authority review and a full Tree Survey (BS5837) prior to determination.

4. Heritage and townscape to conservation area context

Buxton town centre's historic character, including its Georgian and Victorian townscape, falls to be considered under sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and NPPF Chapter 16 (conserving and enhancing the historic environment). References in the Design and Access Statement to "heritage-inspired" materials do not, in themselves, discharge the duty to avoid harm to the setting of heritage assets; a proportionate Heritage Impact Assessment should be required and made available for consultation.

5. Construction impact and public consultation deficiencies

An anticipated 4½ year construction programme will cause significant, sustained disruption to town centre trade, traffic and residential amenity. NPPF paragraph 35 requires that plans be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy to including proper, meaningful consultation. Residents have raised credible concerns (now reflected in the Council's own extension of the consultation period to 23 July 2026) that the scale increase from approximately 250 to 332 homes, and the scheme's evolution more broadly, has not been subject to adequate fresh consultation proportionate to the changes made. I request that the Committee satisfy itself that consultation has been Gunning-compliant (undertaken at a formative stage, with sufficient reasons given and conscientious consideration of responses) before proceeding to determination.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that the Council either refuse the application as submitted or require the applicant to address, through amendment and appropriate planning conditions/Section 106 obligations: (i) a policy-compliant affordable housing offer evidenced by open-book viability; (ii) a robust, independently verified parking and transport strategy with secured delivery of replacement parking ahead of loss of existing provision; (iii)

full highway, arboricultural and heritage assessments; and (iv) confirmation that consultation obligations have been properly discharged in respect of the revised, enlarged scheme.

I would be grateful for confirmation that this objection has been logged against the application and for notification of the Committee date at which it will be determined.

Yours faithfully,

Katie Robinson

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
