

[REDACTED]

From: E-mail Notice <tstjohn@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 22 July 2026 11:26
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: HPK/2026/0228 STRONG OPPOSITION TO THIS SCHEME

Categories: [REDACTED]

Trevor & Stella Johnson
25 Birch Close, Cavendish Fields,
BUXTON SK17 FE

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

We wish to express serious and strong objections to this application, in particular:

1. This proposal is so materially different to the 2025 comprehensive development scheme which was fully subjected to extensive public consultations with Capital & Centric.
2. Can we ask what public consultation has taken place with C&C and the residents in order to submit this revised scheme? To our knowledge very little, if any.
3. In short, this plan does not provide any community facilities for residents, either current or future, it displays a massive reduction in the provision of public realm space, and clearly the availability of parking has been significantly reduced. Where are the 300 + new residents going to park their cars?
4. Who has agreed to a residential development for over 300 persons on this site?
5. The original 2025 proposals encouraged the use of locally used gritstone and other natural materials. The design of these 5/4 stories high concrete blocks lacks any relevance to the buildings in this part of town. The original proposals provided roof gardens, balconies, hipped roofs and other softening features. These display the appearance of tall grey concrete blocks built by a young Lego builder. Most inappropriate to the surrounding building of natural heritage and materials.
6. We are not sure that the provision of car park on the site of the redundant railway sidings will alleviate the parking issue. Station Road is a main road through the town and with an extra roundabout to gain access, the increased footfall of residents/visitors accessing the site through pedestrian crossings will create even more delays to the traffic flow. We would be interested in the comments on what Derbyshire County Council Highways have to say on aspect.
7. We are not convinced that the HPBC are the ideal authority to determine the outcome of this application. We understand they own the land and will no doubt will be the landlord of some of the apartments. No doubt they will have had detailed discussions with the applicant; therefore, how impartial will members of the Council will be in determining this application?
8. We seem to have lost sight that the funding was for 'Regeneration of the Town Centre Area', we see little evidence for the successful outcome of this aim.
9. We understand HPBC will shortly be preparing changes to the Local Plan. How does this dovetail into the creation of a new unitary authority with their revised priorities? Bearing in mind that any costs will fall on the local already hard-pressed residents.
10. Let us not create a concrete jungle! All the new builds should be designed with all the harsh corners 'rounded off' and softened. Any long buildings should be designed with a minor 'crescent shaped façade' to get ride of the 'linear' lines.

11. Our final concern is the greening of the area, there is no provision for roof gardens, no examples of vertical gardens on sides of major expanses of drab walls.
12. Overall, this scheme is more suited to the regeneration of a town whose heritage and development depended on an industrial/manufacturing background. This one does not reflect the rich Georgian and Victorian architecture of the town and the use of open green and wooded spaces in the immediate vicinity. It does not reflect the culture of Buxton.
13. This Scheme has evolved from a regeneration one towards a large housing development.