

## Buxton Civic Association: Comments and Detailed response

The chairman of The Buxton Civic Association (BCA) has responded with considerable detail to the proposed masterplan and we thank him (and his members) for the time they have taken to review all aspects of the emerging masterplan. We hope that the equally detailed response highlights areas where there is mutual agreement that further works need to be undertaken, or explains where ideas have been explored and ruled out.

The Council particularly recognises the Civic Associations commitment to historic Buxton and we welcome this approach. The Council (and partners) has secured over £117 million investment for heritage buildings in Buxton over last 20 years, and have recently secured £1m Heritage Action Zone funding to take forward this work. We continue to be committed to supporting heritage & visitor economy in Buxton – but we also consider it important to help provide facilities for residents and deliver town centre facilities that residents will use and enjoy – so the focus on this Future High Street Business case takes this approach in line with the objectives of the government fund itself.

In order to secure funding under the Government’s initiative, the business case submitted by the Council must generate a Benefit Cost Ratio of at least 2.0. Details of how this is calculated can be found within the Governments [Green Book Analysis](#). In effect, the proposals must generate a commercial return and land value uplift through development using the funding given. Many of the suggestions put forward by BCA would not deliver sufficiently high levels of return on investment to secure the funding. Therefore if a bid were submitted in line with these suggestions, it would fail at this initial hurdle.

The public consultation has identified a clear desire for change and over two-thirds of the 460 written respondents have expressed support for the proposals. Therefore while we note and value the opinions of BCA, we also need to consider and take on board this wider feedback, which appears to be at odds with quite a number of the options expressed by BCA.


Having said this, the proposals do include some interesting ideas, and where possible we are looking to consider these in more detail, either as part of the FHSF or as part of wider proposals for Buxton.

### Detailed response:

	BCA Comment	Response	Follow up Action
1.	<p>Lack of meaningful public consultation</p> <p><i>“This time scale has not allowed for any meaningful public discussions about what we need the centre of town to deliver in this age of the internet and retail decline”</i></p>	<p>1.The Proposals put forward in the emerging masterplan (including new pedestrian route from station to Springs Gardens via shopping centre; New public square, and road facing buildings along Station Approach) are fully in line with adopted ‘<a href="#">Station Road Supplementary Planning Doc</a>’ which had extensive public consultation before adoption in 2007 and also formed the basis of the <a href="#">Buxton Design &amp; Placemaking Strategy</a> 2009 – so the principle of this kind of development has both had extensive consultation but has also been formally adopted as planning policy.</p> <p>2.Meaningful consultation – should not be seen as synonymous with a consultation timescale – but is defined by the level of awareness of the consultation (regardless of people choose to respond); the level of engagement/response &amp; ability for the responses to influence or change proposals</p> <p><u>a)Consultation awareness activities:</u> 3 x business newsletter features (1100 subscribers)</p>	

		<p>2 x Buxton Advertiser features (including front cover newsletter); Buxton Pure Feature;          Buxton Civic Association &amp; Buxton Vision promotion of events to members;          Letters to every freeholder (Nov 19) + follow up engagement with 10 freeholders and every tenant (Feb 20)          4 days of paid for Facebook Advertising + 3 Facebook HPBC posts (45 re-posts; 49 likes; 95 comments)          2 x Public Consultation events at The Springs (circa 800 attendees)          2 x Youth Consultation events (circa 70 attendees)          1 x HPBC member events          1 x Vision Buxton event          1 x Buxton town team event</p> <p>b)Response level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 460 formal written responses</li> <li>• Age of responders: 10% 16-18yrs; 14% 18-35; 45% 36-65; 65+ 32%)</li> <li>• Current rating of existing town centre: 3.3 (needs improving);</li> <li>• 67% broadly positive; 18% neutral (not indicated); and 15% negative.</li> <li>• 65% said more likely to visit Buxton town centre if implemented; 21% (not indicated); 14% no (some because already visit often).</li> </ul> <p>c) We have built in time to amend proposals (between 17/2/2020-26/3/2020) to assess viability of suggestions and re-run draft business case. This is one of the principle reasons why we did not have a longer consultation process.</p>	
2	<p>Constraints of grant scheme  <i>“concentration on developments only within the red line of the grant application boundary is unfortunate”</i></p>	<p>The Future High Street Fund (FHSF) is a specific funding scheme designed by government to co-fund capital initiatives to help regenerate town centre high street areas (with a higher than average shop vacancy level) through diversification of uses to bring new footfall and vitality to town centres. This means that the scope of what can be supported under this initiative is defined (and limited) by the objectives of the fund itself. The Council does not have ability to change scheme criteria.</p> <p>This doesn't mean that other initiatives in other parts of the town cannot come forward by the Council other partners, but it does mean that as part of the development of the business case for this fund, we are only focusing on aspects that are eligible.</p>	
3	<p>Council officers and consultants have not sufficiently utilised local knowledge and expertise from partners.</p>	<p>Consultants are keen to incorporate suggestions from stakeholders – but proposals need to respond to factual constraints and [floorspace] and use demand. The FHSF must also have a private sector partner and leverage significant private sector funding and the owner/potential purchasers of site - must be in support of the proposals in order to deliver any element that affected The Springs, or any land they owned. This baseline understanding of commercial and future demand was undertaken at the first stage to ensure that all consultation would be meaningful in that it was deliverable, would attract co-investment required as well as in line with FHSF criterion</p> <p>It is worth noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historically masterplans commenced with a community consultation exercise to get 'blue sky thinking' and hear community aspirations. BCA members, may have presumed that this widely discredited historic approach would have been process. (It has been widely discredited as it raises aspirations which may have no regard to</li> </ul>	

		<p>commercial deliverability and can alienate residents from future engagement)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key challenges and opportunities had already been already identified via Expression of Interest development (with BCA supported) and as part of Visitor Economy Strategy (which BCA had endorsed).</li> <li>• Throughout the process BCA have been represented at every (monthly) Board meeting, three special meetings with BCA have been held, and we have listened and responded to all feedback.</li> <li>• The Council has also utilised a wide range of local and expert opinion in shaping proposals as well as obtaining significant feedback from public consultation – over two-thirds of which is positive.</li> </ul>	
4.	<p>Re-development of station forecourt and Station Terrace</p> <p><i>a) Developing a route that takes some visitors into The Springs may be beneficial but making it <b>the major desire line</b> from the station is a mistake.</i></p> <p><i>b) “The proposed three flights of steps are a serious barrier to accessibility”</i></p> <p><i>c) “The provision for parking and for buses in the station forecourt is inadequate”</i></p>	<p>a) The suggestion is that the status quo is retained as the primary route from the Station into the town centre As this represents the current situation, it will have no impact on increasing footfall into the town centre, which is one of the primary objectives of the proposals and government funding.</p> <p>It should also be noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The station link is designed to support residents walking to/from the station and emerging health hub via the town centre shopping core – project is not just focused on visitor flow;</li> <li>• The Station link was most popular with 460 written responses to consultation – so BCA response appears out of step with overarching residents’ view.</li> <li>• Proposals for pedestrian route from station to Springs Gardens via shopping centre and road facing buildings along Station Approach are the same as per adopted ‘Station Road Supplementary Planning Doc’ which had extensive public consultation before adoption in 2007 and also formed the basis of the Buxton Design &amp; Placemaking Strategy 2009 – so the principle of this kind of development has had extensive consultation but has also been formally adopted as planning policy.</li> <li>• The premise of approved EOI is to support footfall into the Springs &amp; through to Spring Gardens where there are high shop vacancy levels – and in this way help to arrest the decline rather than accepting this inevitable.</li> <li>• It is not proposed to change the private road (Station Approach) or Terrace Road (the Quadrant) and this will option will still exist.</li> </ul> <p>b)The proposals put forward in the emerging masterplan included a series of steps and lifts to enable pedestrians to transverse the circa 9 metre level change without the need for side/winding ramps which historically have delivered a poor public perception and been targets of anti-social gathering. However, it is clear from the consultation responses, that although the design is fully DDA compliant, it does give perception of inaccessibility; could require a different route requirement and could be impacted by poor maintenance – for this reason, further work on design of this route has been requested, and High Peak Access Group is already engaged directly with Architectural team to discuss options</p> <p>c)We agree that size of transport interchange needs further discussion with Highways &amp; Network Rail and Council has also received comments from Friends of Buxton Station, DCC Highways and bus companies which is being reviewed by Pell Friesman, transport consultants who are part of the consultant team. It is worth noting, that</p>	<p>To be reviewed/re-developed for March Revision</p> <p>To be reviewed/re-developed for March Revision</p>

<p>d)” <i>The scale of proposed cycle hire facility and links to associated cycle routes is not sufficient if we seriously want Buxton to be the key rail head for the Peak District National Park</i>”</p>	<p>although the provision at station represented a loss of 19 spaces, the number of disabled spaces and EV charging points were added – and there was a net gain of 96 spaces across the whole masterplan area. Any reinstatement of car parking could reduce ability to have cycle hire facilities in the future.</p> <p>d) There is currently space allocated for a commercially (or socially enterprise) cycle hire. However at present there is no such commercial (or community) interest in running such a business (despite there being funding available over last 5 years which would 40% fund private business or 80% fund it as a social enterprise). A pilot project ran a cycle hire business a number of years ago but was not taken forward due to lack of customers. Friends of Buxton Station were very dubious about viability of any such scheme. Despite the above, it is recognised that if White Peak Loop were extended into Buxton – this might change viability – and as such space has been set aside for such a future development – which would be soft landscaped in short term.. It should be noted expansion of car parking at station could reduce ability to have cycle hire facilities in the future.</p> <p>Cycle parking is already incorporated</p>	<p>Already included</p>
<p>BCA proposals</p> <p><i>“The scheme must include the development of an equally strong, enhanced desire line and pedestrian route to historic Buxton”</i></p>  <p><i>“Redesign the station forecourt to allow for more parking, better provision for buses and considerably enhanced cycle hire facilities”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A-C route represents the status quo and would not help increase footfall which is the objective of the funding. Funding could not be spent on private road. FHSF allows only 5% of project budget to be spent on public realm improvements, so any improvements to pavement on Station road (close to A on map) would impact on reduced public realm improvements on Spring Gardens.</li> <li>• The proposed pedestrian route (to north of Conways) is proposed to go via soft landscaped and overlooked by residential properties – but BCA have suggested an alternative to the south of Conways. This is an interesting idea and the suggestion has been forwarded to Architects team for consideration. It should be noted that such a pedestrian route (as suggested by BCA) would be located between the rear face of Conways DIY and the rear of proposed new commercial building – so it may not be as attractive route as the proposal and maybe unpopular (perception as location for anti-social behaviour) due to lack of natural supervision.</li> </ul> <p>We agree that size of transport interchange needs further discussion with Highways &amp; Network Rail and Council has also received comments from Friends of Buxton Station, DCC Highways and bus companies which are being reviewed by Pell Friesman, transport consultants who are part of the consultant team. It is worth noting, that although the provision at station represented a loss of 19 spaces, the number of disabled spaces and EV charging points were added – and there was a net gain of 96 spaces across the whole masterplan area. Any reinstatement of car parking could reduce ability to have cycle hire facilities in the future.</p>	<p>Pass to architects team for consideration</p> <p>To be reviewed/re-developed for March Revision</p>

	<p><i>“Provide bicycle routes to and from the station”</i></p> <p><i>“Provide secure covered bike storage”</i></p> <p><i>“Redesign steps idea in conjunction with [sic] Accessible High Peak. [High Peak Access]”</i></p> <p><i>“Reinstate the fan window”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle lines –outside scope of what FHSF could deliver.</li> <li>• Bike storage – included already</li> <li>• High Peak Access Group are already working directly on revision</li> <li>• The existing structure would be incorporated into proposed building as part of any future planning application in line with existing planning policy. There could be scope for reinstatement of lost heritage window if it did not impede future uses. This would need to be explored at design development stage but falls outside the scope of FHSF</li> </ul>	<p>Pass to Highways for consideration</p> <p>To be reviewed/re-developed for March Revision</p>
5	<p>2 – No proposals for significant re-modelling of Springs</p> <p><i>“a) We have not seen any significant proposals for improving the “internal street” environment of the springs”</i></p> <p><i>“steps channel people into a poor environment which is a bottleneck before they reach the High Street.”</i></p>	<p>a) FHSF cannot be used to enhance existing private sector owned internal street or retail floorspace. If Springs were bought by new developer (which is dependant on co-investment from FHSF/Councils) then developer would have to embark on improvement scheme, and would be required to create 24 access from Station Terrace to Spring Gardens. . The opening up of internal route within Springs, will be need to be part of formal legal agreement with owner to co-invest – but the costs of this work would be borne by private sector (and there is a clear business case for them to undertake this work if FHSF secured)</p> <p>b) The premise of the govt funding &amp; our approved EOI – was to increase footfall into areas with high shop vacancy levels – as a means of helping to address this. The numbers of pedestrians walking at any one time is unlikely to cause a ‘bottle neck’ at ‘Tech corner’.</p>	
	<p>BCA Proposals</p> <p><i>“Ensure that the interior of The Springs is significantly improved by the scheme”</i></p> <p><i>“Consider taking out more units to open up the internal street environment... turn the service yard into more of a public space”</i></p>	<p>Interior improvements to Springs: not eligible for FHSF – this would need to be funded by commercial owner.</p> <p>Taking out occupied units is not something that any commercial landlord would agree to and would reduce financial returns.</p> <p>In terms of the creation of a public square in the existing service yard, this idea was explored and discounted as unfeasible because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking out occupied units is not something that the commercial landlord would agree to fund as it would reduce their financial returns;</li> </ul>	

	<p><i>“Relieve the claustrophobia of the existing ceiling in the indoor street by removing the narrow barrow vault”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remodelling of units to ‘turn shops around’ (storage, staff facilities, extraction &amp; power systems) would be extremely expensive with no commercial return</li> <li>• Any proposed square would still need to include rear facilities (waste bins/extraction systems/delivery points etc.) to properties that front north/south axis within the Springs (Loungers, Clinton cards) and properties that front Spring Gardens</li> <li>• Proposals would require change of legal rights &amp; usage for existing tenants which both the freeholders and tenants will oppose. There are multiple freeholders to negotiate with and this could result in projected legal processes.</li> <li>• Any removal of rights for rear-use will make it significantly more difficult for commercial properties to operate (exhaust, waste, deliveries) and make units less desirable</li> <li>• Culvert for River Wye runs underneath-would restrict design and maybe formally opposed by Environment Agency</li> <li>• Proposals need to comply with Planning Policy S7 (protect the quality and quantity of mineral water sources) Advice has been sought as service yard is currently within priority catchment area. Advice given is that Excavations exceeding 600mm would be opposed or even prohibited</li> </ul> <p>Removing barrow vault could be considered as part of making route 24 hours - but would be subject to approval from commercial owners and would fall outside scope of FHSF resource.</p>	<p>Keep under review and include in future discussions.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>3 proposal for 2 large new buildings on Waitrose car park</p> <p><i>“We have many fine large historic buildings in the town looking for new uses. Do we need new buildings?”</i></p> <p><i>“The drawings show these buildings as equivalent of 4-5 stories in height”</i></p> <p><i>“A suggested use for the leisure facility is a commercial cinema. We have strong</i></p>	<p>A number of occupiers of historic buildings are looking for new premises, as both the practicalities of running their organisations and the overheads are not viable long term. The Council has a track record of supporting conversion of historic buildings for new uses, and we will continue to work on this issue, but it also needs to be recognised that if we are to retain (or attract new) these businesses, we also need to respond to their need for bespoke properties.</p> <p>It should also be noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Premise of FHSF is to bring in new footfall and users into the town centres – and new leisure &amp; FE facilities will deliver this</li> <li>• the scheme requires us to achieve a Benefit Cost Ratio of 2.0 in order to secure any funding – so if there were no new buildings then proposals would not meet threshold of outputs required.</li> <li>• Proposals for new buildings at this location are entirely in line with Planning Policy (adopted SPD)</li> </ul> <p>Height and scale of buildings is consistent with guidance in adopted Station Rd SPD and design guide – not 4 or 5 storeys as stated. English Heritage is key consultee on this issue. Design and scale of buildings would be subject to planning permission.</p> <p>The masterplan has identified potential leisure uses – and could include a range of uses. As a commercial cinema operator has specifically expressed interest in investing in Buxton, this has been made public in order to get feedback from public. It should be noted that the Council can only identify if this is a suitable as a town centre use</p>	

	<p><i>concerns about the detrimental impact on the existing community cinema in Pavilion Gardens”</i></p>	<p>and does not have the power to object to any planning application on grounds that an existing facility exists. Buxton cinema does not operate on a full time basis – and consultation responses has shown that while a proportion of respondents over (65 years +) are concerned about impact of cinema, an equally significant proportion of people currently do not use the existing cinema and choose instead to travel outside the town. Consultation responses show a clear age split with all younger age groups supporting the introduction of a commercial cinema.</p>	
	<p>BCA proposals</p> <p><i>“Reconsider the need for these two big new buildings. Could the money be better used?”</i></p> <p><i>“Develop proposed new Further Education College in one of Buxton’s large historic buildings”</i></p> <p><i>“If a large building is required, reduce its scale and reconfigure the design and massing to form a sheltering horseshoe”</i></p> <p><i>“Give it a significant public function for example as a community centre, providing a wide range of facilities (e.g. a multi-use space suitable for fitness, public performances, dance, music practice facilities, community meetings).</i></p>	<p>The business case will fail if it does not meet minimum threshold for benefit cost ratio; so without new buildings there would no funding. These buildings would come from the co-investment from private sector.</p> <p>The key reason why Buxton &amp; Leek College (BLC) want to move, is because it is no longer practical or viable to operate in their current historic building due to overheads of operation and layout of rooms as well as moving the 16-19 year group out of the building, will enable the University to find new uses for the building which maybe incompatible with co-delivery with teenagers. Using another (out of town centre) historic building would not meet their objectives, and it would also not support FHSF objectives of increasing footfall/usage of town centre.</p> <p>The masterplan has identified a building in line with floorspace requirements, and known constraints (such as height restrictions in line design &amp; place-making strategy). It is also designed to provide undercroft building at ground floor (for staff, users) without requirement to excavate. Any building coming forward as part of a planning application would need to ensure that it is fit for purpose and provides required floorspace. It maybe that building could come forward in line with BCA suggestion, but this will be at later stage. Any reduction of floorspace would reduce Benefit Cost Ratio which could reduce likelihood of securing funding.</p> <p>The creation of a community centre is a valid concept but requires an identified partner to be interested is purchase/refurbishment/maintenance as well as having identified use. At present no such interest has been identified. Additional space for community meetings would impact on Pavilion Gardens and other town wide venues.</p>	<p>To be considered at later design stage. Current design needs to be considered in light of public consultation responses to increase wye square area</p>
7	<p>Underground car parks</p> <p><i>“Adequacy of provision- Buxton is growing”</i></p>	<p>Public consultation has shown there is a tension between those wanting more car parking – and those that consider less should be provided as part of climate emergency. At moment, proposal has net 96 additional spaces. The provision has been future proofed in that it could be reduced if automated cars or overall reduction reduce requirements longer term.</p>	

<p><i>“Tightness of internal layouts and usability”</i></p> <p><i>“Viability of road access”</i></p> <p><i>“Possibility of flooding.”</i></p> <p><i>“Impact on the water table (Buxton Water?)</i></p> <p><i>“Poor arrival experience for car-based visitors to Buxton”</i></p> <p><i>“Pedestrian access routes from car parks”</i></p> <p><i>“Future of free parking scheme for residents.”</i></p> <p><i>“The specifications for the roofs – will they be strong enough to support significant tree planting?”</i></p> <p><i>“Lack of natural light to car parks”</i></p> <p><i>“The viability of the access arrangements on to Station Road.”</i></p>	<p>Car parking will be built to national car parking standards in conjunction with Highways. We will not be commenting on ‘tightness of layout’ but leave this to advice from Highway professionals.</p> <p>We will not be commenting on ‘viability of access’ but leave this to advice from Highway professionals.</p> <p>The undercroft car parking is not underground and only removal of rubble tier’ is proposed – so there is no greater risk of flooding than currently exists. The river does not flow under the rear car park. The Environment Agency &amp; DCC Flood team have been fully consulted on proposals from commencement.</p> <p>There is no significant risk to water table. The rear car parking area is not within Zone A (critical water protection area) and discussions on this issue have already taken place in line with emerging SPD on water protection area. Any planning application will be subject to consultation on this issue with relevant authorities.</p> <p>The current arrival experience is acknowledged as poor. If we are to secure the funding, then Benefit Cost ratio can only be achieved by re-use of surface level car parking. This was premise of EOI that all partners supported and is adopted SPD policy.</p> <p>Pedestrian routes from car parks would exist</p> <p>Outside scope of FHSF and could be withdrawn or changed subject to council decisions.</p> <p>Any design would need to be fit for purpose. Structural/Transport consultant specialists are part of consultant team. All development will be subject to planning application process.</p> <p>Emerging masterplan is indicative only – design will be subject to planning permission</p> <p>DCC Highways have been working with Pell Freishman, transport consultants, as a key consultee on all access issues together. Current Highways advice is there no concern. Any changes to project in light of public consultation will also be consulted upon with Highways.</p>	
<p>BCA Proposals</p> <p><i>“Consider the development of a quality multi-storey car park rather than the underground car parks”</i></p>	<p>This isn’t an underground car park. Intention to ensure parking achieves Parkmark quality standards which would include appropriate lighting and CCTV.</p>	



	<p><i>“Consider developing old sidings to the north as car parking”</i></p> <p><i>“ensure the roof specification is strong enough for planting”</i></p> <p><i>“consider replacing the existing roundabouts”</i></p> <p><i>“ensuring electric charging ports”</i></p> <p><i>“guarantee continuance of free residents’ parking scheme”</i></p>	<p>Outside of red line area – projects can come forward independently as station car parking</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>The consultant team include Pell Freishman, one of the UK’s leading consulting Highway engineers who have discussing a range of options with the Highways Authority. An analysis of cumulative impact of developments has taken place and DCC Highways have confirmed that a Transport Assessment is currently underway which will cover this area. Any changes to Station road junction (to access Health hub and car parking) will be informed by this work but will fall outside of the scope of the Future High Street funding business case.</p> <p>It is worth noting that an additional new roundabout at this location is likely to incompatible with pedestrian crossings and could discourage walking to station. DCC Highways continue to be engaged on all traffic aspects, and we will take advice from them</p> <p>Already included</p> <p>Outside scope of FHSF and could be subject to change.</p>	
8	<p>5. Wye Square</p> <p><i>“Suitability of the space for a public square.”</i></p> <p><i>Size (it is small and would feel very enclosed).</i></p> <p><i>“Focus on deep culverted river.”</i></p> <p><i>“Enclosed on three sides by large unattractive buildings”</i></p> <p><i>“Danger of new pods for cafes etc. acting as a barrier to the</i></p>	<p>Site was proposed as public square within adopted Station Road SPD.</p> <p>At stakeholder meeting of 25/11/19, which two members of BCA attended, the consensus was for a smaller square in this location with buildings to mask the rear of Spring Gardens properties. Feedback from public consultation is a preference for larger area which can be used for more events/screenings and this is now being reviewed by Architects as part of next revisions.</p> <p>Proposal is to widen &amp; create stepped approach to river where open so that while overall depth is not changed, it is opened into an attractive area. This idea was strongly supported in public consultation and BCA appears out of step with public consultation on this issue.</p> <p>Proposals include new frontage to Waitrose buildings, and single storey restaurants to mask unattractive buildings. Design of new building will be subject to planning.</p> <p>There is no commercial desire from freeholders to create through buildings – and these buildings would still require waste/service access and access to upper floor flats. Feedback from Historic England and Conservation</p>	<p>To be reviewed/re-developed for March Revision</p>

	<p>High Street... though fare facilities”</p> <p>“Loss of parking for potential new residential developments in second floor of High Street buildings.</p>	<p>Officer has strongly supported masking the rear of these properties (in fact suggesting scale of ‘pods’ increased). It should also be noted that new commercial space for restaurants would be required to deliver viability of leisure uses and will deliver Benefit cost ratio required to secure funding. Public consultation has backed the introduction of this kind of leisure and food use in this location.</p> <p>As town centre flats, existing town centre planning use would not require additional spaces. Note net 96 spaces.</p>	
	<p>BCA proposals “design and massing should be reconfigured to form a sheltering horseshoe”</p> <p>“larger, more meaningful public space”</p> <p><i>“Break up and redesign the pods... open up rear 55-75 Spring Gardens”</i></p> <p><i>“move one of pods to rear of Lomas”</i></p> <p>“Maintain small amount of parking on Wye Street”</p>	<p>The masterplan has identified a building in line with floorspace requirements, and known constraints (such as height restrictions in line design &amp; place-making strategy). It is also designed to provide undercroft building at ground floor (for staff, users) without requirement to excavate. Any building coming forward as part of a planning application would need to ensure that it is fit for purpose and provides required floorspace. It maybe that building could come forward in line with BCA suggestion, but this will be at later stage. Any reduction of floorspace would reduce Benefit Cost Ratio which could reduce likelihood of securing funding</p> <p>At stakeholder meeting of 25/11/19, which two members of BCA attended, the consensus was for a smaller square in this location with buildings to mask the rear of Spring Gardens properties. Feedback from public consultation is a preference for larger area which can be used for more events/screenings and this is now being reviewed by Architects as part of next revisions.</p> <p>Any commercial leisure operator will need to be co-located with restaurants to be viable. Stakeholders at 25/11 specifically liked masking of unattractive ground floor rear buildings and public consultation also backed this aspect. Planning Policy and conservation responses has indicated a preference for 2 storey buildings at this location to mask rear buildings to a greater extend.</p> <p>There is no identified freehold interest in opening up rear of units facing Spring Gardens and FHSF cannot be spent on retail.</p> <p>This is privately owned service yard for tenants and is in business use.</p> <p>Insufficient space to retain service level car parking and will also reduce Benefit cost ratio of overall scheme. Any conversion of upper floors will not require bespoke parking due to town centre location.</p>	<p>Current design needs to be considered in light of public consultation responses to increase wye square area</p>
9	Environment of High street (spring gardens)		Consider

<p><i>“Very limited proposals for improving the landscaping of the High Street”</i></p> <p><i>“only two new areas [of upper floor development] are proposed</i></p> <p><i>“No proposals for significant increase in tree planting”</i></p> <p><i>“No proposal for reinstating the canopies at the western end of the High Street”</i></p> <p><i>“proposal for public toilets at the western end of the High Street”</i></p> <p><i>“pedestrianised surfacing to the road at the bottom of Holker Road is dangerous.</i></p>	<p>Funding criteria only permits 5% on beautification of public realm. HAZ funding already secured for shop front improvements – but additional options to increase landscaping will be considered.</p> <p>This is only indicative. Proposal is to operate a grant scheme which will open to all property owners to apply for funding to support viability gaps on conversion (subject to MCHLG approval)</p> <p>While generally supportive of this idea, there are access rights to route which restrict tree planting, issues with native species that do not drop leaves (which leads to lack supervision/higher crime) and cost of maintenance. Additional options to increase tree planning and landscaping will be considered in March revision</p> <p>Outside scope of FHSF. Could be funded by Heritage Action Zone</p> <p>While in theory, a commercial landowner could choose to evict an existing business tenant, or use an empty one to re-model as a new toilet block, it would not be in their commercial interest to do this. There are already proposals for new toilets including a Changing Places toilet within the FHSF proposals, and if successful, we would be happy to see if there is an option to locate new facilities at another location – but it maybe more cost effective to locate these adjacent to new public square.. The only alterative to above would be a toilet pod on the public realm. This would not provide the accessible toilets that are proposed.</p> <p>Not proposed to pedestrianize Holker road. Any design would need to be fit for purpose. Structural/Transport consultant specialists are part of consultant team. All development will be subject to planning application process.</p>	<p>additional options for soft landscaping/tree planting in march revision</p> <p>Keep under review</p>
<p>BCA proposals</p> <p><i>Upper floor use should be extended.</i></p> <p><i>Extend landscaping/ planting trees</i></p> <p><i>Emphasis on child friendly landscaping &amp; sculptures</i></p> <p><i>Attention needs to be given to creative lighting</i></p> <p><i>“Do not pedestrianise the bottom of Holker Road”</i></p>	<p>BCA have commented that there is only proposals to support upper floor conversions in two buildings on Spring Gardens. They appear to have misunderstood proposals; which is that a FHSF project (if approved) will include a grant scheme for property owners to apply for funding to help resolve viability gaps in bringing forward new uses. This will be open to all property owners on Spring Gardens. Consultant team is aware that at least 10 property owners who have expressed an interest in such a fund.</p> <p>Will be considered for March</p> <p>Funding criteria only permits 5% on beautification of public realm. HAZ funding already secured for shop front improvements – but additional options to increase landscaping will be considered.</p> <p>Agree – this will be included in design stage if we secure funding. It should be noted that Lighting maybe incompatible with trees. May need to prioritise one over other.</p>	<p>For March revision</p>

	<p><i>“Create public toilets at both ends of the High Street.”</i></p> <p><i>Reinstate the canopies</i></p>	<p>No proposal to do this.</p> <p>Buxton already has public toilets at the Market Place, Pavilion Gardens and Sylvan Car park and an additional set is proposed as part of the scheme.</p> <p>Could be funded under HAZ scheme, subject to co-investment from freeholder. It is not possible to duplicate FHSF with elements that are eligible to be funded under HAZ.</p>	
10	No public facility	At the time of masterplan there was no commercial viable need identified – but we agree with the principle of such a building if a user can be identified.	Keep under review.
	<p>BCA Proposals</p> <p>“bring the public library back into the centre of town”</p> <p>“Council and County Council should work with the owners of what was M&amp;S to allow development of the building ...facilitated by a grant application to the Architectural Heritage Fund”</p> <p>“through route between the High Street and The Springs should be maintained”</p> <p>Public space in service yard</p>	<p>Agree that having a town centre library would be very desirable. At the time of public consultation, it was known that DCC were exploring relocation of Library at Health/public sector hub at former Nestle site. Previous instruction was not to consider this within FHSF as discussions were at advanced stage. As the Public consultation response has shown positive support for a more central library, this has been referred to DCC for further consideration. If DCC were interested in operating a library within this area, this can be incorporated into March revision and we would welcome this approach.</p> <p>AHF is not open to District or County Councils to apply to. It has to be community led.</p> <p>M&amp;S is private building and although clear desire to maintain through-route (as shown) this is subject to future use. Whilst outside of ownership will continue to push for this to be retained</p> <p>Creation of a public square in the existing service yard, this idea was explored and discounted as unfeasible because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking out occupied units is not something that the commercial landlord would agree to fund as it would reduce their financial returns;</li> <li>• Remodelling of units to ‘turn shops around’ (storage, staff faculties, extraction &amp; power systems) would be extremely expensive with no commercial return</li> <li>• Any proposed square would still need to include rear facilities (waste bins/extraction systems/delivery points</li> </ul>	<p>Review for March revision, subject to response from DCC.</p>

		<p>etc.) to properties that front north/south axis within the Springs (Loungers, Clinton cards) and properties that front Spring Gardens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals would require change of legal rights &amp; usage for existing tenants which both the freeholders and tenants will oppose. There are multiple freeholders to negotiate with and this could result in projected legal processes.</li> <li>Any removal of rights for rear-use will make it significantly more difficult for commercial properties to operate (exhaust, waste, deliveries) and make units less desirable</li> <li>Culvert for River Wye runs underneath-would restrict design and maybe formally opposed by Environment Agency</li> <li>Proposals need to comply with Planning Policy S7 (protect the quality and quantity of mineral water sources) Advice has been sought as service yard is currently within priority catchment area. Advice given is that Excavations exceeding 600mm would be opposed or even prohibited</li> </ul>	
11	<p>Lack of climate change gains</p> <p>No proposals for solar panels or rainwater collection on buildings.</p> <p>electric charging points for cars.</p> <p>No proposals for significant increase in tree planting, green walls etc.</p> <p>No significant proposals to encourage more bicycle use in the centre of town</p>	<p>Agree that revised proposals need to better consider climate change gains although actual design of buildings and inclusion of solar panels/rainwater collection would be considered is part of building design not at business case stage. Any building works would be required to meet existing and emerging policy in regard to environmental standards of buildings and any emerging policies related to climate emergency.</p> <p>EV points are included.</p> <p>Tree planting is proposed at station forecourt and on top of undercroft parking. Further review of landscaping will take place in light of comments.</p> <p>.</p> <p>New cycle parking is proposed at Station – but agree additional cycle parking should be considered at either end of Spring Gardens</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Review climate emergency actions.</p> <p>Consider additional options for soft landscaping</p> <p>Consider options for March revision.</p>
	<p>BCA proposals</p> <p><i>Add solar panels/ rainwater collection on buildings.</i></p> <p><i>electric charging points</i></p> <p><i>increase tree planting on the</i></p>	<p>To be considered at design stage. Please note Historic England has previously opposed roof level solar panels due to impact on heritage.</p> <p>Already included</p> <p>Further review of landscaping will take place in light of comments.</p>	<p>Consider additional options for soft</p>

	<p><i>roofs of the car parks and along High Street.</i></p> <p><i>Provide secure bicycle storage</i></p> <p><i>Provide clearly marked bike lanes along the High Street and Station Road.</i></p> <p><i>Provide for future bike hire facility at the Station</i></p> <p><i>Investigate whether it would be feasible to install a small hydro- electric generator in the culverted River Wye to help supply electricity to the area.</i></p>	<p>Cycle storage proposed for station. Agree additional cycle parking should be considered at either end of Spring Gardens</p> <p>Outside scope of FHSF – will pass to DCC Highways for consideration</p> <p>There is currently space allocated for a commercially (or socially enterprise) cycle hire. However at present there is no such commercial (or community) interest in running such a business (despite there being funding available over last 5 years which would 40% fund private business or 80% fund it as a social enterprise). A pilot project ran a cycle hire business a number of years ago but was not taken forward due to lack of customers. Friends of Buxton Station were very dubious about viability of any such scheme. Despite the above, it is recognised that if White Peak Loop were extended into Buxton – this might change viability – and as such space has been set aside for such a future development – which would be soft landscaped in short term.. It should be noted expansion of car parking at station could reduce ability to have cycle hire facilities in the future.</p> <p>Ask Consultants to raise with Environment Agency and DCC Flood team and cost if feasible</p>	<p>landscaping</p> <p>For March revision</p> <p>Pass to DCC Highways</p> <p>Consider option for March revision.</p>
12	<p>Digital screen</p> <p><i>“see these as gimmicks that are out-of-keeping with Buxton”</i></p> <p><i>“who would control their content?”</i></p>	<p>Clearly this is a subjective view. Response from public feedback was this aspect was well liked and not viewed as gimmick.</p> <p>Management of content would be agreed at later point. Likely to include some commercial promotion (e.g. encouraging shop/leisure use)</p>	
	<p>Proposals</p> <p><i>“Remove these gimmicks from the scheme and replace with new family friendly public art / sculpture ideas”</i></p>	<p>We agree that some form of public art is needed, particularly close to the eastern end of Spring Gardens to create a focal point. The emerging masterplan had identified a ‘giant picture frame’ concept but following feedback it was felt that a high quality arts element developed by and reflecting the towns cultural heritage would be more appropriate. This is being reviewed for inclusion of a public art project fund within the FHSF business case and would need to involve arts and creative organisations based in the town in further development. It should be noted that the HAZ project includes a Cultural programme as well.)</p>	<p>Need to consider additional options in march revision</p>