

## KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

### PLANNING SERVICE

#### UPDATE OF LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DECIDED BY

#### DISTRICT WIDE PLANNING COMMITTEE

29 JANUARY 2026

---

Planning Application 2025/92443

Item 11 – Page 11

**External works to Market Building and wider site including alteration and demolition of modern additions to the Market building, new glazed screens, new WC and welfare facilities, provision of services and lighting including associated works, remodelling to the stone annexe, alterations to catering facilities, and self-contained commercial units, works to floor surfaces of Market Building. Use of Market Building for a mix of uses (sui generis) including retail, hot food takeaway, drinking establishment, restaurant / café uses, market office, public welfare facilities, storage facilities as well as provision of areas that provide a mix of fixed and flexible indoor and outdoor market stalls. Creation of areas for open market, siting of associated structures, installation of new fixed market stalls demolition of external bin store and creation of waste compound area, storage compounds, vehicular parking, remodelling and surfacing of areas of hardstanding, street furniture, car park layout, installation of parcel lockers, landscaping and associated works (Listed Building within a Conservation Area)**

**Huddersfield Open Market, Brook Street, Huddersfield.**

An email has been received on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2026 in relation to a petition which it states has received 1370 signatures in support of a co-design process.

The signatures have been gained on the basis of a request for a co-design process and its support on the basis of a letter which states the following:

*We are visitors to Huddersfield open market and this letter is to make you aware of our opposition to the plans for the open market submitted in planning applications 2025/48/92443/W 2025/65/92444/W.*

*We object on the material grounds of design, heritage, and local policy.*

*We know that Huddersfield open market is a flourishing and unique market in a Grade II\* listed building that is well loved and popular in its current configuration by traders and visitors alike.*

*We call on you to support the rejection of the current planning*

*applications and to support their replacement by suitable plans for the market devised through a co-design process.*

*We trust you will begin a conversation with traders and visitors about their objections and about the appropriate co-design process to move forward.*

Figures provided in relation to the petition are broken down as being the following:

- 1000 people from the collectables and second hand markets with more than 25% of those from outside Kirklees
- 370 responses in relation to auto jumble with 37% visitors from outside Kirklees and 39% outside west Yorkshire.

Further to the above, a statement has been received which has been requested to be made available for members to view in the absence of it being able to be presented to them verbally at the meeting.

Other than the removal of personal information as required for data protection purposes the statement is copied below, in italics, in full:

***Objection to Planning Applications 2025/48/92443/W and 2025/65/92444/W Brook Street Market***

*I am objecting to this application. I am not a resident of Kirklees but my interest is as a relative of a trader who will be affected by the plans. My overall objection is that the application is not valid in accordance with the National Policy Framework section 4, "Preapplication Engagement and Front Loading." In addition, I am also relying on advice received from the Planning Department on 6 November 2025 and 17 November 2025, that my representations "will be addressed in the processing of the application."*

*My main concerns are that consultation was inadequate, either inaccurately recorded or not recorded at all, and therefore came to inaccurate conclusions; and that the plans for the revamped market are either ill-thought out or not fully disclosed, leading to a project that has poor, or non-disclosed, objectives.*

***Consultation***

*Paragraph 3.2 of the cabinet report (document A, see below) refers to "partnership working with...local traders" Paragraph 3.3 quotes an "exercise that engaged local people and town centre stakeholders, businesses and users." My Freedom of Information request asked who the town centre stakeholders were. The response was in document C, which refers to trader and community engagement. Whilst it is self evident that the traders spoken to have a vested interest, there is no description of who the town centre stakeholders were and therefore traders and customers cannot evaluate whether responders have a vested interest in the outcome of the plans. Document C summarises responses in some detail but as it does not indicate who said what, it*

cannot be a reliable, impartial source of information. **Consultation was therefore inadequate, and the lack of detail about the consultees demonstrates inaccurate recording of who was consulted.**

The Freedom of Information response states that in July 2024, “a walkaround took place over two days with the design team and Markets Team. Plans were shared with each of the traders.... This was followed up by further discussions with trader reps in Autumn 2024. There is not a list of these traders.” A walkaround is not a consultation; at best it was informal feedback. **Consultation was therefore inadequate.**

The traders never received a copy of the responses to the walkaround. **This consultation, such as it was, was not recorded so there is no evidence that the detail of traders’ views has been considered.**

The Freedom of Information response states that in February 2025, traders were asked to complete an Expression of Interest to determine demand for returning to the market. 98 traders stated they’d like to transfer to both the temporary and new markets. **This consultation is not recorded in the planning documents themselves.**

It might be worth noting that traders saying they would like to transfer is not the same as saying they approve. What other choice do they have?

### **Planning**

The success of the plans for the re-fitted market depends on attracting new, high quality, business to it. The Freedom of Information request defines high quality, but states that there is no plan which explains the type of businesses approached who will apply to become traders. **There is no “preapplication engagement” in this respect evident in the proposals.**

The Freedom of Information response states that the layout will “create open spaces for market led events or seasonal markets which may bring their own infrastructure or require different pitch sizes” but contains no detail of the businesses consulted, if any, who will partake in these events. **There is no “preapplication engagement” in this respect evident in the proposals.**

Document C states, “New commercial and retail opportunities are introduced to maximise the potential of the public asset, without losing the existing market use for which it has a strong and much loved local reputation.” Once again, this commendable objective is lacking detailed business planning. **There is no “preapplication engagement” in this respect evident in the proposals.**

### **Summary**

It is by no means clear who has been consulted, where consultation has been recorded and how the results have been properly incorporated into the proposals.

There is ample evidence of planning for the physical work required to change the market but what is missing is any sort of coherent, settled plan for what comes after the refurbishing is completed. **This planning** Page 3

***is surely a pre-requisite for securing the future of the market; therefore national guidance that “Early engagement has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system for all parties. Good quality pre-application discussion enables better coordination between public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community,” has not been met.***

*Documents Referred to:*

*Funding associated with Huddersfield Open Market, Penistone Rail Line, Dewsbury Long-term plan and West Yorkshire Investment Zone; and delivery of Growth & Regeneration portfolio. Cabinet report 12 March 2024 (Document A)*

*Huddersfield Market Redevelopment Planning Statement. 14 August 2025 (Document B)*

*Project Planning and Statutory Requirements. Undated (Received from the Council following a Freedom of Information request, 12 December 2025) (Document C)*

---

**Planning Application 2025/93197**

**Item 12 – Page 51**

**Erection of free standing single storey structure to be used as a temporary indoor market (sui generis) with associated facilities, office cabins, waste compound, parking spaces and works (within a Conservation Area)**

**adj, Huddersfield Open Market, Brook Street, Huddersfield, HD1 1RY**

The additional information submitted under planning application 2025/92443 (see above) is of relevance in so far as it relates to the temporary arrangements proposed for the redevelopment of Huddersfield Open Market.

---

**Planning Application 2025/93235**

**Item 13 – Page 71**

**Removal of the Cross and reinstatement within the grass verge on Cross Street/Wyke Lane (Listed Building)**

**The Cross, Wyke Lane/Cross Street, Oakenshaw**

Following publication of the Committee Report, four (4) additional representations have been received which supplement the existing comments made.

The following points have been raised with an officer response provided for each:

1. *The council erected direction arrows around the monument many years ago thereby creating a roundabout and the site does function as an effective traffic calming measure. To remove this would increase danger of speeding traffic on Wyke Lane and a danger to pedestrians particularly where there is little or no pavement.*
2. *Alternative traffic calming measures as previously suggested, including speed limits, must be in place if the Cross is to be moved from its original position*
3. *Removing the Cross makes safety much worse unless the Council commits to road safety measures.*
4. *16.5m long articulated HGVs should be banned on this section of road.*
5. *The cross and its plinth serve as a traffic calming measure, if the cross is not replaced in situ this measure will be lost.*
6. *The process of access and egress of Wyke Lane has become more complicated.*
7. *Removal of the Cross will cause highway safety issues onto Bradford Road.*
8. *Traffic calming measures should be introduced to combat implications relating to speeding traffic at this section of the road.*

**Officer Comment:** Temporary safety measures were put in place by the Highway Authority. Works to the junction are detailed within Drawing No. HD/25/67355/GC-1A. The highway works will be undertaken by the Highway Authority and do not require planning permission.

9. *There has been no explanation of why it can't be returned to its original position*

**Officer Comment:** The highway safety implications have been considered at the beginning of paragraph 10.22 of the Committee Report.

10. *We were told that road safety audits would be conducted before any work, but nothing has materialised yet. Similarly, we were told in February 2025 that the council continues to monitor traffic on Wyke Lane.*
11. *The statement in the Highways consideration understood to be from community engagement regarding HGVs from one business is incorrect or not fully understood from community reporting.*
12. *There have only been two traffic collisions with the cross.*

**Officer Comment:** Relevant highway safety information has been provided in order to make an assessment of the application. The highway safety

implications have been considered at the beginning of paragraph 10.22 of the Committee Report.

13. *The current protective concrete bollards take up more road surface than the original monument and also protect a heritage site that we were told by the Council's Conservation Officer could not be visually improved as it would be a criminal offence. How can this be tarmacked over?*

14. *The Construction Plan states that the remaining stones should be "removed carefully without any damage due to the heritage vale and set aside for re-use." This stone belongs to Oakenshaw, should be retained there and could be used as a historical feature.*

**Officer Comment:** Further archaeological investigation is recommended to enable the measurement and recording of below-ground features, ensuring that any removal of significant material is carried out in accordance with appropriate archaeological methods, as detailed at the beginning of paragraph 10.37 of the Committee Report.

15. *As stated by Historic England (HE) and the Heritage Statement the original location of the Cross in the middle of the village with full site along Wyke Lane is very significant.*

16. *The letter of application states that the Cross would be moved 12m further than its original position. The application form and the DAS both state it will be moved 20m further away but the Heritage Statement by Ecology Solutions states 15m. The latter was the figure sent to HE in preapplication discussions so they may have been misled.*

17. *Historic England favours the nearest position which would be the site of the cherry tree on the grassed area, and this would maintain the visual perspective of its significance. This is also a flatter area for construction. Surely this is better from a heritage perspective as long as one or two trees are planted further down Cross St as replacements.*

18. *The Cross should be returned to its original location.*

**Officer Comment:** Officers, KC Conservation & Design and Historic England consider the significance of the heritage asset will be preserved. Officers measure the Cross will be moved 17.50m to the north-west.

19. *The proposed siting on the plans means that it will not be visible along Wyke Lane and only to those on Cross St which reduces significantly its important heritage position.*

20. *It has stood on Wyke Lane for over 300 years and being on the road means it can be seen, to move it down to the left on the grass will mean it cannot be seen from the main road as now.*

**Officer Comment:** The Cross will be visible from aspects along Wyke Lane.

21. *Cross is moved development of a public realm space should include a waste bin and there must be a guarantee that the council maintains it. It has been made clear to the council applicant that the community will not volunteer to maintain such a space.*

**Officer Comment:** Proposed enhancements to the grass verge are indicated on drawing LA-03.

22. *An interpretation board could have a QR code to a website. It could have a timeline of the history of the Monument. Acknowledgements to villagers who have kept our history alive and reading references. Recognition that Brontes would have gone past the Monument. Record of archaeological remains.*

23. *The current information board was funded by the Council. Are they really going to dig it up again using their funds to do so?*

24. *It's important that the information offered is in a format to suit all current age groups and future ones who have yet to see the Cross for the first time.*

25. *A noticeboard up there would allow residents to be updated with new findings about the Oakenshaw history as well as events happening in the village or surrounding areas.*

**Officer Comment:** It is proposed that the existing interpretation board be reused.

26. *There is concern that having it off the road makes it more vulnerable to being vandalised and will attract folks who want to be noisy after hours.*

**Officer Comment:** Impact on residential amenity has been discussed at the beginning of paragraph 10.18 of the Committee Report. It is considered the impact would be limited with no concerns in terms of crime and safety.

27. *Where do vehicles park that want to bring people who cannot walk to be beside the Cross.*

**Officer Comment:** There is suitable on-street parking on public roads in the surrounding area.

28. *No answer as to why has ever been given yet it seems sensible for a third party to pay for damage they have caused by wilfully ignoring the restriction sign.*

**Officer Comment:** The history of the previous incidents involving the Cross cannot be considered within the planning balance.

29. *There has been no assessment if the foundation can withstand the weight of the monument.*

**Officer Comment:** Specification: Structural Works, authored by Blackett-Ord, reference Y19, submitted on 12 January 2026 references work in the event voids are uncovered during the installation of the monument under beginning on line 330 & 337, Lines 270 & 310 relate to procedures for a stable base.