About the application

Application number: 2025/92444	
What is the application for?:	Listed building consent for external works to Market Building and wider site inc
Address of the site or building:	Huddersfield Open Market, Brook Street, Huddersfield, HD1 1DY
Postcode:	HD1 2NF

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

Good afternoon, to whom it may concern, I write to formally object to the above planning applications, concerning the proposed redevelopment, modernisation, and temporary relocation of the Huddersfield Wholesale and Open Market Brook Street, Huddersfield.

This objection is submitted on the basis of material planning considerations as required under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and associated planning policies.
The significant reasons for the objection are listed further below.

The Huddersfield Wholesale Market is a long-established cultural, social and economic asset to the community. The current proposals constitute a high risk to its continued viability, the livelihoods of stallholders, and the historic character of the market.

1. Drastic damage to the Heritage Asset

Listed as a Grade II* heritage site, under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Sections 199-208), grave consideration must be given to the preservation of designated heritage assets, and any harmful alterations must be clearly and convincingly justified.

The proposal to significantly alter the configuration, trading, and operational environment of the market - including introducing a bar/restaurant/café/food stalls and extended opening hours - represent substantial impact on the listed building. However, the application fails to provide justification if such impact, harm, is outweighed by the public's welfare.

In addition, the application does not asses the loss of the market's current function, which forms a curtail part in its heritage.

2. Failure to demonstrate the economic viability

The planning submission provides no strong, concrete, independent economic impact

The planning submission provides no strong, concrete, independent economic impact assessment demonstrating that the proposed redevelopment will improve or sustain the livelihoods of existing traders.

Material planning considerations include:

Loss of footfall due to relocation and reduced visibility
Risk of permanent trader displacement during and after redevelopment.
Reduction of stall space during the proposed temporary market period.

The proposed temporary market is smaller in scale and economic value comparing to the existing market. It also fails to demo state the same benefits and like-to-like perception of the facilities. This directly conflicts with the NPPF's objective of maintain town centre vitality and economic resilience.

3.Loss of employment and established local economy

The market supports a wide network of independent traders, employees, and suppliers. The application fails to assess:

Job losses during the temporary relocation period.
Long-term trader deprecation following the redevelopment.
The impact on small, independent businesses reliant on the market model.

Planning policy requires the governance board to consider the economic role or town centre users. The proposed scheme prioritises leasure-led development (bars and hospitality uses) over a proven, employment-generating wholesale and retail market.

4.Conflict with local planning policy

The proposal conflicts with the Kirklees Local Plan, particularly policies that seek to:

Protect town centre uses.
Safeguard heritage assists and their setting.
Support small and independent businesses.

No evidence has been presented demonstrating that alternative options - including sensitive refurbishment without functional displacement - have been properly explored.

5.Inadequate consultation and procedural concerns

Despite the submission of a planning objection letter by the stallholders, no engaging communication has been established. This raises concerns regarding:

Indifference to stakeholder consultation.
Failure to meaningfully consider trader representations.

Failure to properly consider representations and evidence can render planning

decisions unlawful.

6.Historical precedent: Huddersfield Market Hall (1970 demolition)

The demolition of the former Huddersfield Market Hall in 1970 serves as a local precedent illustrating the irreversible cultural and economic loss that can result from short-term redevelopment decisions.
This historical example reinforces the need tor extreme caution to be taken then altering long-standing market infrastructure.

7.Legal and policy basis for refusal or amendment

In light of the above, the application:

Fails to meet the NPPF tests for heritage harm justification.
Undermines town centre vitality and employment.
Lacks sufficient economic evidence.
Conflicts with local planning policy.
Risks irreversible cultural and social loss.

I therefore respectfully request that the application be refused, or at minimum differed pending:

A full independent economic impact assessment.
A like-to-like temporary market provision.
Genuine engagement with existing traders.
Consideration of alternative refurbishment options.

The Huddersfield Wholesale Market is not a vacant development site for commercial use; it is a living cultural and thriving institution, which plays a crucial part in its community. Planning policy requires its protection, and that proven benefit can be demonstrated - which has not occurred in this case.

I respectfully urge the Kirklees Council to uphold its statutory duties and protect this vital asset for current and future generations.

Kind regards,
Custodian of Huddersfield Civic Memory