

Public Document Pack



**Service Director – Legal, Governance and
Commissioning**

Julie Muscroft

The Democracy Service

Civic Centre 3

High Street

Huddersfield

HD1 2TG

Tel: 01484 221000

Please ask for: Jodie Harris

Email: jodie.harris@kirklees.gov.uk

Monday 25 October 2021

Notice of Meeting

Dear Member

Economy and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Panel

The **Economy and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Panel** will meet in the **Council Chamber - Town Hall, Huddersfield** at **2.00 pm** on **Tuesday 2 November 2021**.

This meeting will be webcast live and will be available to view via the Council's website.

The items which will be discussed are described in the agenda and there are reports attached which give more details.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Julie Muscroft", on a light-colored background.

Julie Muscroft

Service Director – Legal, Governance and Commissioning

Kirklees Council advocates openness and transparency as part of its democratic processes. Anyone wishing to record (film or audio) the public parts of the meeting should inform the Chair/Clerk of their intentions prior to the meeting.

The Economy and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Panel members are:-

Member

Councillor Harpreet Uppal (Chair)

Councillor Gwen Lowe

Councillor Yusra Hussain

Councillor Andrew Pinnock

Councillor Adam Gregg

Councillor Elizabeth Smaje

Chris Friend (Co-Optee)

Andrew Bird (Co-Optee)

Agenda

Reports or Explanatory Notes Attached

Pages

1: Membership of the Committee

To receive apologies for absence from those Members who are unable to attend the meeting.

2: Interests

1 - 2

The Councillors will be asked to say if there are any items on the Agenda in which they have disclosable pecuniary interests, which would prevent them from participating in any discussion of the items or participating in any vote upon the items, or any other interests.

3: Admission of the Public

Most debates take place in public. This only changes when there is a need to consider certain issues, for instance, commercially sensitive information or details concerning an individual. You will be told at this point whether there are any items on the Agenda which are to be discussed in private.

4: Call-In of Cabinet Decision in relation to the A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme

3 - 150

The Panel will consider issues arising from a Call-in request in relation to the decision taken by Cabinet on the 12th October 2021, on the A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme.

Further clarifications in respect of the Areas of Focus will follow.

Contact:

Leigh Webb, Governance Manager

KIRKLEES COUNCIL					
COUNCIL/CABINET/COMMITTEE MEETINGS ETC					
DECLARATION OF INTERESTS					
Economy & Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Panel					
Name of Councillor					
Item in which you have an interest	Type of interest (eg a disclosable pecuniary interest or an "Other Interest")	Does the nature of the interest require you to withdraw from the meeting while the item in which you have an interest is under consideration? [Y/N]	Brief description of your interest		

Signed: Dated:

NOTES

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your disclosable pecuniary interests under the new national rules. Any reference to spouse or civil partner includes any person with whom you are living as husband or wife, or as if they were your civil partner.

Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner, undertakes.

Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses.

Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority -

- under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
- which has not been fully discharged.

Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.

Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.

Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) - the landlord is your council or authority; and the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.

Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -

- (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
(b) either -

the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.



Name of meeting: Economy and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Panel

Date: 2 November 2021

Title of report: Call in of Cabinet Decision in relation to A62 Cooper Bridge Improvement Corridor

Purpose of report: To provide members of the Economy and Neighbourhoods Panel with background information in respect of the Call-In.

Key Decision - Is it likely to result in spending or saving £250k or more, or to have a significant effect on two or more electoral wards?	Yes/ no or Not Applicable Yes
Key Decision - Is it in the <u>Council's Forward Plan (key decisions and private reports)</u> ?	Key Decision – Yes Private Report/Private Appendix – No
The Decision - Is it eligible for call in by Scrutiny?	Yes/No or Not Applicable Yes
Date signed off by <u>Strategic Director</u> & name Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Finance? Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Legal Governance and Commissioning?	N/A Report for Information
Cabinet member portfolio	Councillor Peter McBride - Regeneration

Electoral wards affected: N/A

Ward councillors consulted: N/A

Public or private: Public

Has GDPR been considered? Yes

Summary

1. Key Points

- 1.1 On 19 October 2021, the Service Director for Legal, Governance & Commissioning received written notification from 5 non-executive councillors of their wish to call-in a decision of Cabinet made on 12 October 2021. The decision was in relation to the A62 Cooper Bridge Improvement Corridor. Following a validation exercise of the Call-in request form by the Chair of Scrutiny and the Service Director for Legal, Governance and Commissioning, a document has been produced, including the validated reasons for the call-in (attached at Appendix 1).
- 1.2 The Panel has access to all papers considered by the Cabinet when making the decision, and will be able to question the relevant officers and Cabinet Members. Committee Members are also able to hear from other interested parties including other councillors and members of the public. A detailed timetable for the Panel meeting is attached at Appendix 2.
- 1.3 The Panel and the public should focus its attention and questions on those issues that are set out in the validated Call-in request.
- 1.4 Once the Panel has considered the points raised and all supporting information and evidence, it must resolve either to:
 - (1) Free the decision for implementation
 - (2) Refer it back to the Cabinet with a recommendation for amendment
 - (3) In exceptional circumstances, refer the issue to the next Council meeting if the decision is not consistent with the budget or any policy previously agreed by the Council. This can only be done with advice from the relevant senior officers and the Service Director: for Legal, Governance and Commissioning.
- 1.5 If the decision is referred back to Cabinet, it will be considered at the next meeting of Cabinet. Cabinet may:
 - Accept the recommendation of the Scrutiny Panel and amend its decision;
 - Decide that further work needs to be done and defer the item until this is completed. The Economy and Neighbourhoods Panel should be kept informed of the work as it progresses and be formally notified when it is to be reconsidered;
 - Not accept the view of the Scrutiny Panel and confirm its original decision;
 - Refer the issue for discussion at the next appropriate Council meeting.

1.6 If the Cabinet confirms its original decision, it can be implemented immediately as there is no scope for further review and challenge. A decision may only be reviewed once.

2. Information required to take a decision

The Panel will have access to all the information considered by Cabinet when making the original decision.

3. Implications for the Council

There are no specific implications for the Council within this report as the Panel does not have decision making powers. However as a result of hearing the call in evidence, recommendations may be made to Cabinet to amend its decision which, if accepted, could result in implications for the Council.

3.1 Working with People

N/A

3.2 Working with Partners

N/A

3.3 Place Based Working

N/A

3.4 Climate Change and Air Quality

N/A

3.5 Improving outcomes for children

N/A

3.6 Other (eg Legal/Financial or Human Resources) Consultees and their opinions

N/A

4 Next steps and timelines

Following consideration of all the information and evidence, Members of the Panel need to make one of the following three recommendations, in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules:

(1) Take no further action and free the decision for implementation.

- (2) Refer it back to the Cabinet with recommendation(s) for amendment.
- (3) In exceptional circumstances, refer to the next Council meeting (only if the decision is not in line with the budget or any policy previously agreed by the Council. This can only be done with advice from the relevant senior officers and the Service Director for Legal, Governance and Commissioning.)

5 Officer recommendations and reasons

That Members of the Panel consider all of the information and evidence and make one of the three recommendations in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny rules as set out in the Constitution

6 Cabinet Portfolio Holder's recommendations

N/A

7 Contact officer

Leigh Webb, Governance Manager, Tel: 01484 221000
email:leigh.webb@kirklees.gov.uk

8 Background Papers and History of Decisions

Overview and Scrutiny Rules – Council Constitution.
A62 Cooper Bridge Improvement Corridor – Cabinet Report 12.10.2021
Cabinet Presentation – 12.10.2021

9 Service Director responsible

Julie Muscroft, Service Director, Legal, Governance & Commissioning

Scrutiny Areas of Focus following Call In request relating to the A62 to Cooper Bridge Improvement Scheme report which was considered by Cabinet on the 12th of October 2021

Following consideration of the call in request form, the following areas have been validated as the focus of the call in review meeting [2 November 2021].

Decision making principle	Area of focus
1. Relevant considerations	<p><i>A number of technical questions were asked at Cabinet , following the staff presentation at the start of the meeting and no answers were given meaning that Cabinet were taking a decision without assessment of all the facts</i></p> <p><i>[Council has previously agreed that these works and others which affect the B6118 and subsequently Grange Moor/Flockton should have an impact assessment report, this did not and when questioned cabinet failed to respond]</i></p> <p>Issues Moved from elsewhere: <i>The decision by cabinet to build the major works at Cooper bridge “online” i.e. on or largely on the existing highway will have a massive impact on the locality for the period of the works yet no data is given on this , what impact there is on traffic flow at the strategic junction, no details of the impact on air</i></p> <p><i>No reference or proof of compliance has been had with modern transport design guidance and criteria</i></p> <p><i>The plan has no clear bus priority measures, other than possibly transponders when the bus is at the front of a queue, getting there being the main delay. Yet bus travel and modal shift is a key priority for kirklees and west Yorkshire with agreed targets to increase usage</i></p>

	<p>List supporting evidence: Cabinet webcast and supporting agenda papers</p>
<p>2. Clarity</p>	<p><i>The project does not with clarity set out objectives and the measurable outcomes it hopes to achieve, the air quality for example needs to be a holistic view of not only the potential at the end of the project but to factor in any detrimental impacts during construction, offset against the end result and how many years it is to “break even”</i></p> <p>List supporting evidence: cabinet papers and webcast</p>
<p>3. Options</p>	<p><i>Members in the debate said a number of alternatives had been considered but no details were presented for consideration and no reason and data on why some more effective options were not pursued</i></p> <p>List supporting evidence: Cabinet papers and webcast</p>

Call-In Hearing Timetable
A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme

Meeting	Timetable ¹
<p>1. Introduction by Chair of Panel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - explanation of conduct of the meeting 	<p style="text-align: center;">2pm</p>
<p>2. Lead Signatory's Statement</p> <p>Explanation of reasons set out in call in request and any supporting evidence</p> <p>Clarification: Panel Members may seek clarification on anything that has been said.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">20 minutes</p>
<p>3. Public Participation (Councillors)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - councillors who are not signatories may attend to give evidence relevant to the reasons set out in the Call-In request (up to 5 minutes each) <p>Clarification: Panel Members may seek clarification on points raised by councillors</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">20 minutes</p>
<p>4. Public Participation (Public)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - members of the public may attend to give evidence on the reasons set out in the call on request (up to 5 minutes each – it is recommended that pressure groups are represented by 1 speaker) <p>Clarification: Panel Members may seek clarification on points raised by members of the public</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">30 minutes</p>
<p>5. Decision-Makers Statement</p> <p>The relevant decision-makers, with support from appropriate officers, will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - respond to the reasons set out in the call in request - Have the opportunity to respond to any information that has been raised during the discussion at the meeting. <p>Clarification: Panel Members can raise issues of clarification with the decision-makers</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">40 minutes</p>
<p>6. Final Panel clarification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If required, Panel Members can ask any outstanding questions of any of those who have presented information at the meeting 	<p style="text-align: center;">10 minutes</p>

Call-In Hearing Timetable
A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme

BREAK – COMMITTEE WITHDRAW TO FORMULATE DECISION	
7.	<p>The Panel will reconvene to read out their decision and the reasons for this which will be in accordance with the options set out in the Council Procedure Rules:</p> <p>(1) take no further action and free the decision for implementation *</p> <p>(2) refer it back to the Cabinet with recommendation/s for amendment</p> <p>(3) in exceptional circumstances, refer to the next Council - only if the decision is not in line with the budget or any policy previously agreed by the Council**.</p> <p><i>* The Panel may identify areas of learning for Cabinet to consider which do not require the original decision to continue to be suspended from implementation.</i></p> <p><i>** This can only be done with advice from the relevant senior officers and the Service Director for Legal, Governance and Commissioning Head of Legal Services.</i></p>

1. Please note that the timings are for guideline purposes only and are subject to change on the day at the discretion of the Chair of the meeting.

Name of meeting: Cabinet

Date: 12 October 2021

Title of report: A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme

Purpose of report: For Cabinet to:

- Agree in principle to the scheme
- Authorise the Council to accept and spend funding to work up the WY+TF A62 to Cooper Bridge scheme to Full Business Case (FBC),
- Agree in principle to land acquisition as part of a land assembly

Key Decision - Is it likely to result in spending or saving £250k or more, or to have a significant effect on two or more electoral wards?	Yes. Additional funding is being sought from West Yorkshire Combined Authority to enable the development of the A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement scheme.
Key Decision - Is it in the <u>Council's Forward Plan (key decisions and private reports)?</u>	Key Decision – Yes Private Report/Private Appendix – No
The Decision - Is it eligible for call in by Scrutiny?	Yes – already called to Economy & Neighbourhood Scrutiny in August 2021
Date signed off by David Shepherd Strategic Director Growth & Regeneration Date signed off by Eamonn Croston Service Director Finance Date signed off by Julie Muscroft Service Director for Legal Governance and Commissioning	Give name and date for Cabinet / Scrutiny reports Give name and date for Cabinet reports Give name and date for Cabinet reports
Cabinet member portfolio	Cllr McBride –Regeneration Cllr Mather - Environment Cllr Firth –Town Centres

Electoral wards affected: Ashbrow, Liversedge & Gomersal, Mirfield. Given the strategic location of this scheme is has the potential to impact wards across the wider Kirklees/Calderdale districts.

Ward councillors consulted: Cllr Homewood, Cllr Uppal, Cllr Pinnock, Cllr Bolt, Cllr Hall, Cllr Kath Taylor, Cllr Lees Hamilton, Cllr Stephen, Cllr McBride, Cllr Mather, Cllr Eric Firth, Cllr Simpson, Cllr John Taylor.

Public or private: Public

Has GDPR been considered? Yes

1. Summary

- 1.1. Congestion, long journey times and poor air quality is currently experienced in the Cooper Bridge area and on the A644 and A62 nearby. The A62 and A644 have been identified as key routes which, through improvements, could support the creation of jobs in the area, relieve congestion, reduce journey times for general traffic, and improve pedestrian and cycling accessibility.
- 1.2. The A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement scheme is being developed to address these issues, its strategic objectives are:

To improve journey time reliability and reduce journey times for all vehicles travelling through the scheme section of the A62 corridor, achieving an average saving of 1 minute or more for buses within 1 year of the scheme opening. This will be achieved by maximising the capacity of Bradley and Cooper Bridge junctions.
To contribute towards the economic, physical, and social regeneration of Huddersfield and the Leeds City Region by increasing the capacity of the local road network to support the phased delivery of approximately 1,460 homes by 2031 in this part of Kirklees
To realise a positive first year rate of return in casualty numbers by delivering a range of complementary measures within the scheme limits that enhance road safety including the introduction of improved cycle and pedestrian facilities
To mitigate the potential environmental impacts of the scheme and enhance the local environment where possible. Including contributing to the Councils target to reduce the Bradley AQMA NO2 to below 40µg/m3 and not creating any new Air Quality areas of concern within 1 year of opening.
To realise an increase in the number of active mode journeys against a 2022 baseline.

- 1.3. The scheme complements a wider package of investment in our transport network across the Kirklees and Calderdale districts to collectively improve access into Huddersfield and its connectivity with existing and planned neighbourhoods and other local towns. The scheme supports wider economic and housing growth and specifically the development of the Bradley Park Strategic housing site.
- 1.4. An Outline Business Case (OBC) has been prepared for submission to the Combined Authority and will seek Grant funding of £10m to develop the scheme to Full Business Case (FBC) submission.
- 1.5. The economic appraisal demonstrates the scheme offers High Value for Money (based on the Department for Transport Value for Money Framework), with a Benefit Cost Ratio of 2.959.
- 1.6. The proposed scheme will require third party land to enable the construction of a new roundabout and targeted highway widening.
- 1.7. An essential element of securing FBC approval is to demonstrate that the necessary interests in land and, where necessary, creation of new rights over

land, needed, to enable the proposed highway improvements and mitigation measures to be delivered, have been obtained.

- 1.8. Initial engagement with landowners regarding the likely needs to acquire land has been ongoing since 2018, however formal negotiations are yet to commence and are subject to approval of the OBC.
- 1.9. The terms under which the Council will negotiate is on "a deemed CPO basis", in accordance with what would be payable pursuant to the "Compensation Code", (the body of statute and case law that establishes the basis of compensation in the event that a CPO is confirmed and implemented). In such circumstances, qualifying affected parties may have rights to additional compensation payments in addition to the value of the land.
- 1.10. Whilst it is proposed to seek to acquire land by negotiation, it is necessary, in the event that negotiations either fail or do not proceed in a timely manner and therefore to mitigate against delay, to progress preparation of a CPO under Part XII Acquisition, Vesting and Transfer of Land etc., namely Sections 239, 240 and 246 of the Highways Act 1980 and otherwise as may be necessary to acquire all outstanding interests in land and new rights required for the construction of the improvements and the mitigation of impacts of the project.
- 1.11. Where necessary Cabinet authority will be sought separately to make CPOs once the case for CPO has been established.
- 1.12. A six-week public consultation ran between 7 June and 18 July 2021, design changes have been incorporated following the feedback received.
- 1.13. Given the engineering complexity and third-party interfaces associated with this scheme it is intended to procure a Delivery Partner via a Design and Build contract to take the scheme through delivery and construction.
- 1.14. The contract will include a break clause between the design and construction stages to facilitate a termination of the contract should the project be unsuccessful in securing funding and/or necessary statutory consents.

The Strategic Director for Growth & Regeneration is seeking authorisation from Cabinet:

- to agree in principle to the scheme
- for the Council to accept and enter into any agreement with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority for the funding to work up the A62 to Cooper Bridge Scheme to FBC.
- for the Council to incur expenditure in the working up of the scheme if the Council's application to the West Yorkshire Combined Authority for funding is successful.

- to delegate to the Strategic Director Growth & Regeneration the authority to negotiate and agree the terms of any agreements that may be necessary to work up the A62 to Cooper Bridge Scheme including the funding agreement with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority.
- to delegate authority to the Service Director – Legal, Governance & Commissioning to enter into the grant agreement with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority for the funding of the A62 to Cooper Bridge and any other relevant agreements and documents to which the Council is party.
- the acquisition of land in principle as part of a land assembly.

2. Information required to take a decision

- 2.1. Kirklees, together with the other four West Yorkshire (WY) district councils, the West Yorkshire Combined Authority and York (WYCA), have created a government funded West Yorkshire plus Transport Fund (WY+TF) that will facilitate major investment in transport to create an environment where economic growth will occur across WY.
- 2.2. In July 2014, the Government announced that the West Yorkshire Combined Authority had secured funding to establish a £1bn fund over 15 years.
- 2.3. To date, Cabinet has received three reports which relate to the West Yorkshire plus Transport Fund:
 - a) West Yorkshire Transport Fund – Scheme Principles - On 9th February 2016, Cabinet approved the ‘West Yorkshire Transport Fund – Scheme Principles’ report which highlighted a number of key highway design principles that could be used as a basis for the design and development of the Kirklees WY+TF schemes, these were
 - Balancing strategic needs against local concerns;
 - Creating “Gateways” for our main town and urban centres;
 - The acquisition/appropriation of land for highway purposes;
 - The future use and management of the road-space of our key transport corridors; and
 - The environmental and economic benefits of greening up our key transport corridors (Green Streets).
 - b) ‘Land Acquisition Costs’ - On 22nd August 2017, Cabinet agreed to underwrite land acquisition costs until finance is subsequently secured from WY+TF and costs reimbursed. Because of this decision a rolling ‘WY+TF Land Acquisition Fund’ has been set up in the Council’s Capital Plan.
 - c) ‘WY+TF Schemes Update’ - On 19 December 2018, a WY+TF Schemes Update report was presented to Cabinet which included a description and status of the A62 to Cooper Bridge scheme (then named the ‘A62/A644 (Wakefield Road) Link Road’ scheme).

- 2.4. The scheme previously included the delivery of a new link road between Bradley junction and the A644, to create additional capacity and a new access point into the Bradley Park strategic housing site.
- 2.5. In 2018/19 the council undertook a public engagement on three potential link road options. Despite support for the proposals some objections were raised in relation to the environmental impacts of the scheme, most notably the significant loss of Ancient (irreplaceable) Woodland.
- 2.6. Despite efforts to minimise the loss of woodland, work which concluded in 2020 established the loss of Ancient Woodland could not be wholly avoided. Subsequently, considering the council having declared a climate emergency and the objections received the decision was taken not to pursue a link road solution.
- 2.7. Instead, four options were considered which focussed on improving the existing network, maximising the capacity of Cooper Bridge and Bradley junctions to meet the strategic objectives of the scheme, whilst minimising the environmental impacts.
- 2.8. A general arrangement drawing showing the latest scheme design is included at **Appendix A**. The preferred scheme includes the following interventions:
 - creating a new three-armed roundabout at Cooper Bridge junction with dedicated left-turn links
 - widening Cooper Bridge Road between Cooper Bridge and Bradley junctions
 - widening of the A62 Leeds Road between Bradley junction and Oak Road
 - widening of Colne Bridge Road on the approach to Bradley junction
 - widening of the A644 Wakefield Road on the approach to M62 junction 25
 - improving signal timings and changes to lane markings and permitted movements at Bradley junction
 - changing Oak Road to one-way
 - improving pedestrian and cycle facilities throughout, including new signal-controlled crossings and segregated cycle facilities on Leeds Road, Oak Road, Cooper Bridge Road and at Cooper Bridge junction
 - new landscaped areas and sustainable drainage systems
- 2.9. To maximise the capacity of Bradley junction it is proposed to ban the right turn for traffic travelling from Cooper Bridge and turning onto Bradley Road. Instead, this traffic will be directed onto Oak Road.
- 2.10. To mitigate the impacts of this the scheme includes widening of Leeds Road between Bradley junction and Oak Road to cater for the diverted traffic and proposes changing Oak Road to one-way. This enables parking bays to be provided outside properties, live traffic to be physically further away from the

frontages of properties and removes the potential conflict between two-way traffic.

- 2.11. The left turn from Leeds Road onto Bradley Road at Bradley junction will also be banned. This will allow improved arrangements for pedestrian crossings.

Existing issues

- 2.12. The performance of the highway network in Kirklees was assessed in producing the Local Plan. This identified that the Cooper Bridge, Three Nuns (A62/A644) and Bradley junctions were all ranked in the top five junctions with the most delay in the district.
- 2.13. The existing Cooper Bridge roundabout and approaches currently experience delays and congestion during weekday peak periods, impacting on journey time and reliability.
- 2.14. Observed journey time data obtained from the Department for Transport (DfT) highlights increased peak period travel times during both morning and evening peak periods. Morning peak period journey times are approximately 109% above interpeak times, between M62 Junction 25 and Bradley junction, increasing from approximately 4 minutes to 8 and a half minutes.
- 2.15. Similarly, journey times more than double to over 7 minutes for traffic travelling from Mirfield on the A644 to Cooper Bridge junction in the morning compared to interpeak times of 3 and a half minutes. Observed journey time data is presented in Table 1.

Route	Direction	Journey time (mm:ss)		
		Morning peak	Interpeak	Evening Peak
A644 Wakefield Road between M62 and Cooper Bridge Road roundabout	NW to SE	08:30	03:57	08:29
	SE to NW	03:00	02:22	02:40
A62 Leeds Road between Robert Town (junction with Sunny Bank Road) and Cooper Bridge Road roundabout	NE to SW	15:25	04:20	05:06
	SW to NE	04:53	03:13	03:36
A644 Huddersfield Road between Mirfield (junction with Stocks Bank Road) and Cooper Bridge Road roundabout	SE to NW	07:12	03:30	03:42
	NW to SE	03:00	02:39	02:35
A62 Leeds Road between Deighton (Whiteacre Street junction) and Cooper Bridge Road roundabout	SW to NE	05:25	04:21	10:46
	NE to SW	04:24	03:55	04:39

Bradley Road/ Cooper Bridge Road between A641 roundabout and Cooper Bridge Road roundabout	W to E	05:49	05:37	07:08
	E to W	06:28	05:14	08:25

- 2.16. In addition, due to the strategic nature of the A62 corridor, daily traffic flows remain high, with any delays impacting movement between the local network and strategic motorway network.
- 2.17. Significant employment and housing growth from sites allocated in the Local Plan will result in a notable increase in new trips on the network, which will lead to increasing deterioration of conditions if no improvement is made.
- 2.18. The work undertaken to date has concluded that doing nothing is not a viable option and intervention is required.

Journey time benefits

- 2.19. Journey time benefits are derived by comparing a 'Do Minimum (DM)' scenario, i.e., leave the road layout as it is, against a 'Do Something (DS)' scenario in a future year rather than against current journey times. This is to take account of the additional predicted traffic on the network at that time and to assess the suitability of the proposed improvements.
- 2.20. Journey times have been modelled along the A62 corridor across three time periods; morning peak; inter-peak and evening peak. The forecast average journey time savings along this section of the A62 for the scheme opening year (2026) are presented below, by time period.

Table 1: 2026 Forecast journey times with and without scheme (mm:ss)

Route	Time period	DM	DS	Saving
A62 Northbound	AM Peak	17:02	15:05	01:57
	Inter Peak	15:56	14:53	01:03
	PM Peak	20:33	19:24	01:09
A62 Southbound	AM Peak	19:19	16:19	03:00
	Inter Peak	14:32	13:14	01:19
	PM Peak	17:32	16:27	01:05

- 2.21. It should be noted that the scheme increases the capacity of the junction, so whilst delivering journey time savings it also caters for an increased volume of traffic in comparison to the Do Minimum scenario.

Modelling

- 2.22. In 2018, when we were considering delivering a high-capacity new link road it had the potential to attract traffic from across the wider district. Our current proposals are not likely to attract the same level of rerouting but will still deliver the necessary network capacity improvements.

- 2.23. Our appraisal of the scheme has been carried out in accordance with DfT guidance and traffic forecasts have been developed for morning and evening peak hours as well as an average daytime hour for our expected opening year (2026) and, in accordance with guidance, for 2041 which is 15 years later.
- 2.24. Forecast changes in traffic levels within the wider area, outside of the scheme boundary have been modelled. Changes are seen but are not considered significant. Further, more refined modelling will form part of the development of the Full Business Case.

Economic Appraisal and Value for Money

- 2.25. In accordance with Department for Transport (DfT) guidance, the journey time savings and other impacts of the scheme have been appraised over a 60-year period to determine whether the scheme offers Value for Money.
- 2.26. The appraisal has demonstrated the scheme will provide £107,489,000 present value benefits (2010 values, as required by DfT guidance) against a present value of costs of £36,327,000. This delivers a net present value of £71,162,000.
- 2.27. The Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) for the scheme is 2.959, based on the DfT Value for Money Framework the scheme offers High Value for Money.

Land requirements


- 2.28. The scheme design is currently at an outline stage and subject to change following the completion of topographical and site surveys during the FBC stage. Such changes will impact the volume of land to be acquired.
- 2.29. Currently there are 35 parcels of land identified as required to construct the scheme, some of these will also require future rights to be secured to facilitate maintenance access. It is also possible the number of parcels can be reduced through design revisions.
- 2.30. Land assembly is required throughout the scheme extents, but an outline of the requirements is:
- north of Cooper Bridge junction (at the junction itself and through to the Three Nuns junction),
 - along Cooper Bridge Road
 - along Leeds Road between Bradley junction and Oak Road
 - along Colne Bridge Road
 - on the approach to junction 25 of the M62

3. Implications for the Council

3.1. Working with People

- 3.1.1. A six-week consultation has been held during June and July, approximately two thousand letters and leaflets were distributed to the local community across both Kirklees and Calderdale, in addition to letters to statutory stakeholders, affected landowners and interested parties.
- 3.1.2. The consultation was also promoted through the council's social media channels and Variable Message Signs were displayed along the route for the duration of the consultation period. Posters were also displayed in bus shelters on this section of the network.
- 3.1.3. Due to restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic there was no face-to-face engagement opportunities, however a virtual event was hosted at 5.30pm on 23 June 2021 on YouTube, where viewers were able to hear a presentation from the project team and ask questions via the online chat function. For those unable to attend, the video was available to watch later Kirklees Council's YouTube channel.
- 3.1.4. 367 surveys were completed, 36 questions raised through the Your Voice website and 21 emails received.
- 3.1.5. Respondents were asked to rate the existing and proposed infrastructure for cars, cyclists, and pedestrians.
- 3.1.6. Figure 1 shows a comparison of the responses received.

Figure 1: Survey responses rating existing and proposed facilities



- 3.1.7. 54% and 56% of those who responded to the survey agree the existing facilities are either poor or very poor for cars and cyclists respectively, with 45% sharing this view of the existing pedestrian infrastructure. The ratings of the existing network are summarised in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Summary of the ratings and percentages of the existing network

	Cars	Cyclists	Walkers
Net negative	54% n=196	56% n=195	45% n=157
Neutral	21% n=77	15% n=52	21% n=73

Net positive	21% n=78	12% n=42	16% n=55
Don't know	3% n=9	17% n=58	18% n=63
Total responses	n=360	n=347	n=348

Please note that due to rounding, total percentages may not always be 100%.

3.1.8. Respondents' views were much more positive overall when answering about the impact of the proposed improvements for car users, cyclists, and walkers. 45% believe the proposed scheme is good or very good for cars, 41% and 37% agree with this view of the proposed cycling and pedestrian facilities respectively. The ratings for the proposed scheme are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of the ratings and percentages of the proposed scheme

	Cars	Cyclists	Walkers
Net negative	35% n=126	23% n=79	21% n=72
Neutral	15% n=54	19% n=66	25% n=89
Net positive	45% n=164	41% n=144	37% n=130
Don't know	5% n=19	17% n=61	17% n=60
Total responses	n=363	n=350	n=351

Please note that due to rounding, total percentages may not always be 100%.

3.1.9. Of those who do not support the scheme, three primary themes were noted in the reasons given:

- Lack of support for highway schemes in general – i.e., on environmental grounds and/or believing funding should be spent on public transport schemes.
- Concerns about the impact on local residents, specifically along Oak Road. These include worries about safety (especially given the location of the recreational park), increased traffic, particularly HGV numbers and worsening environmental impacts.
- Issues with elements of the cycling design i.e., the scheme doesn't go far enough in terms of prioritising cyclists.

3.1.10. A copy of the Consultation Report is available at **Appendix B**.

- 3.1.11. The project was called to Economy & Neighbourhood Scrutiny panel on 24 August, with the focus of scrutiny being on the results of consultation and design amendments made because of consultation ahead of Cabinet.
- 3.1.12. Scrutiny identified the main issue as being the impact on Oak Road and highlighted the need to mitigate negative impacts on its residents (see section 3.1.23 / 3.1.24).

Bradley Junction Optioneering

- 3.1.13. The development of the A62 to Cooper Bridge scheme has evolved over several years, before culminating in the preferred option recently consulted upon.
- 3.1.14. Work undertaken in the early stages of the scheme (2015) included consideration of several alternative options to create additional capacity at the Bradley junction, these included:
- Significant widening on the approaches to Bradley junction;
 - A large-scale roundabout in lieu of the existing Bradley junction
 - Banning the turn from Bradley Road on to Colne Bridge

These options were determined to either require significant acquisition and potential demolition of properties around the junction and/or didn't provide the additional capacity required. Several physical factors also must be considered in the selection of a solution, such as the junction being on a gradient and several private access/egress points around the junction (e.g., the pub etc).

- 3.1.15. This work concluded that displacing the right turn from Cooper Bridge to Bradley Road onto Oak Road provided the additional capacity required whilst minimising the need to acquire significant local properties. This was subsequently taken forward as the optimum solution for this junction.
- 3.1.16. To accommodate this change the scheme will alter Oak Road to a one-way street, allowing the provision of formal parking bays in lieu of existing on-street parking and moving the live traffic lane further from property frontages.
- 3.1.17. For completeness, following the recent consultation the proposed scheme has been tested with the right turn on to Bradley Road included in the design to understand the implications.
- 3.1.18. These tests have maintained a single right turn lane (rather than the two lanes currently available). Due to the constrained nature of the built environment at the junction there is limited physical width to accommodate increased capacity on all movements and active travel improvements.

3.1.19. The assessment undertaken using the Kirklees Transport Model highlighted higher delays than generated from the preferred option (removing right turn movement). The delays to traffic waiting to turn right also lead to some reassignment of trips onto Oak Road, as traffic attempts to find an alternative route with less delay. The level of reassignment onto Oak Road under this scenario was lower than in the preferred option.

3.1.20. Increased delay at the junction will have negative consequences for local air quality, in comparison to preferred scheme. However, further assessment would be needed to quantify the scale of the worsening.

3.1.21. In addition, the overall results illustrated a reduction in traffic using the A62 corridor, in comparison to the preferred option. This is mainly due to there being less overall compacity for other movements, which also has implication on the capacity of the scheme to accommodate future housing release in the surrounding area. The preferred option removes the right turn lanes, which allows more highway capacity to be allocated to ahead and left turn movement.

3.1.22. At present the right turning movement from Leeds Road onto Colne Bridge is banned, this increased the junction's ability to manage the traffic demand that existed then. Banning the right turn from Leeds Road onto Bradley Road will help to further increase capacity to cater for the predicted increase in general traffic demand and because of housing growth.

3.1.23. Whilst banning the right turn onto Bradley Road will result in increased traffic on Oak Road, traffic is also expected to reassign across the wider network, meaning not all existing traffic is forecast to divert on to Oak Road. Table 4 shows the 2026 changes to forecast traffic on Oak Road for each time period. The Do Minimum (DM) scenario is the traffic forecast without the scheme in place, Do Something (DS) is with the scheme in place (and the right turn banned). Table 5 shows the same information for 2041.

Table 4: Oak Road Traffic Forecasts in 2026 with and without scheme

2026	DM			DS			Difference		
	AM	IP	PM	AM	IP	PM	AM	IP	PM
Northbound	56	102	87	216	226	197	160	124	110
Southbound	51	98	71	0	0	0	-51	-98	-71
Two-way	107	200	158	216	226	197	109	26	39

Table 5: Oak Road Traffic Forecasts in 2041 with and without scheme

2041	DM			DS			Difference		
	AM	IP	PM	AM	IP	PM	AM	IP	PM

Northbound	50	92	55	188	223	244	138	131	189
Southbound	82	86	86	0	0	0	-82	-86	-86
Two-way	132	178	141	188	223	244	56	45	103

3.1.24. The design has been amended since the consultation to include:

- reduced the number of crossings for cyclists travelling through the scheme
- increased cycling priority at junctions

Furthermore, to resolve issues raised by the residents on Oak Road we are also proposing to include the following proposals for Oak Road, as part of the Cooper Bridge scheme.

- a 20mph speed limit on Oak Road
- traffic calming features on Oak Road
- a 7.5tonne weight limit on Oak Road

3.1.25. The CPO procedure published by the UK government includes a mechanism for compensating parties whose property is not acquired but is negatively affected by the use of certain public works. Claims are only payable if a case is proven and can only be submitted after the road is in use but will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

3.1.26. Follow up meetings will be held with key stakeholders throughout the development of the design.

3.1.27. Subject to the outcome of Cabinet the team will agree with Ashbrow members how best to communicate any proposed changes to the local community and keep them informed throughout scheme development.

3.1.28. A further pre-application consultation will be held in 2023/24 following completion of the detailed design.

Scheme optioneering

3.1.29. The A62 to Cooper Bridge scheme has a long history with many options having been considered over the years.

3.1.30. These include:

- a large gyratory at Cooper Bridge - eliminated due to the need to supplement it with changing the A644 to a dual carriageway, rendering the option unaffordable.
- three potential link road options, which were presented publicly in 2018. Despite support for the proposals, concerns were

raised about the environmental impacts of the plans, most notably the significant loss of Ancient Woodland which led to their elimination.

- a link road between Bradley junction directly to junction 25 of the M62. The alignment of a road in this area would encroach onto the edge of the Bradley landfill site (which contains hazardous waste).

3.1.31. The feasibility study of the latter option found that whilst in engineering terms the option was feasible there would be significant challenges and risks in terms of deliverability. Specifically, the need to build over the oldest part of the landfill would introduce the need to secure permits from the Environment Agency which may prove difficult and/or costly to obtain and the future liability for maintenance and any environmental breaches of this part of the landfill would rest with the council. For these reasons this option was deemed to be undeliverable within the timeframes necessary for the A62 to Cooper Bridge scheme.

3.1.32. Ultimately, in 2020 the decision was taken to eliminate all link road options due to the environmental impacts and instead focus on improvements to the existing network, with a view to maximising the capacity of both Cooper Bridge and Bradley junctions to support the delivery of Bradley Park.

3.1.33. As presented to Executive Team on 2 March 2021, four online options were appraised as part of the work to identify a preferred option. Details of the appraisal results were presented in that paper and therefore are not repeated here.

3.2. Working with Partners

3.2.1. A £69.3m budget has been ringfenced for the project funded from the West Yorkshire Combined Authority's (WYCA) West Yorkshire plus Transport Fund (WY+TF). The scheme is therefore being delivered in accordance with the WYCA Assurance Framework.

3.2.2. Additionally, the scheme crosses the boundary between the Kirklees and Calderdale districts, therefore whilst led by Kirklees Council the project is being developed in partnership with Calderdale colleagues who are represented on the scheme's project board.

3.2.3. The scheme has a key interface with Network Rail on two fronts, one relating to the widening of a Network Rail asset and the second regarding potential conflicts during the delivery phase of the scheme with the Transpennine Route Upgrade project. Initial meetings have been held with both teams within Network Rail and will be maintained throughout the development and delivery of the scheme.

3.3. Place Based Working

- 3.3.1. The scheme forms one part of the Council's wider vision for the area and has been designed to integrate with surrounding interventions, including the masterplan for the J25 Garden Community Corridor Spatial Priority Areas, the A62 Smart Corridor scheme, and the Bradley to Brighouse Greenway.
- 3.3.2. New landscaping and tree planting will be incorporated into the scheme to enhance the public realm and create an attractive gateway into Huddersfield.
- 3.3.3. The scheme will enhance the pedestrian experience of using the area, specifically providing improved crossing arrangements at Bradley junction, making traffic islands more accessible and optimising signal timings to enable crossings to be made in one movement, rather than holding pedestrians on islands.
- 3.3.4. Additional pedestrian and cycle crossings are provided throughout the scheme allowing safe access around all junctions and improved access to local Public Rights of Way.
- 3.3.5. Going forward, engagement with residents, stakeholders and businesses will continue to help place shape the scheme with particular reference to walking and cycling.

3.4. Climate Change and Air Quality

- 3.4.1. A carbon impact assessment and off-setting strategy has been prepared for the scheme. The assessment is relatively high level given the early stage of the scheme and will be reviewed and updated as construction methods and materials become clearer.
- 3.4.2. The principle of avoiding and/or reducing direct carbon emissions will be adopted throughout the development and delivery of the scheme, through the implementation of sustainable construction methods and materials. However, proposals to offset carbon through a range of approaches are also being developed in discussion with internal stakeholders, these include carbon sequestration and potential investment in Low and Zero Carbon technologies.
- 3.4.3. The potential to enable projects to purchase carbon credits offset against the council's own woodland creation via the White Rose Forest programme is also being explored.
- 3.4.4. The project is not expected to trigger Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations; however, an EIA Screening Opinion has been sought from the LPA and, at the time of writing, is awaited.

- 3.4.5. A mitigation strategy will be developed to identify potential environmental mitigations to offset the scheme impacts and where possible improve the local environment. This will be developed in the next stage alongside progression of the design. Green Streets principles and SuDS systems will be adopted as the design develops in accordance with Local Plan policies 24 and 28, improving the visual amenity.
- 3.4.6. The scheme aims to reduce congestion and improve journey times through this section of the network, this is supportive of the council's aspiration to improve air quality. This will be achieved not just through reducing congestion, but also by incorporating Intelligent Transport Systems which will enable optimum speed information to be communicated to drivers when travelling between junctions. Additionally, it facilitates vehicle prioritisation enabling HGV and Public Transport to be prioritised through junctions further supporting improved air quality.
- 3.4.7. The scheme will achieve improved journey times for all vehicles, including buses in comparison to the Do-Nothing scenario.
- 3.4.8. It also provides much improved infrastructure for safer active travel which will encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport helping to tackle the climate change emergency and improve local air quality.
- 3.4.9. Previous consultation feedback indicated that Bradley junction is a deterrent for cyclists given the volume of traffic and safety concerns. Dedicated cycle signals and segregated facilities have been incorporated into the scheme where feasible, and in compliance with LTN 1/20 guidelines.
- 3.4.10. Air quality is forecast to have improved in the area by the scheme's opening year (2026). Initial air quality assessments predict pollution levels in the vicinity of the scheme will be below the UK Air Quality Standards Regulations threshold of 40µg/m³ with or without the scheme.

3.5. Improving outcomes for children

- 3.5.1. Improvements to air quality will have positive benefits for children and young people. The schemes commitment to improving cycling, walking, public transport provision and place making is intended to assist the switch to more active travel which will help improve health and quality of life for all.
- 3.5.2. Targeted engagement will take place with local schools to try to limit the effect of the school run by the promotion of healthy travel choices.

3.6. Other (e.g., Legal/Financial or Human Resources) Consultees and their opinions

- 3.6.1. The latest commercial estimate for the scheme is £75.1m and is inclusive of risk and contingency.
- 3.6.2. There is a c.£5.8m funding shortfall between the WY+TF budget of £69.3m, which has been underwritten in the Capital Plan approved at Cabinet on 27 July.
- 3.6.3. However, it should be noted the scheme is in an early stage of development and there are opportunities to reduce these costs. The project team will consider potential value engineering opportunities as the design develops.
- 3.6.4. It should also be noted there is potential to secure developer funding contributions from Bradley Park and other A62 developments. Although, it is unlikely these will fulfil the whole shortfall required. Additionally, it is likely the developer contributions will not be received in advance of scheme construction and will therefore have to be underwritten by the council and reclaimed.
- 3.6.5. In addition to the previously mentioned public consultation other consultees have included Strategic Housing with reference to Bradley Park. Legal and Financial colleagues are consulted in relation to ongoing matters which includes input in the Cabinet Report. There are no Human Resource issues to report

4. Next steps and timelines

An outline of key milestones is presented below, it should be noted design development, land negotiations and the CPO preparation will be ongoing activities once a Delivery Partner is appointed.

The project will return to Cabinet to seek authority to make CPOs where necessary once the case for CPO has been established.

Activity	Timeframe
Submit OBC	November 2021
Combined Authority Decision	February 2022
Commence CPO preparation	February 2022
Appoint Delivery Partner	August 2022
Pre application consultation	December 2023
Planning application submission	February 2024
Cabinet – final scheme	February 2024
FBC submission	April 2024
Start of Works	2024
Completion	2026

5. Officer recommendations and reasons

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- agree in principle to the scheme
- authorise the Council to accept and enter into any agreement with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority for the funding to work up the A62 to Cooper Bridge Scheme to FBC.
- authorise the Council to incur expenditure in the working up of the scheme if the Council's application to the West Yorkshire Combined Authority for funding is successful.
- delegate to the Strategic Director Growth & Regeneration the authority to negotiate and agree the terms of any agreements that may be necessary to work up the A62 to Cooper Bridge Scheme including the funding agreement with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority.
- delegate authority to the Service Director – Legal, Governance & Commissioning to enter into the grant agreement with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority for the funding of the A62 to Cooper Bridge and any other relevant agreements and documents to which the Council is party.
- authorise the acquisition of land in principle as part of a land assembly
- note the design team's commitment to work with and place shape the scheme with residents and businesses
- note that land negotiations will commence subject to funding approval of the OBC
- note that the project will return to Cabinet to secure authority to make CPOs in relation to the scheme, where necessary.

6. Cabinet Portfolio Holder's recommendations

The report has been discussed with Portfolio Holders for Regeneration, Environment and Town Centres.

It is recommended that Cabinet approve the Officer recommendations as set out in section 5.

7. Contact officer

Sarah Kearns,
Major Projects Project Officer
Sarah.kearns@kirklees.gov.uk
01484 221000

8. Background Papers and History of Decisions

West Yorkshire Transport Fund – Scheme Principles (9th February 2016)
Land Acquisition Costs (22nd August 2017)
WY+TF Schemes Update (19 December 2018)

9. Service Director responsible

Edward Highfield
Service Director Skills & Regeneration


Appendix A General arrangement drawing showing the latest scheme design. See separate document.

Appendix B A copy of the Consultation Report. See separate document.

Option-30

KEY

-  Existing highway boundary
-  Proposed Kerb
-  Proposed edging
-  New / improved footways or Resurfaced footways
-  Proposed block paving area
-  Existing & Proposed Parking Bay
-  New segregated two way cycle lane
-  New segregated one way cycle lane
-  New one way cycle crossing lane
-  New / improved footways to provide shared space for pedestrians and cyclists
-  New advisory cycle lane
-  Proposed vehicular crossing
-  Island/central reservation to keep traffic separated and allow pedestrians to cross the road safely
-  New soft landscaping (indicative)
-  New trees (indicative)
-  New signal controlled pedestrian crossing - toucan (pedestrian and cycle) crossing with pedestrian island
-  New signal controlled pedestrian crossing - toucan (pedestrian and cycle) crossing
-  New uncontrolled pedestrian crossing with pedestrian island
-  New uncontrolled pedestrian crossing
-  New blacktop road plateau
-  Proposed Stone Boundary/Retaining Wall



Proposed Landscape Area
(Visibility envelope to provide desirable minimum stopping sight distance)
Area should be kept clear and without any obstruction


For details see A62 to Cooper Bridge
Corridor Improvement Scheme -
Proposed Indicative Cross Sections drawing

For details see A62 to Cooper Bridge
Corridor Improvement Scheme -
Proposed Indicative Cross Sections drawing


For details see A62 to Cooper Bridge
Corridor Improvement Scheme -
Proposed Indicative Cross Sections drawing

For details see A62 to Cooper Bridge
Corridor Improvement Scheme -
Proposed Indicative Cross Sections drawing

Wakefield Road Improvements on the approach to Junction 25



Scale (1:500)



Scale (1:1500)

REF. DATE REVISIONS



Directorate of Place
Civic Centre 3, Market Street
Huddersfield, HD1 2TG

SECTION: INVESTMENT AND REGENERATION

DRAWN: HM CHECKED: KB

SCALE: As Shown PROJECT NO: TF4 DATE: 06/09/2021

PROJECT: A644-A62 COOPER BRIDGE JUNCTION

TITLE: OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE DRAFT LAYOUT OPTION 30

DRAWING No: TF4/WP1/OBC/OP-30L

CAD No:

This page is intentionally left blank

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme

Public consultation results report

Consultation and Engagement Team

September 2021

Contents

1. Executive summary	3
2. Background information	4
2.1. Previous consultation in the area	4
2.2. Aims of the latest plans	4
2.3. Preferred Option	5
3. Methodology	5
3.1. Public consultation	5
3.1.1. Key activities	5
3.1.2. Promotion	6
3.1.3. Inclusive approach	6
3.2. Analysis methodology	6
3.2.1. Data cleansing.....	6
3.2.2. Quantitative Data Analysis	7
3.2.3. Qualitative Data Analysis	7
4. Summary of results to the consultation	7
4.1. Respondents.....	7
4.2. Survey responses	8
4.2.1. Travel habits.....	8
4.2.2. Views on the proposals	12
4.2.3. Comments.....	16
4.2.4. Optional questions.....	21
4.3. Email responses	24
4.4. Questions and answers	25
Appendix A: Survey comments	26
Appendix B: Emails	57
Appendix C: Questions and answers	84
Appendix D: Paper survey	100
Find out more	102

1. Executive summary

Background

Congestion, long journey times and poor air quality are experienced along the A62 and A644 in the Cooper Bridge area. Through improvements, this area could support the creation of local jobs, relieve congestion, reduce journey times, and improve pedestrian and cycling accessibility.

Public consultation

Between 7th June and 18th July 2021, public consultation was undertaken to gather feedback on a preferred option and the perceived impact of this for car users, cyclists and walkers. Comments were also received as part of the consultation from bus users.

This consultation was planned and delivered by the West Yorkshire Combined Authority, in partnership with Kirklees Council and Calderdale Council.

People were asked to share their thoughts on the plans via a survey, which was hosted on a dedicated page on the [Your Voice digital engagement hub](#) and promoted via a range of channels, including social media, a press release, and emails to key stakeholders.


Overall, 367 surveys were completed, alongside a selection of email and Q&A correspondence.

Travel habits

- 82% (302 respondents) said they frequently travel through the area (once a week or more). 17% (62 respondents) use it less frequently.
- 4 out of 10 respondents felt their travel patterns have changed since the start of the pandemic, now travelling less than before.
- Most survey respondents stated they usually use a car (369 responses) compared to 111 responses for other modes of transport, including 71 responses for active travel options (multiple choice question).

Views on the proposals

The **existing conditions** for car users, cyclists and walkers were generally viewed poorly. Respondents' views were much more positive overall when considering the impact of the **proposed improvements** for car users, cyclists and walkers:



Comments

226 additional comments were provided. Many of these were detailed, thoughtful comments which help highlight the strength of feeling around the proposals and their impact on residential life and public travel in this area. This report contains a summary of the feedback received on the proposals.

2. Background information

2.1. Previous consultation in the area

Congestion, long journey times and poor air quality are experienced along the A62 and A644 in the Cooper Bridge area.

Kirklees Council, in partnership with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority and Calderdale Council, has previously explored a number of options to address these issues.

In December 2018 / January 2019, Kirklees Council asked the public for their views on plans to relieve congestion in the Cooper Bridge area by constructing a new link road between the A62 and A644 (Wakefield Road).

Whilst there was support for those proposals, there were also concerns raised about some elements of the designs and the wider environmental impacts of the plans. Additionally, since then Kirklees Council has declared a climate emergency putting an even greater focus on the environmental impact of any plans.

Designs have been reviewed to best balance these issues and address the transport problems in this location.

This has included considering new options which do not provide a link road, but instead include making improvements to the existing network to reduce congestion whilst minimising the environmental impacts.

2.2. Aims of the latest plans

The A62 and A644 have been identified as key routes which, through improvements, could support the creation of jobs and housing growth in the area, relieve congestion, reduce journey times for general traffic, and improve pedestrian and cycling accessibility.

Kirklees Council, in partnership with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority and Calderdale Council, has considered four options aimed at enhancing the existing network at Cooper Bridge and Bradley junctions to improve journey times and reliability along the A62 and A644 routes.

The plans aim to:

- relieve congestion and improve journey times and reliability
- support economic and housing growth
- improve road safety
- improve pedestrian and cyclist facilities to encourage more use
- support the improvement of air quality

2.3. Preferred Option

To help identify a preferred option, four potential options were assessed and the likely effects of these were considered. This assessment helped with understanding how the different options might improve journey times and impact the local environment, and led to the selection of a preferred option.

The four options considered were similar due to the physical constraints in the area. The preferred option includes a number of interventions that were included in all options, these include:

- widening of the A62 Leeds Road between Bradley junction and Oak Road
- widening of Colne Bridge Road on the approach to Bradley junction
- widening of the A644 Wakefield Road on the approach to M62 junction 25
- improving signal timings and changes to lane markings and permitted movements at Bradley junction
- changing Oak Road to one-way
- improving pedestrian and cycle facilities throughout, including new signal-controlled crossings and segregated cycle facilities on Leeds Road, Oak Road, Cooper Bridge Road and at Cooper Bridge junction

In addition to the above changes, the preferred option also includes:

- creating a new three-armed roundabout at Cooper Bridge junction with dedicated left turn links
- new landscaped areas and sustainable drainage systems
- widening of Cooper Bridge Road between Bradley and Cooper Bridge junctions to provide two lanes of traffic in each direction

3. Methodology

3.1. Public consultation

3.1.1. Key activities

From 7th June to 18th July 2021, members of the public were invited to provide their feedback via a survey. 367 surveys were completed in the consultation period.

An overview of the scheme, which included plans of the preferred option and discounted options, and the survey were made available to the public on the Your Voice digital engagement hub, www.yourvoice.westyorks-ca.gov.uk/.

Due to current restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic there was no face-to-face engagement opportunities, however a virtual event was hosted at 5.30pm on 23 June 2021 on YouTube, where viewers were able to hear a presentation from the project team and ask questions via the online chat function. For those unable to attend, the video was available to watch later on Kirklees Council's YouTube channel.

The Your Voice site also hosted a Question & Answer tool (Q&A) which allowed participants to submit any queries for the project team to respond to. To ensure

compliance with the GDPR, responses were either sent privately or made public depending on the nature of the query and the information provided within it.

Responses were also accepted via email to the dedicated address;
yourvoice@westyorks-ca.gov.uk

3.1.2. Promotion

The consultation was promoted widely on a range of channels, including social media, a press release, and emails to key stakeholders.

Leaflets containing the details of the consultation and maps were also created and distributed to residents and businesses along the route and shared on the [dedicated Your Voice page](#).

Real-time messages and posters were also displayed on bus shelters along the route, and Variable Messaging Sign (VMS) roadside displays were in position for the duration of the consultation period.

3.1.3. Inclusive approach

The term 'seldom-heard groups' refers to under-represented people who are typically harder to reach, or rarely have the same opportunities to express themselves as other stakeholders. Due to multiple barriers affecting access to and the use of public services, often the views of these groups are underrepresented.

Many factors can contribute to people who use services being seldom heard, including disability, geographical or digital isolation, ethnicity or cultural barriers, mental health, sexuality or other reasons.

It is key that efforts are made to connect and communicate with these groups, helping to facilitate better participation and ensuring that the consultation be as accessible and inclusive as possible.

Utilising local knowledge from district councils, seldom-heard groups along with other stakeholders were identified, and communications sent to key contacts signposting the consultation materials and offering the opportunity to engage directly. It was also requested that those contacts circulate the information supplied to their wider networks.

In order to support those who are digitally disengaged, a freepost address was supplied for letters, along with a dedicated telephone number, printed leaflets and posters, articles in local newspapers and paper versions of materials upon request.

3.2. Analysis methodology

3.2.1. Data cleansing

Before analysis commenced the raw dataset was cleaned to ensure that any test responses, blank responses, and duplicates were removed.

3.2.2. Quantitative Data Analysis

The quantitative responses from the survey were analysed using standard frequency counts and percentages.

3.2.3. Qualitative Data Analysis

The survey contained four open ended questions, two of those being 'other' options and one space for them to elaborate on a previous closed question if they chose to. The fourth open ended question allowed space for the respondent to make any further comments they wished.

Analysis of this type of free text qualitative data is commonly undertaken using thematic coding. This process involves the identification of themes that are present throughout the dataset and the assignment of responses, or elements of responses, to these themes. Comments relating to each theme are then grouped together and counted which allows the most common themes to emerge, thus aiding a deeper understanding of respondents' feelings and thoughts regarding the proposals.

4. Summary of results to the consultation

4.1. Respondents

A total of 424 responses or comments were received during the consultation period from three different sources:

- Survey responses: 367
- Emails: 21 sets of email correspondence
- Questions or comments on the Q&A sections on Your Voice page: 36 questions posed.

The consultation information and materials, including the survey and Q&A, were hosted on Your Voice webpage (www.yourvoice.westyorks-ca.gov.uk/cooperbridge) which was the main source of information for people interested in the consultation.

Your Voice website categorises its visitors into three categories:

- Aware participants, counting all visitors who viewed at least one page,
- Informed participants, referring to those who took an action on the page such as downloading a document,
- Engaged participants, those who participated in the survey or submitted a question via the Q&A tool.


According to Your Voice data, during the consultation period there were 2740 unique visits to the Your Voice webpage, which represents the number of 'aware' participants who visited at least one page of the A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme consultation page. Of these, two-thirds were 'informed' participants (1845 participants), with common actions including downloading a document (1494 participants), viewing an image (486 participants) and/or viewing multiple project pages (1469 participants).

403 visitors were classed as engaged, which means that they participated in the survey or asked a question.

Visitors came from a number of channels, with the majority being directed from a Kirklees Council webpage (656 visitors), followed by people using links from social media platforms (737 visitors). Other visitors were referred to the consultation page from a range of sources such as local press websites, mobile applications and other indirect sources or directed from search engines (such as Google, Bing, etc)

Visits by Channel

Your Voice from 07 Jun '21 to 18 Jul '21



Number of visits over time to www.yourvoice.westyorks-ca.gov.uk/cooperbridge split by channel.

4.2. Survey responses

A total of 367 surveys were completed during the consultation period.


Any quotes or comments presented in this report have been copied verbatim from their source and have not been altered, updated or amended.

4.2.1. Travel habits

Respondents were asked questions to provide some background about how often, and why they travel in the area, along with the key modes of transport they use.

Responses below indicate that the majority of survey respondents live locally, use the corridor frequently, travelling by car. Unsurprisingly, many indicated that they are travelling less frequently due to the pandemic.


1. Before the COVID-19 pandemic how often did you travel through the Cooper Bridge area? (364 responses)



As demonstrated above, 82% (302 respondents) said they frequently travel through the Cooper Bridge area (once a week or more). 17% (n=62) use it less frequently.

2. When you travelled through the Cooper Bridge area, what was your usual mode of transport? (363 responses)


Respondents were able to choose up to three options.



Bearing in mind that respondents could select multiple options here, most survey respondents appear to usually use a car (369 responses) compared to 111 responses for other modes of transport.

Of these, 71 responses were received for active travel options.

3. Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic have your travel patterns changed? (362 responses)



Mixed results were received here, with 4 out of 10 respondents feeling their travel patterns have changed.

Those respondents that chose Yes, their travel patterns have changed, were asked to explain their answer.

Comments received here generally noted that the respondent was travelling less now than pre-pandemic. Many explained this is because they now work from home either all or part of the time, and no longer need to commute, or commute less frequently.

Others noted various other reasons for reduced travel such as recent retirement, student courses moving online, self-employed respondents having less work on, leisure opportunities being reduced (e.g. sports matches cancelled), and being unable to visit friends and family due to restrictions.

Some mentioned that they were making fewer journeys more generally, including fewer trips to the shops as they now shop more locally or online.


Some respondents commented they were giving greater consideration to journey planning by choosing to make one trip for multiple reasons rather than multiple trips.

Some noted changes specific to modes of transport, e.g. walking or cycling more, and spending less time on public transport.

While the majority talked of greatly reduced travel, some did note that they are now beginning to travel more, due to changes in their circumstances (such as returning to offices or starting a new job) and some expect to return to pre-pandemic travel habits.

A full list of comments is included in Appendix A.

4. What is your main reason for travelling through the Cooper Bridge area? (364 responses)



Living in the area, and travel for work related purposes, were by far the most prevalent responses here.

Those respondents that selected Something else as their main reason, were asked to explain their answer.

Answers here included travelling for work (e.g. delivering goods), travelling to specific destinations e.g. Brighouse, travelling for childcare or to fulfil caring duties, and generally passing through the area.


A full list of responses is included in Appendix A.

4.2.2. Views on the proposals

Respondents were then asked for their views on the proposals. This was achieved by asking them to rate the existing conditions, for both cars, cyclists and walkers, followed by asking them to rate the proposed improvements for the same modes of transport.

'Don't know' responses have been excluded from the charts for ease of understanding and comparison.

Please rate the existing conditions for the following:




	Cars	Cyclists	Walkers
Net negative	54% n=196	56% n=195	45% n=157
Neutral	21% n=77	15% n=52	21% n=73
Net positive	21% n=78	12% n=42	16% n=55
Don't know	3% n=9	17% n=58	18% n=63
Total responses	n=360	n=347	n=348

Please note that due to rounding, total percentages may not always be 100%.

Of those that felt able to provide a positive or negative response (excluding neutral and don't know responses), a negative rating about the existing conditions was most common.

However, respondents felt slightly more positive in relation to cars and walkers, than for cyclists.

Please rate the proposed improvements for the following:




	Cars	Cyclists	Walkers
Net negative	35% n=126	23% n=79	21% n=72
Neutral	15% n=54	19% n=66	25% n=89
Net positive	45% n=164	41% n=144	37% n=130
Don't know	5% n=19	17% n=61	17% n=60
Total responses	n=363	n=350	n=351


Please note that due to rounding, total percentages may not always be 100%.

Respondents' views were much more positive overall when answering about the impact of the proposed improvements for car users, cyclists and walkers.

Results demonstrate the balance has shifted towards the majority feeling positively, though for cars this is less marked.

When displayed as a 'before and after' type comparison, results demonstrate an overall increase in positive opinion and decreased negative perception:





Bus users

The proposed improvements did not include changes specific to bus users, with space constraints preventing the inclusion of a dedicated bus lane throughout the extent of the scheme.

The specific impact on bus users was not asked about as part of the consultation, though all respondents, including bus users, were able to feedback on the existing conditions and proposed improvements.

The scheme aims to improve journey times along the corridor, and it is expected that bus services will benefit from the journey time savings delivered by the scheme.

Of the 367 surveys completed, 21 respondents selected bus as one of their usual modes of transport through the Cooper Bridge area. (Respondents were able to choose up to three options).

As part of the additional comments received, a small number included bus specific comments, listed below:

- How does this plan support bus travel?
- One idea is the bus lane from around Brooklands could be used as an extra lane at certain times for turning on to that road like they use on motor ways but again your expecting people to park else where.
- Provide better bus links for Bradley.
- These proposals don't discourage car use at all. Where are the bus lanes?
- Why no bus lanes planned. This route would be brilliant for express bus services.

- Even though this is a major transport route there's no reason you can't create bus or taxi lanes.
- The proposed alterations look viable maybe a separate lane is needed for bus services to Dewsbury and a possible direct link road for trucks.
- Why is there no consideration of bus uses in these plans and this survey?
- Would be good to consider allowing electric cars in bus lanes.
- The area is very busy with traffic making walking and cycling pretty unappealing, noise pollution, roaring traffic resulting in safety issues, traffic fumes, it's just not good, even waiting at the bus stop is particularly unpleasant
- How are large vehicles, lorries and buses supposed to turn left into Oak Road, if they cannot turn left onto Bradley Road from the Road/Bradley Junction.
- As a resident on Oak Road I totally object to the proposed improvement scheme, it will bring much more traffic including buses and wagons on Oak road...
- Maybe actively encourage more people back on to railways and buses and away from cars now covid has dropped.
- Please restart the plan with completely new roads from Mirfield, Bradley and Leeds Road that create a free-flow system away from Cooper Bridge junction so it can be redeveloped for cyclists, walkers and buses ONLY.

4.2.3. Comments

Respondents were provided with an open text box for any additional comments they wished to make at this stage.

226 respondents provided a comment; 62% of all survey completions.

Below is a summary of some key themes emerging from the comments, with illustrative quotes, followed by a tally table of themes.

Many comments received feature views opposing particular aspects of the proposals. This demonstrates strength of feeling here, and can to some extent be expected as those that choose to leave an optional comment tend to be those respondents with a stronger opinion.

The proposed changes at Bradley Road were generally viewed poorly:

'The 2 lanes of road to go up Bradley Road from Bradley junction have never in my 10 years of living in Bradley impacted the amount of traffic trying to go towards Huddersfield and created additional congestion so I can't see what possible benefit this would have to alleviating traffic issues; it just moves it further up Leeds Road.'

The impact of the Oak Road and Bradley Road proposals, particularly for residents, was noted, with additional traffic here seen as particularly problematic:

‘Currently there are two lanes of queueing traffic to turn up Bradley road and, at busy periods, they are regularly both full. To funnel all that traffic along a small road sandwiched between a residential street (with no off street parking for residents) and a children's playground is madness’

‘My husband is a lorry driver and feels that manoeuvring an articulated lorry on oak road due to visibility and space will be dangerous for drivers and residents especially in peak traffic.’

‘Parking is already at a premium and sometimes we have to park streets away and walk back to our houses... I work shifts and sometimes this means late at night I'm walking home alone as I have no option’

Some commented that the proposals do not go far enough to support tackling climate change, with the inclusion of additional lanes potentially leading to an increase in the number of cars using the road.

‘Adding more capacity for cars will encourage driving and increase congestion, pollution, and climate change. We need fewer cars not more. Instead, you should remove road capacity and increase space for walking cycling and public transport’

‘Please fix the flooding under Cooper Bridge, two lanes each way, sort out the roundabout but please leave the Bradley Junction alone, it's the best and possibly most cost effective solution to a complex junction – plant more trees if you can’

‘The scheme should not go ahead in its current design as it does nothing to decarbonise transport by increasing public transport use...’

There was also some disparity in opinion between car users and those wanting to travel more sustainably, with both groups feeling the proposals benefit other types of road user:

‘Don't see many cyclists on this route on a regular basis. Feel the provision of the proposed cycling facilities are a waste of resources considering the amount of usage.’

‘I don't feel safe cycling on here as it is and I don't think your improvements would make me feel safer. Kinda feels cyclists are an after thought to your plans. The road works well for cars as it is.’

Some chose to mention wider issues such as the potential for this scheme to impact on surrounding areas, namely Flockton and Midgley:

‘I reside in Flockton village and the traffic problems are well documented ,in my opinion this scheme will only make the situation in Flockton worse’

Others commented that in their opinion the proposals don't go far enough and that more intervention is needed to make a real difference to congestion in the area.

A general sense of dissatisfaction was apparent for some respondents, e.g. that the proposals would not be achieved, delivered at pace, or were not cost-effective:

'I understand that this scheme will reduce journey times by 3 minutes only. Is it worth the expense and climate impact?'

Some respondents made positive comments about wanting the improvements to go ahead.

This includes both general comments and on specific aspects of the proposals:

'Finally a sensible, affordable and realistic proposal that recognises simply taking left turners out of the Cooper Bridge roundabout will make a massive difference to traffic flows.'

'So many junctions can be improved by allowing left turning traffic to continue. Good to see that here.'

'Great improvement on original schemes. Far less damage to the environment.'

'...the proposal of creating two lanes on Wakefield Road towards Dewsbury near the scrapyards is a very sensible idea, as traffic currently always backs up a long way from Cooper Bridge'

'The proposed plans look good and will aid congestion. It may cause disruption for a period of a few years whilst it is being completed so a well organised road work plan will be required'

'The changes look like exactly the sort of thing we need to make it safe - particularly in allowing crossing and getting over to the right hand turn to Mirfield - and encourage less confident cyclists and pedestrians to make their journeys in a more sustainable way.'

'Don't talk a good job, just get on with it...'

Some comments took a more neutral or balanced standpoint. These can loosely be divided into further suggestions to enhance the scheme, and more general pragmatic commentary on the area, local development, and the impact of the proposed changes.

'Business parks have been developed along Bradley Road with the consequent increase in traffic from Cooper Bridge - few people working on this site live locally. The housing development just proposed at Villa Farm, and the hundreds of houses planned at Bradley golf course will add considerably to the traffic travelling up and down Bradley Road throughout the day.'

'The improvements should be linked to improving the current situation, and not be used to facilitate the building of even more houses at Bradley.'

Some detailed suggestions were made around improving the safety offer for cyclists:

‘Looking at the plans if I’m cycling from Huddersfield to Mirfield I have to turn right here where the steakhouse is. This means using your segregated cycle lane, repeatedly stopping or dismounting... and then how am I supposed to get across this carriageway to ravensthorpe direction’

‘... Cyclists need to be able to get to mirfield in the right hand lane at the roundabout...’

‘...the canal path, which I think could be a better way for cyclists into Huddersfield, but would need a bit of surface and lane improvement to make it safe for everyone.’

Other suggestions included both large scale and wide ranging additions such as building a new motorway junction, amending traffic light sequencing, through to smaller interventions like reducing on street parking at Marstons chicken shop:

‘...either add a road off M62 J25 roundabout going towards Bradley, possibly the roundabout next to Villa Farm Shop that leads down left passing the Asda to Huddersfield. Alternatively a new Junction off the M62 leading to Bradley and the Stadium’

‘...i’ve noticed when on the few occasions the traffic lights are not in operation the flow of traffic is a better and free flowing .No artic’s stuck trying to go around the roundabout and getting stopped with the traffic lights at red’

‘My suggestion would be to stop vehicles parking along the road by Marstons chicken shop as this is the bottleneck for the entire junction.’

Please note that due to the variety and depth of comments received, the tally does not correspond with the total number of comments received; some comments were coded against multiple themes.

A full list of comments received is provided in Appendix A.

Comment theme	Tally
Positive:	
· General comment in overall favour	26
· Any change to current situation is welcomed / ‘better than nothing’	3
· Positive about increase in lanes	2
· Positive about roundabout plans	3
· General improvement is needed (dirty, smelly, polluted)	2
· Should reduce congestion/pollution	3
· Glad that the link road proposal has been removed	1
· Seems sensible, affordable, realistic	1
· Hope it starts soon / just do it	4
· Will be an inconvenience while work being done	2

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme public engagement report


· Better for the safety of cyclists/walkers	1
· Proposals will help with future Leeds Road development	1
Neutral:	
· General comment:	
○ Benefits this area but by moving the congestion elsewhere	3
○ Benefits cyclists/walkers at detriment of car users	3
○ Need to respect local heritage – architecture, greenspace	1
○ Need to encourage people back onto public transport	1
○ I don't know / ask the experts	1
· Suggestions:	
○ Amend traffic light sequencing (at peak times, for flow, to reduce accidents)	6
○ Intervene at Marstons chicken shop – on street parking here is dangerous / causes congestion	6
○ Go further with cycle lane proposal – improve / extend traffic free routes by river/canal, not just junctions	4
○ Add a flyover - Cooper Bridge/Leeds Road	2
○ Add new motorway junction between J24 and J25 / westbound at J23	4
○ Add relief road parallel to M62 from J25 to Bradley Bar	1
○ Dual carriageway from M62 to Cooper Bridge	3
○ Add one way gyratory at Leeds Road/Oak Road/Bradley Lane	1
○ More speed control in place (cameras/congestion charge)	3
Negative:	
· General comment on negative impact to residents – more traffic where I live, no parking, lengthier journeys, impact on quality of life, house values	11
· Problem too large - will never be enough capacity on these roads	4
· Against the Oak Road /Bradley Road proposal:	
○ Negative impact on residents' quality of life, parking, children's safety, property values	38
○ Unsuitability for HGVs/increased traffic	28
○ Won't reduce Leeds Road congestion	14
· Incompatibility with climate emergency:	4
○ More capacity will increase car use, noise and air pollution	15
○ Need to tackle flooding	3
○ Plant more trees/don't remove them	5
· Proposals biased towards car users/ won't increase walkers/public transport users	13
· Proposals biased towards cyclists	2

· Shared space is not safe for cyclists/walkers, lack of consideration for cyclists/walkers	10
· Changes/increased lanes will lead to confusion/erratic driving	3
· Proposals don't go far enough:	
○ for cyclists/walkers	4
○ For bus users	4
○ Won't make a difference	8
○ Missed opportunity to make a difference / original proposals were better	11
○ Need greater reduction in congestion to improve air quality	1
· Comments beyond the scope of proposals:	
○ Don't go ahead with further housing/business development	7
○ Impact on Flockton/Midgley – consider knock on effects, needs to work with Flockton bypass/ will lead to more traffic in this area	13
· Dissatisfaction with performance of authorities:	
○ Won't be achieved/on time	5
○ Short term fix	4
○ Not cost effective/waste of money	10
○ You don't listen/care	3

4.2.4. Optional questions

1. How did you find out about this consultation? (318 responses)


This was an open text question for respondents to answer in their own words. Responses have been coded below, to give an indication of key sources:




Other ways people found out about this consultation: via poster, email from various sources, LinkedIn, via Google search etc.

Equality monitoring data


1. Do you identify as (355 responses)




2. Which age category do you fall within? (360 responses)



3. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?
(355 responses)





4.3. Email responses

An email address was publicised during the consultation period as an additional mechanism by which members of the public, groups or businesses, could feedback or contact the project team. Two email address were included: major.transport@kirklees.gov.uk and yourvoice@westyorks-ca.gov.uk.

Comments were collected, with questions receiving a response from the project team. 21 sets of email correspondence were received during the consultation. These were from individuals, stakeholders and representatives of residents and community groups.

Emails received covered a variety of concerns and questions. Many from local residents sought to explain their personal concerns regarding the impact of the proposals on their parking, neighbourhood, or driving experience. Emails from residents of the Oak Road area shared their experience and concerns, and some asked for reassurance that residential parking would be given more thought.

Some wished to make specific suggestions such as to cycle path routes, additional lanes etc. Some requested clarification on the plans to help them better understand the preferred option, or on the data used to inform the proposals.

Emails from stakeholders included local businesses, groups with an environmental interest, specific interest in cycling and active travel, and utilities. Some provided very specific in depth feedback, while others noted the need for ongoing dialogue and clarification as the scheme develops.

The full list of emails can be found in Appendix B.

4.4. Questions and answers

Q&A is a tool function on the Your Voice website to enable respondents to engage on a project by asking questions within the website to receive an answer. Each question was provided to a member of the project team to provide an answer. The Q&A section was supplemented by a frequently asked question (FAQ) section on the Your Voice site, which presented information around technical aspects of the scheme for public reference.

36 questions were received throughout the consultation period. Questions received a public response from the project team. In some instances information posted was not a question, therefore no answer could be provided, and instead the information was collated to be included in the wider consultation analysis. The full list of questions and answers can be found in Appendix C.

Appendix A: Survey comments

Redacted: Any information that could potentially identify an individual has been redacted from the content of this report to retain anonymity, and best practice data handling in line with our privacy statement.

Redacted information includes names, addresses and contact information. Where this information is relevant or necessary for a timely response to have been provided (emails), this information has been given freely, however redacted for the purposes of this report only.

Please also note that these comments have been copied verbatim from their source and have not been altered, updated, or amended.

Any further comments:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are very few walkers down there as can only walk to the motorway, so lets not kid ourselves that more people will walk if better pavements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new proposed plan looks lovely. I like the ideas of the slip roads for the motorway and for traffic coming out of mirfield: I believe the motorway slip road would help ease congestion coming from Leeds road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot see anything to relieve congestion on the A62 from Liversedge at the junction of A644.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You need to tackle the regular flooding at this location. It would also benefit from a dedicated Mway junction taking traffic off priory to J24 to access Elland - tailbacks to Junction 24 a major hazard when on M62 - this is a short term fix which is not cost effective as a result and would cope with local traffic only Ravens Thorpe to Mirfield another more pressing problem as so stop start everyone avoids the area which will effect the local economy. How does this plan support bus travel?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Really like the proposals! A junction that has been crying out for improvement for years - especially now with the new commercial and residential developments up Leeds Road in Mirfield
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It looks good. It'll be a nightmare while it's being done but short term pain for long term gain. I say crack on.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main reason for the 'poor' rating for cycling is the lack of consideration for cyclists at junctions and roundabouts in the existing layout. When I have cycled here I have usually stopped at the bridge, as the roundabout and roads off it are unfriendly. The proposal appears to improve this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Something needs doing so this is better than nothing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leeds Road traffic turning right up Bradley Road - Note: At present Bradley Road is designed, and built for heavy traffic, with a good distance between Bradley Road and the houses, your proposal will bring heavy traffic closer to the houses, children's gardens (at one side of the road) & children's play areas (at the other side of the road) - Please, Please, Please - reconsider diverting heavy traffic from (the main) Bradley Road, along a residential side street BEFORE my friends, family, and /or neighbours children are killed or seriously injured - Who will be responsible for the house foundations collapsing?

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme public engagement report

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists, doesn't solve issues on Bradley road, especially with the planned housing development on golf course. Doesn't address climate change.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area is not fit for purpose and doesn't have the capacity for the traffic passing through. And I doubt it ever will. A new junction off the m62 between junct 24 and 25 combined with a new bypass to decrease travel from the M1 to m62 through a644 is the only way forward.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on your previous performance on WYCA projects there is no chance of you achieving the 2024 start date. Network Rail will stuff you all the way they won't allow their railway to be closed while you widen the road, better get those Christmas possessions booked now.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planned improvement will cause more traffic through my village
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the two way segregated cycle lanes are welcomed they don't actually lead anywhere other than to junctions. They should be viewed as a start and extended.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is traffic being diverted through??? What about Flockton WF4 we need a bypass, lack of pavements, speeding traffic, always congestion. Nowhere for emergency blue light service to get through, dangerous speeding traffic, not a thought for residents, let alone cycling, parents walking children to and from schools. Traffic does not stop at the zebra crossing either, you take your life into your hands just trying to cross the road, children, elderly, impaired vision, disability impaired, DANGEROUS BARNSELY ROAD FLOCKTON WF4. MANY ACCIDENTS WE DON'T NEED ANYMORE, ONE YOUNG GIRL LOST HER LIFE ON BARNSELY ROAD FLOCKTON, LEAVING 2 CHILDREN WITHOUT A MUMMY! KIRKLEES, KIRKLEES, KIRKLEES, KIRKLEES LISTEN TO THE RESIDENTS AND STOP YOUR BOYS SCRATCHING BACK uncaring about Flockton residents, air pollution due to amount of traffic. Stop you're back handers by which ever means you can.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What effect are these improvements expected to have on the B6118, and subsequent impact on traffic using the A637 through Flockton? Kirklees Council have previously indicated that any major road improvements at the eastern end of the village would result in more traffic using the B6118, and therefore would not be advisable. "Better roads attract more traffic" was said. My question is why improvements at one end yet not the other as appears to be the case here.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think changes to the Calder greenaway would be welcomed. However, the changes would help ease congestion and reduce pollution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed plan needs to be in conjunction with the bypass of Flockton and Midgeley. There is no current safety issues around the Colne Bridge area, only traffic hold ups. The Barnsley Road through Flockton is dangerous to traffic as the road is no longer suitable for the volume / amount of traffic. A good start would be to have regular police speed checks through the 20mph zone. This would quickly boost the council coffers in speeding tickets and go towards funding the bypass !
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building an industrial park at Mirfield and adding more hgv,s to a congested road hasn't helped having an m62 turn off at brighthouse would reduce the traffic more
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be too much traffic using oak road to access bradley road. Current traffic turning up bradley road off Leeds Road is massive at all periods of the day and adding two lanes on Leeds Road to turn up oak road will cause massive congestion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • doesn't look like it will make much difference at all to traffic. If anything, it will encourage more erratic behaviour.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes will not address volume issues on a644 between m62 and cooper bridge

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This scheme is grossly inappropriate in incompatible with Kirklees and Calderdale declaring a climate emergency. Adding more capacity for cars will encourage driving and increase congestion, pollution, and climate change. We need fewer cars not more. Instead, you should remove road capacity and increase space for walking cycling and public transport. Removing road capacity would avoid expensive projects such as the proposed bridge widening and that money could be reallocated to low carbon transport elsewhere.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The worst congestion is when approaching the Cooper Bridge junction from the Brighthouse/M62 side and joining single lane queuing traffic up to the last few metres preventing right-turners from reaching the junction, due to left turners waiting. <p>There is also concern about the knock-on effects creating additional heavy traffic through Flockton via the B6118 without a bypass or link road in place.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• You are not taking into consideration the impact on surrounding villages and what the impact of this scheme would make on the residents of these villages. I reside in Flockton village and the traffic problems are well documented ,in my opinion this scheme will only make the situation in Flockton worse . kirklees council would appear to have no answer to traffic problems in Flockton any talk of a bypass for Flockton falls on deaf ears or is treated with contempt with the proposed scheme this will increase traffic through Flockton and on the inadequate road system leading to Cooper bridge. More thought should be taken about the scheme and should include spending to include elevation of traffic problems which the scheme would create.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The cycle path running past the mardens chicken shop mite be a accident waiting to happen. It's a very busy shop in the afternoon and tea time
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This scheme is heavily biased towards cyclists. As local resident, living on the section of Leeds Road between Oak Road and Bradley Junction, these changes will significantly impact on my day to day activities. I will no longer be able to easily get to my property - I will not be able to access from Oak Road, the plans also mean that I will also be unable to turn onto Bradley Road at Bradley Junction. As we cannot do a U-Turn, are you expecting residents to drive all the way down to Cooper Bridge to turn around - so we can access Bradley Road?? This will add to the congestion at Cooper Bridge. There are already significant shortages for resident parking, which I have reported previously, these changes do not seem to have considered how/where residents will park or how they will get around. I would like to see the plans for changes directly outside these properties and the proposals for traffic movement FOR THESE RESIDENTS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The traffic lights also need looking at. Too many accidents because they change at the same time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• As with all these things it does move the problem to another area but it's good that this is being looked at and it should make an improvement to this location.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why are you stopping people turning off the a62 onto Bradley road & other roads at that junction?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Putting slip roads in every direction will not help. People will simply seer that they are full and divert back to the roundabout. The one going from Leeds Road - Wakefield Road is a good idea, but it should be a single lane that will merge with traffic from the roundabout going to 2 lanes all the way to the motorway junction 25. The proposal to stop turning right from from Leeds Road to Bradley Road is a bad idea as this will force more traffic towards the Oak Road junction. Many people use this turning as it leads to a major supermarket at the top of Bradley Road. If the idea

<p>is to ease congestion, it has been proven that widening roads doesn't help as much as encouraging walking, cycling and public transport, none of which seems to have really been changed or improved by these plans.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a homeowner on oak road which is really bad for parking as it is looking at the proposed parking bays this is only going to make a bad situation much worse not to mention the increase in traffic on our road parking needs increasing on oak road not decreased with the added planning gone in to develop the 4 derelict houses located on oak road this will also increase parking problems
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't understand what you're actually proposing here? Let's be honest, you were never going to build a new road. This area has been terrible for 30 years and you've done nothing. All you'll do is build new cycle lanes and expect everyone to travel by bicycle. Meanwhile the potholes get bigger.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I currently don't believe the existing traffic light sequence is being used to its full potential, especially peak times with the impact and delay the sequence effects the next set of traffic lights you arrive at... increasing flow through cooper Bridge I don't believe the next set of traffic lights will be able to cope and so for the financial investment for just one roundabout is not justified. I would be more inclined to research into the slip road from the M62 at ainley top, I avoid this due to the time spent queueing on the M62, and the danger of high speed traffic passing you while sat, and the cars coming to a stop up ahead trying to force themselves in early avoiding the need to queue scary and highly dangerous risk takers.... Secondly how many people use the junctions Into huddersfield that could potential use an opening west bound at junction 23 of the M62, this would elevate pressures at brighthouse and ainley top. Surley a wiser and more beneficial investment..
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be great to know which one way system you have proposed for Oak Road as i am a resident on the road and there's not much info in the leaflet that we recieved.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have started using birkby-bradley Greenway for cycling, I would like to see more such excellent facilities connecting Huddersfield to brighthouse/surrounding areas to encourage cycling and walking.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> won't solve the problems. mass missed opportunity. dual carriageway needed all the way from M62 to Cooper Bridge given Kirklees's plans for mass development around the area. my business will be relocating from kirklees as soon as possible due to lack of investment, delays and wasted time it costs my business
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would object to the re-siting of the Dumb Steeple. Its existing location would be in the middle of a large triangular island in the new layout. As the road to the south of that would be one-way, there should be no difficulty in providing safe access for pedestrians to view the listed monument in situ, at no more cost than that of re-siting it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My understanding was part of the reason for the new link Road was to provide access to the huge new housing development planned at Bradley golf course and the surrounding land. These changes around Cooper Bridge may alleviate some issues but without further changes further up Bradley Road around the existing traffic lights to the industrial park and Bradley Bar roundabout you will just be creating huge issues to the already overstretched road network in this area. Plans need to be made to detail how the huge amount of additional traffic around Bradley Bar created by these new developments will be accommodated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As I said at the original consultation, if experts need to consider more than one option, how can amateurs like me know?

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme public engagement report

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Don't talk a good job, just get on with it, we are all fed up with the length of time this is taking.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with the improvements and the requirement to relieve congestion, however, unless this goes hand in hand with improved public transport links and services and other transport initiatives to encourage less car use then capacity will peak in a few years time again requiring further work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please ensure traffic flow is high and has two lanes (inc. crawler lane) to M62
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We would not want any changes to happen to parking on Bradley Road for residents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Turning in to oak Road now cause a back log of traffic, you've also not considered the housing and their parking so not sure how you think your getting an extra lane on Leeds Road. Also the chicken place causes road issues on a daily bases. I live in this area so know the issues on a tea time, and the road towards Bradlet Road is not an issue as that moves freely, the issues lie around the old 3 nuns where that road often gets blocked by cars coming down or from the direction of mirfield, coming up from Colne Bridge but I find that your in that queue for about 10 to 15 mins and going towards Colne Bridge. Oak Road should be banned for lorries as its a tiny road where they is a park and home parking which makes it more difficult to move on there. One idea is the bus lane from around Brooklands could be used as an extra lane at certain times for turning on to that road like they use on motor ways but again your expecting people to park else where.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In your proposals you propose to remove the right turn to Bradley road from cooper bridge and reroute the traffic through oak Road, this will cause a number of problems. The quality of life for the residents on Oak Road will be worse as this will become the main route to Bradley road for all cars and lorries coming from the a62. Secondly there will be increased pollution around the recreation ground, one of your goals was to reduce pollution. The traffic will be held up by Oak Road, and this potentially will cause a backlog of cars building up back towards cooper bridge, again contradicting one of your main stated goals of smoothing traffic flow . My suggestion would be to allow a right turn for cars coming from cooper bridge on to Bradley road as now. My second problem is the proposal to add a bike lane. Unless you intend to extend the cycle lanes into brighthouse with a safe route through or around the motorway roundabout I am not convinced it has much benefits to cyclists and seems a bit of tokenism and basically a waste of council money.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I currently live on Bradley Road just after the oak road turning, my parent have lived and still do live on oak road and this is the house I was born in, oak road is busy enough as it is especially with a park in there with kids crossing from the local area, oak road is basically enough room for 1 car width due to residents parking outside there houses, it will make the route to Tesco's etc a lot more difficult and longer for people, nor to mention the implications it will have on the residents of oak road only been able to travel one way on a road they live on and will have to take a much longer route to get home and be stuck in traffic just to get home through no fault of there own. Not to mention the additional traffic there will be when the proposed 1500 new homes are built off Bradley road where the golf course currently is. I really think this is a terrible idea and it should stay as is.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The original proposal was better. "Climate crisis" bullshit. Excuse to not fulfill what was an excellent proposal. I see the improvement to stocks bank road/A62 junction has disappeared. Thanks very much. This junction is a bottleneck, it's too narrow to cope. And it seems it will continue so. Brilliant!

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• sending traffic turning right up Bradley Road via Oak Road is an absolutely ridiculous idea.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need urgent attention on this cooper bridge as on daily my journey it add additional 10-15min which is effective nature and driver .
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• •Left turn only lane on Leeds Road to Colne Bridge Road•2 lanes into 1 from Leeds Road to continue onto Leeds Road and so people can make a right at Oak Road•Keep the 2 lanes from Leeds Road to Bradley road. Make sure the traffic lights stay on for a bit longer. Where can lorries go if they wanted to continue onto Bradley road? They can't make a left turn onto Oak Road.•2 lanes turning right from Colne Bridge Road onto Leeds Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I disagree with the changes to Oak Road. By forcing all traffic from Bradley Road wanting to turn onto Leeds road in the direction of Huddersfield to Bradley junction and the traffic from Cooper Bridge forced onto Oak Road will increase traffic congestion between and at both junctions. Bradley junction is working well for right turn traffic from Cooper Bridge but there is nothing in the plan to improve Colne Bridge Road which suffers major congestion at busy times. I believe Oak Road should be improved to allow 2 way traffic but leave Bradley junction as it is, as it works well. If lorries have to turn right from Leeds Road into Oak Road buildings should be demolished to improve the turning circle or all parked cars be banned. It is too narrow and is a tight turn for longer vehicles; the plan does not show how it will improve traffic flow. Better consideration of green options and removing cars from the roads would be far more future proof. Provide better bus links for Bradley.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Making oak road the main road would be a disaster. It is a small residential street not made for all the traffic that comes on the road now it is disgraceful
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• making oak road needs rethinking as all the new houses on tith house and the farm will have a very heavy traffic on the small road
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Don't put cyclists and pedestrians in shared paths.these never work, and the Highway Code states cyclists can just use the road anyway.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• As well as being a driver, I am also a cyclist. The Cooper Bridge to Brighouse route is the ONLY flatish route between Huddersfield and Calderdale. Currently it is an appallingly dangerous one for cyclists. Kirklees Council/Calderdale Council MUST provide a traffic-free alternative for cyclists - perhaps along the banks of the River Calder or the Calder Canal. It is outrageous that cyclists are obliged to subject themselves to such risks. And their inevitably slow progress is of course a further source of delay to the motorists who must remain behind them. Also, while you are engaged in your deliberations as to how deal with the Cooper Bridge area congestion, might I urge you in the meantime to adjust the sequencing of the traffic lights at Cooper Bridge roundabout. While the queue along Wakefield Road to get to the roundabout regularly extends up the slip road of the westbound M62, the queues to it in both directions of the A62 are invariably minimal - usually no more than several cars long.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The plan to re-route all right turning traffic along Oak road is a terrible idea. Currently there are two lanes of queueing traffic to turn up Bradley road and, at busy periods, they are regularly both full. To funnel all that traffic along a small road sandwiched between a residential street (with no off street parking for residents) and a children's playground is madness and will transpire to be utterly unworkable. The build up of (single file) queueing traffic to turn right on Oak road will lead all the way back to the junction and will gridlock the flow of traffic through it. And lets not forget that there are plans to build another 2000 houses off Bradley road which will

<p>only serve to increase this already huge traffic load. Please come to your senses now before it's too late! If this goes ahead in it's current form, I guarantee remedial work will need to be undertaken within a year of it's implementation. Don't say we didn't tell you so!</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed change is likely to greatly improve pedestrian and cyclist experience but negatively impact drivers. The addition of extra lights on Leeds road will likely cause greater congestion. The measures to address the heavy congestion regularly at the bridge are decent but not sufficient to greatly offset the issue and be less environmentally impactful than a bypass. The biggest problem is the 1700 new houses being built further east. The majority of those commuting from these new homes will travel through cooper bridge, drastically increasing the stress on infrastructure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I can't tell from the plans what the actual improvements are. I cycle between Brighouse, Mirfield and Huddersfield. Some cycling facilities disappear when most needed. Some junctions look great but then later on the cyclist is out back into traffic at a pinch point. Will this actually make cycling between Brighouse, Mirfield and Huddersfield safer than currently?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am concerned about the provisions for traffic turning right from Leeds road to go up Bradley Road. In my view the proposal will simply move congestion down the road to the new junction with Oak Road and make matters worse. There is already 2 lane provision for traffic turning right onto Bradley Road and is not currently a problem. The new proposal seems to reduce capacity to turn right from 2 lanes down to one lane - how can this be an improvement? I am concerned that large vehicles will struggle to make the tight right turn onto Oak Road. The junction of Oak Road and Bradley Road will become more congested whilst the short 2 lane section of Bradley Road from Leeds Road to Oak road will become virtually redundant. I would be keen to see the modelling to support this proposal as on the face of it the proposals for Bradley junction look like a step backwards.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main bottlenecks are between the miller n carter and cooper bridge and again outside mars tons in my opinion both where two lanes fight to merge back into one some just don't want to give way - also I don't feel that the blocking off of traffic going up Bradley Road is a good idea - sending all the traffic onto oak road which is a small residential road with a recreation area used by children and dog walkers sounds quite dangerous to me - somebody suggested that there'd be 110 cars approx an hr I feel that to be grossly underestimated as obvs there's asda, the crem, two schools and lots of residents and other drivers all heading up there currently.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When heading towards Cooper Bridge via Cooper Bridge Road, many car drivers cut through traffic on the inside lane then immediately after the roundabout merge onto Leeds road which causes further congestion and risk to drivers / cyclists. Only drivers heading towards Mirfield should be in that lane.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These would definitely be an improvement for people travelling by bike or walking, but this is mostly because what currently exists is so bad. I think the new road layout around Bradley road would be welcome because it currently feels like trying to cross a motorway, it's very unsafe and the air quality is dire. Must be awful to live next to this road. It would make it easier to pass through this area by sustainable modes, which I support. I am concerned about the red section then route towards Brighouse, presumably the Bradley to Brighouse greenway is being relied on to provide that provision but that needs to progress. It is good to see segregation on cycle routes, especially considering the traffic levels and speeds on this road. I hope they are LTN1/20 compliant- wide enough and provide enough of a buffer to traffic. Also that the timings on signals and way finding

<p>is clear enough for what is a hostile and complicated road environment, particularly around the junction and roundabout.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed works coming away from Huddersfield seem ok. The works proposed coming into Huddersfield and Bradley road are a big concern. There is to be no right turn from Leeds road up Bradley road instead you have to go further on Leeds road, before you will need to do a sharp right turn into a narrow residential street. This might be ok for cars but certainly not for big HGV's. You are also proposing yet another set of traffic lights at this junction to enable the right hand turn. One has to ask why you can't stick with the right turn as it is now. Before you do all these work you sort out parking and access to Marstens chicken shop as the parking for this business causes no end of traffic worries. No doubt even after this public consultation you will do what ever you feel like and not listen to the people who use these roads everyday.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a supporter of banning right turn up Bradley Lane travelling from Cooper Bridge. Could see this as sensible if Leeds Road - Oak Road - Bradley Lane became a one way gyratory
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You are taking the easy option. It is a sticking plaster and not a solution for cars in the long term.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please minimise any tree removal and ensure they are replaced. 2. Please take into account the architectural value of the existing bridges in the design of the replacements. 3. Has any consideration been given for providing signaling on the Bradley Road/Oak Road junction to provide for traffic turning right towards Colne Bridge?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed plans will not make traffic any better this will actually make things worse due to the amount of traffic that goes down from 2 lanes to one lane on a stretch with cars parked on either side. Where the issue comes in is the residence parking by the traffic lights by BP your splitting the traffic from one lane to 2 but cars prevent this from happening due to no yellow lines. The proposed plans to make the one way system to gain access to bradley Road will be a mistake simply because I travel during commuting times and that junction is the smoothest on the junction and flows naturally onto bradly Road. HGV drivers will consistently block traffic if the one way route that is proposed goes ahead and will make things worse for the resident and the children who use the park behind the post office. My suggestion would by to stop vehicles parking along the road by Marsden chicken shop as this is the bottleneck for the entire junction.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITS ABOUT TIME SUM ACTION WAS TAKEN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can people who live on Leeds Road who live between Oak Road and the Leeds Road/Bradley Junction turn left onto Bradley Road so they can get into Huddersfield. How are large vehicles, lorries and buses supposed to turn left into Oak Road, if they cannot turn left onto Bradley Road from the Road/Bradley Junction. This is a very tight junction for vehicles coming into Huddersfield. It is also opposite a very busy shopping area. The plan is putting more pressure on Oak Road which is already a busy road and in a highly populated residential area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I live on Oak Road and I think this plan is going to cause a horrible situation for us as residents and our neighbours. The road itself is already busy and this plan does not make us happy.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oak Road is a residential road that is already too busy due to the change of the traffic light system and in poor repair. Many pets have been injured. It is used by children and families to access the park and will cause a hazard to them. Also emergency vehicles will struggle to attend the residents. There are also listed buildings on this road and the extra vibration from even more heavy traffic will cause horrendous damage. This is not an acceptable route at all.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it appears you are just pushing congestion problems up to Oak road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Cyclists being prioritised yet again. These changes will have a negative impact on those residents living locally - particularly in the Oak Road/Bradley Rd/Leeds Rd triangle. Proposals will make getting to and from home very difficult. How will a HGV make the turn, from Leeds Rd onto Oak Road?? Even with slight widening, this is a very tight turn Local parking is already extremely difficult. Tree planting in existing parking spaces, and increased traffic flow on Oak Road will make this even worse (cars often park on both sides of Oak Rd, due to lack of spaces) - No evidence shown, to support the changes. Specifically, how will stopping traffic going up Bradley Road (from Leeds Road and Bradley Junction) improve capacity at Cooper Bridge????
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think this will cause more traffic troubles, you can have way too many lanes, it will just anger drivers more and cause more confusion than its worth.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i've noticed when on the few occasions the traffic lights are not in operation the flow of traffic is a better and free flowing .No artic's stuck trying to go around the roundabout and getting stopped with the traffic lights at red
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finally a sensible, affordable and realistic proposal that recognises simply taking left turners out of the Cooper Bridge roundabout will make a massive difference to traffic flows.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans look good. I travel down the a62 towards j25 and it takes a long time, sometimes easier to drive to brighthouse and go the other way round. Much better for our area to get to the motorway and back
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option of Oak Road is too dangerous but a better option would be to introduce traffic lights at Lower Quarry Road to access a contra-flow lane on the other side of the road next to the cause-way to Bradley Road with traffic lights at Upper Quarry Road to allow access back to the normal side of Bradley Road. Traffic coming down Bradley Road to then have a direct lane on to Leeds Road there then would be three lanes past Lower Quarry Road towards Leeds. Traffic then from Leeds or from Bradley Road would not be involved in the main lights at Colne Bridge Road. There is room to achieve this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I really hope your new option for Cooper Bridge works and if it does, then my rating will be well done!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue is at cooper bridge .. too much change on bradley road where there are no issues!!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from making Oak Road one-way the other changes are positive. Those of us who live in the area use Oak Road a considerable amount already and to make it one way is ridiculous, to have so much traffic on that road will be of detriment to those who live on Oak Road and what will you be doing to prevent accidents from children in the park crossing the road not to mention the fumes that these children will be exposed to !!! How do you propose that the traffic will be able to turn onto Oak Road without causing even more congestion, the corner is tight enough as it is. I can only see that this will not relieve the congestion but will add to it as well as

<p>causing other issues that will be detrimental to those living on Oak Road, the families that use the park and those of us who live within the vicinity.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals at the Oak Road junction with Leeds Road result in the loss of 5/6 parking spaces outside properties 1161-1169. Although access has been provided for the driveway at the side of 1169. Residents at 1161-1167 will no longer be able to park anywhere near their properties. In addition 1159 has a driveway that you appear to be blocking off. In short, parking is already a major issue at this point since most families these days have two cars and as a result many vehicles are parking half on the walkway and you appear to be reducing parking to the extreme, which is likely to encourage further parking congestion. Cyclists currently ignore the directions to use the cycle lane at this point, preferring to continue on the footway, and since they will be held up by the traffic lights here due to the proposed significant right turn movements into Oak Road, they are likely to also attempt to circumvent the signal controls, creating a major safety issue. The combination of focused turning movements, parking issues, cyclist delays, not to mention pedestrians, that will all be focused at this point as a result of the improved crossing facilities raises serious concerns in my mind. One last note - your base plan is not up-to-date, as it does not show the large garages at the sides of 1153 and 1169 and the divisions of the rear gardens along the row which preclude vehicles parking to the rear of these properties.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a resident of Oak Road I think this proposal is ludicrous. Why divert heavy traffic, Inc heavy goods vehicles, along a narrow street beside a well used park? Air and noise pollution is inevitable and there will be no safe place to cross for children wanting access to the playground area. A beautiful stand of mature trees had better be protected. I dread the whole operation esp considering the huge building project traffic heading past my house to Bradley golf course.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I've never seen a more ridiculous plan. The idea to stop vehicles turning right up Bradley Road, but instead to divert them around the hair pin junction along the residential Oak Road is beyond a joke. I cannot see how this is possibly going to improve the flow of traffic, but will instead increase impede vehicles and slow them down. Shifting more traffic onto Oak Road will increase the risk to local residents, especially children crossing to use the play area. I strongly oppose this scheme.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme doesn't consider the knock on effects to surrounding areas. Villages such as Flockton which are far more difficult to get through, not just in rush hour, will be adversely affected, please assess how the scheme will affect that village. Surely there is something you can do to ease the traffic in Flockton too.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am fully supportive of changes to A644, the new roundabout at Cooper Bridge and widening of roads. However, the idea to divert all traffic going up Bradley Road down Oak road seems absolutely insane. I drive down Oak road multiple times a day and it is already essentially a one way piece of road with all the cars parked there and the ridiculous amount of pot holes that Kirklees seemingly ignores. What use is the 2 lane stretch from Bradley Junction to Oak Road going to be? That's the clearest part of that whole area! The 2 lanes of road to go up Bradley Road from Bradley junction have never in my 10 years of living in Bradley impacted the amount of traffic trying to go towards Huddersfield and created additional congestion so I can't see what possible benefit this would have to alleviating traffic issues; it just moves it further up Leeds Road. By all means stop traffic turning left from Leeds Road up Bradley Road, this will stop what 1 car an hour?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make no right turn from Bradley Road onto Leeds Road (towards Huddersfield) - use roundabout by Mamas & Papas followed by left turn onto Leeds Road. Current

situation means that if wagon, school bus or incorrectly positioned car is turning right at front of queue, a whole traffic light cycle is missed and traffic queuing down Bradley Road doubles

- It is so bad this road. From coming of the m62 its shocking. Traffic, the dirt and no cycle lane, then the poor road surface. Its a poor welcome to huddersfield and its in need of a super serious change as the amount of traffic used is massive and really needs 2 lanes i would say and or a split road thats more direct. Drastic changes should be done. And please focus on more of a cycle lane joint with a pedestrian lane. I so hope for a positive change and road resurfacing on leeds road. Huge changes is the answer.

- bringing main road traffic along oak road is totally stupid. there is a children's play area on that road. the amount of traffic on oak road now is bad but will get worse. whoever thought it was a good idea should have a serious rethink

- This proposal to funnel traffic on oak road will cause increased traffic immediately next to a park which will take away children's freedom to visit the park alongside been a risk for dog walkers in the area. The right turn from Leeds road is tight for commercial vehicles leading to potential accidents and due to volume of traffic will cause tail back and congestion at white cross lights. Alongside this residents on oak road will have noise levels increased and value of their property reduced. Cars and commercial vehicles are highly likely to take short cuts through the Bradley estate where there is a school present increasing risk of accidents to children and residents and increased noise and pollution and a poor impact to the air quality in the area. Leeds Road and Keldregate have been accident areas in the past and this would increase risk in the area. It is my feeling that Kirklees are taking any action possible to push through the housing development in the golf course on green belt land without any care for environmental, pollution or air quality in the Bradley area. Putting money and development before the welfare of children and residents in the surrounding areas. This road work should not be passed in its current plan as this is a highly unsuitable impact on the Bradley area and it's residents. My husband is a lorry driver and feels that manoeuvring an articulated lorry on oak road due to visibility and space will be dangerous for drivers and residents especially in peak traffic.

- from looking at the plans, traffic travelling from the M62 to Huddersfield, will have to navigate around the new roundabout. However, from my experience of using this junctions, delays are caused by the tight right hand turn around the roundabout, which drivers have to slow down for. My view is if this was a junction, or the roundabout was realigned, more cars could turn right in the same amount of time, as the junction could be navigated faster. furthermore, there is no proposed increase in traffic lanes toward huddersfield.

Additionally, the removal of vehicles travelling up Bradley road at Bradley junction, would create a significant increase in vehicles using oak road which is only a narrow residential street, especially with the increase of HGVs using the road. this has the potential to increase the noise and AQ impacts at receptors on Oak Road

- Diverting traffic from going up Bradley Road from Leeds Road is absolutely crazy. I use that junction on a daily basis and there are almost always 8-10 cars queuing at the lights to go up Bradly Road.

How will diverting them along Leeds Road and Oak Road not cause further congestion? Turning right from Leeds Road to Oak Road and then turning left from

Oak Road to Bradley Road will be at gridlock.

Things will only get worse with the houses being built at the rear of Villa Farm and on the golf course.

The best way to tackle the traffic levels would be to provide an alternate route that takes traffic off Leeds Road and Bradley Road. If you're adamant about digging up the golf course, then why not build a relief road that runs parallel to the M62 from Bradley Bar down to junction 25?

- As with the previous proposal, the scheme fails to address the potential congestion at the right turn into Oak Road that will result from the increase in heavy commercial and private vehicles on Bradley Road, predicted by the Kirklees Development Plan increasing housing and commercial development off Bradley Road. The current layout at the Bradley Junction / Leeds Road provides for two lanes of traffic onto Bradley Road, this improvement scheme proposing a single right turn onto Oak Road is only one lane and not suitable for the heavy commercial traffic that needs access to the industrial estate on Bradley Road.

The confluence of roads, rail, river and canal at Cooper Bridge can only be properly resolved by a significant, radical and expensive development. The proposed improvement scheme might increase the flow of traffic in some directions but will only move the pinch points and extend the length of congestion on the approach roads.

Please fix the flooding under Cooper Bridge, two lanes each way, sort out the roundabout but please leave the Bradley Junction alone, it's the best and possibly most cost effective solution to a complex junction – plant more trees if you can but developing Oak Road is not an improvement.

- Just glad you have dropped the link road idea, at least leave that beautiful area alone undeveloped and hope that silly idea of building on golf course at Bradley will be dropped soon too

- The proposed provision of two lanes travelling towards Huddersfield on Leeds Road at Bradley is sensible, as this is currently often a location for congestion as the road goes from two lanes into one at the Bradley junction.

However, I cannot understand logic of preventing traffic turning right off Leeds Road onto Bradley Road and making it turn left at Oak Road only - all this will do is MOVE the congestion further up than it currently is, rendering the positives from the two lanes I've just mentioned obsolete, and causing more congestion closer to the houses and businesses close to the Oak Road junction. There are currently no problems with traffic turning up Bradley Road from Leeds Road (I use this junction every weekday), so I am unsure at the logic behind this decision - if the proposals were altered, to RETAIN the ability to turn up Bradley Road from Oak Road (i.e. from Dewsbury to Fixby), AND to introduce two lanes towards Huddersfield on Leeds Road, that is what will improve congestion.

Also, the proposal of creating two lanes on Wakefield Road towards Dewsbury near the scrapyards is a very sensible idea, as traffic currently always backs up a long way from Cooper Bridge, which should be (at least partially) alleviated by creating two lanes.

- The motorway to Cooper bridge was round about is the issue. Getting into Mirfield is awful!

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area need some improvement As an entry to Mirfield it is dreadful, dirty, sewerage works and definitely puts people off
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hoping the scheme is started soon
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed housing developments in the Bradley area will substantially increase traffic and by the time the work has been completed, any so called benefit will have been negated and you will need to rethink the whole situation again. It is not just the immediate area but all the new builds up Leeds Road, Raistrick, Outlane are already causing congestion. Bradley Road is congested most of the time and can be dangerous at school day times and peak times (just about all day every day) Too many housing projects will only make matters worse and we will have our community walking round with pollution monitors. Not to mention the building on green sites. We cannot win whichever way you go but the money could be used in other more needy ways. We cannot keep our population growing while you spend money trying to keep up with demand - not going to happen!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with regards to traffic no longer being able to turn right onto Bradley Road from Cooper Bridge, as it is commonly used, and I imagine there will be heavy traffic jams waiting to turn right onto oak road with the amended changes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You have spent a lot of tax payers money to draw up plans and disrupt residents lives about the uncertainty of what was going to happen. You still do not listen to residents views. The major problem is too many vehicles on the road. Need to look at trains for goods transportation. Do not need more housing, because this will cause more chaos on the roads. Bottom line too many people in country. Can not say that I approve of filling in a survey on my views. You probably will not take any notice of what residents say any way.!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals favour motorists disproportionately. The cycling facilities planned aren't good enough.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't put cyclists and walkers together. Create segregated cycle lanes through armadillos. Reduce speed of road to 30mph through a TRO. Cyclists need to be able to get to mirfield in the right hand lane at the roundabout. Can't see how you're going to solve that. Plus more toucan crossings are needed on leeds road to get to the greenway. This is hardly mentioned. Very poor cycling and walking ideas here, comes across as lip service.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First thing that springs to mind is the Miller carter steakhouse. Looking at the plans if I'm cycling from Huddersfield to Mirfield I have to turn right here where the steakhouse is. This means using your segregated cycle lane, repeatedly stopping or dismounting which slows my journey tremendously and then how am I supposed to get across this carriageway to ravens Thorpe direction. Granted there may be a crossing (not toucan though) but this is completely undermined by the Highway Code stating cyclists can use the road anyway. All of this is a massive waste of the taxpayers hard earned cash. These proposals don't discourage car use at all. Where are the bus lanes? Why should cyclists share such a tight space and cycle towards each other? Why in this day and age are we still putting motorist before other road users? This really is a poor attempt.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed plans look good and will aid congestion. It may cause disruption for a period of a few years whilst it is being completed so a well organised road work plan will be required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough space or priority given for cyclists in these plans. If your going to encourage use of bicycles then this should have far greater priority in these plans. Two way segregated cycle lanes are dangerous and j wouldn't use them. Why not use armadillos? Advanced stoplines?? Plus the speed limit of 40 is way too quick for

<p>this road?? Why no bus lanes planned. This route would be brilliant for express bus services.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aside from congestion, these plans will contribute extremely little to increasing air quality of the area. These plans are clearly designed to make motorists journeys quicker and do little to protect more vulnerable road users or to get more people walking. You've turned what was a fairly simple road into a complex maze. This past year I have taken up cycling and would gladly do so more were this road quieter. Looking at these plans and designs you've got there's nothing here in all this esoteric infrastructure that would encourage me to cycle. I do support the creation of a cycle route from Bradley to brighthouse but that's not relevant here. These plans and the funding here give us a real opportunity to discourage car use and to spend a lot of money making sustainable forms of transport more attractive, it's shameful you haven't done that. Why not dedicate a whole lane to cycling. Yes that's right, a whole lane. And force cars down to one lane. This road needs calming devices, not fancy designs. We need to slow cars down, that helps air quality, and make it blatantly obvious that we are encouraging cycling and walking. Not giving the most eco friendly and yet most vulnerable among us a tiny bit of space where they have to cycle towards each other
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I just don't understand why you're spending so much money potentially on benefiting cars and HGVs that are choking the atmosphere of this area. You won't reduce pollution or congestion, because you aren't making cycling or walking safer, just more inconvenient. I am concerned about the cycling route down Bradley road and again on Leeds road. If I were doing this I would completely rethink how I can make this area more encouraging for sustainable transport and discourage motorists. Even though this is a major transport route there's no reason you can't create bus or taxi lanes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the plans for the existing "allocated" parking for the row of (9) houses on Leeds Road immediatbefore Oak Road? This appears to have disappeared from the draft plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't few safe cycling on here as it is and I don't think your improvements would make me feel safer. Kinda feels cyclists are an after thought to your plans. The road works well for cars as it is.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have noticed that you have changed the sequence of the traffic lights at the junction further up to coincide with the consultation, which has eased the traffic at Cooper Bridge roundabout heading out of Huddersfield. What this has resulted in is that Colne Bridge is completely snarled up, especially when there are lorries from the quarry on the two narrow bridges. A 35 minute return journey has just taken an hour because of this, which impacts on my ability to work and contribute to the economy. Traffic is queing along Dalton Bank almost back to the point where the road goes from 50 to 40. There will be an accident there at some point, as one does not expect to find a line of queuing traffic on such a road when emerging from a bend. That accident will be caused by your decision to shorten the decision to change the traffic light sequence and give cars turning right onto Leeds road less time. Well done!!!!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans don't look to make walking or cycling easier or safer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I tried cycling from Mirfield where I live to Huddersfield where I work. The cycling on the greenway was easy but the roads felt very unsafe. I also cycled on the canal path, which I think could be a better way for cyclists into Huddersfield, but would need a bit of surface and lane improvement to make it safe for everyone. I think this off road route could be an encouragement to walkers and cyclists.

- The proposed alterations look viable maybe a separate lane is needed for bus services to Dewsbury and a possible direct link road for trucks.
- Don't see many cyclists on this route on a regular basis. Feel the provision of the proposed cycling facilities are a waste of resources considering the amount of usage.
- How will the proposed scheme of adding a further lane (that will STILL get backed up then remain stationary as they turn right from Tesco's) improve air quality for the residents of Leeds Road?

How will the air quality improve for residents with stationary traffic heading to and from Huddersfield?

How will congestion be relieved when it is clearly evident there will be a bottle neck on the Huddersfield approach to turn right into Oak Road. Traffic now going into town is free flowing. (Believe me, I live here....I've not relied on a dip test of surveys) By putting traffic lights and a filter, how on EARTH will this improve congestion and queuing??? This is literally the worst idea in the history of ideas!

The plans propose removal of some mature trees along Leeds Road - what will replace them? How is this an improvement on air quality?

How will residents living along Leeds Road return to the carriageway into Huddersfield? Will there now be a huge diversion to Cooper bridge roundabout and back in? How does this relieve congestion and reduce travelling time?

The current reckless double parking of customers for Marstons is a danger to pedestrians, cyclists and most road users. This scheme will exacerbate the current situation. I have raised this with our local councillors prior to this consultation. How will this be rectified? Their current parking situation clearly isn't fit for purpose as it is....

How will this scheme support housing growth for the residents of Leeds road? What benefits will they see? Will there be any adverse affect on values of our properties?

I suffer from asthma. How will this scheme support air quality for me living on Leeds Road? What do the current read outs say (on the air quality box outside the post office) and what does your model forecast these will be? Will there be any recourse should these projections prove inaccurate?

- As one of the objectives of the scheme is to improve the environment in the area and therefore improve the air quality how does widening roads which allow vehicles to travel even faster achieve this?

Instead of wasting millions on a scheme that merely moves congestion from one area to another try introducing and enforcing speed control measures in the form of speed cameras and a congestion charge.

Either or both measures would go a long way to improving the air quality in the area and also pay something towards to the upkeep of roads.

- This COULD work to alleviate traffic, however does not mean more houses can now be built! I reside stocks Bank Road and traffic is horrendous. I'd like to know what will be done to stop cars cutting up Coppin Hall when Huddersfield Road is busy.

<p>Also walkers- I cross Leeds Road to get to the footpaths behind the 3 nuns. Its awful to cross</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why is there no consideration of bus uses in these plans and this survey?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal to prevent traffic coming from Cooper Bridge turning right into Bradley Road is ludicrous. Oak Road is far too narrow to accommodate the current volume of traffic which turns up Bradley Road, even if the proposal to make Oak Road one way is carried out. Additionally, large vehicles attempting to turn right from Leeds Road into Oak Road will have severe difficulty negotiating the tight corner. How many vehicles per hour currently turn right into Bradley Road from Cooper Bridge at off peak and peak times? Has a comprehensive traffic survey for each hour of the day of this manoeuvre as it takes place now been carried out? I fear that the whole scheme will sink under the weight of traffic attempting to turn right into Oak Road and will result in lengthy queues back along Leeds Road towards Cooper Bridge past the present junction. Business parks have been developed along Bradley Road with the consequent increase in traffic from Cooper Bridge - few people working on this site live locally. The housing development just proposed at Villa Farm, and the hundreds of houses planned at Bradley golf course will add considerably to the traffic travelling up and down Bradley Road throughout the day. I have lived in this area since 1986 and remember the congestion on the A62 before the current road layout was adopted to allow two lanes of traffic to turn right from the Cooper Bridge direction up Bradley Road - the queues were horrendous. Given the increase in housing, the business park traffic, and general traffic levels I urge you to reconsider this part of the scheme before a serious and very expensive mistake is made which will reflect badly on planners and designers and cost a fortune to rectify.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I believe you are moving the congestion further up the Leeds road to the junction with Oak Road. I do not believe this solution is well thought through. It does nothing to elevate the number of cars along the section of the Leeds Road nor will it have a significant downwards impact upon air pollution in the area. When there are issues on the M62 and the Bradley Road is used to bypass the issues the congestion will become even worse.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is there anything been planned to aid the congestion down Leeds Road from Roberttown? This has a knock on effect on traffic right back to Heckmondwike at certain times and is my personal main area of concern.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The plans regarding the roundabout at Cooper Bridge are good and the new slip roads taking traffic from the roundabout have been needed for many years. Glad to see finally happening. However, the plan to prevent traffic heading toward Huddersfield from Cooper Bridge then turning right up Bradley Road is less good and will worsen the situation for traffic normally turning up Bradley Road. I can fully understand the need to give extra time for other routes at the Bradley traffic lights, but expecting traffic to then turn right along Oak Road will create a bottleneck there. I have regularly queued at the present right turn for Bradley Road and can assure you that "the expected increase of c.110 vehicles in the peak hour which equates to less than two vehicles per minute" is a huge underestimate. In peak times pre-Covid it was not always possible to enter either of the 2 lanes for this right turn so all these vehicles will now be queuing to turn right onto Oak Road. This will require traffic lights with a reasonable green operation time thereby creating a further delay for traffic coming from Huddersfield. I know this will be expensive, and possibly be regarded as an eyesore, but has a

<p>flyover from Cooper Bridge/Leeds Road been considered? This would then remove any need for a right turn onto Oak Road and traffic flows would be unimpeded.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having traffic unable to turn right coming from cooper bridge is ridiculous and will cause havoc when they turn onto oak road. It will be noisy for the residents living on oak road and cause build ups of traffic when vehicles cannot turn right onto oak road due to opposing traffic. Also stopping left turns from Leeds road to Bradley road will make it difficult for people who do not know to turn up oak road and miss it as there will be nowhere for them to turn around for a while, causing more issues further down the road. Additionally, Oak road is not wide enough for the vehicles such as large lorries etc that use Leeds road and Bradley road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at the plan I believe your going to cause more problems around the Bradley junction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as a resident of Leeds Road [redacted] your so called improvements do not take into account our safety. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You plan to move the cycle lane over the road where currently it acts as a buffer zone between residents parking and the outbound traffic. Removing this would increase the accident rate. <p>2a. for residents on Leeds Road between Oak road and Bradley Road you are to terminate the left turn at the lights. This puts an extra mile on our journey to the closest supermarket. oh no wait we then can't turn right on the approach to the white cross pub? so are we to all including everyone else wanting to turn right up Bradley road have to devalue the houses on oak road and make this road even more dangerous than it already is?</p> <p>2b. when returning home from picking up my children I would then either park outside my house (now with no cycle lane that offers minimal protection anyway) against the flow of traffic then having to pull out into now 3 lanes of traffic on an already busy road because you want to make oak road one way? and therefore increasing my distance to my home as I'll have to drive on toward Brooklands to turn my car around to so that I can park it correctly and not against the flow of traffic.</p> <p>3 Martons Chicken shop.</p> <p>This place at the best of times is a nightmare for the residents of Leeds Road with them (Marstons) not allowing their own staff to park in their carpark so they inevitably park outside everyone else's home for 8 hours at a time making it highly inconvenient for us all, creating a knock on effect for people haveing to walk considerably further to their home sometimes with heavy shopping. If you are going to make any improvements to the traffic in this area then may I suggest relocating Marstons to somewhere else.</p> <p>With your new plans, customers of Marstons will inevitably park in the cycle lanes and again outside residents homes making it even more impossible for us down here on Leeds Road.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme looks good, hope it helps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there no mention of HGV in the area? There are very high movements of HGV vehicles each day. The proposal to make Oak Road one way from Leeds Road to Bradley Road is impractical and could be dangerous. Impractical because of long vehicles turning into Oak Road and Oak Road into Bradley Road and also because there is no facility for pedestrians crossing Oak Road. Reducing the size of

<p>the playing field/recreation ground is unnecessary and pollution will increase in the area because of the volume of slow moving traffic and large diesel engine HGV vehicles exhaust emissions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be enormous cost with very little gain
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads too fast
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dedicated left turn into Wakefield Road. Also dedicated left filter into A62 from much further east along Wakefield road to avoid the roundabout. Would allow better filtering of traffic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a resident on Oak Road I totally object to the proposed improvement scheme, it will bring much more traffic including buses and wagons on Oak road, worried for children using play area, worried about noise, air quality, we already have double glazing which will not be sufficient in keeping the noise out of our home, I would expect the council to install at least triple glazing for all residents in oak road with no cost to us to eliminate the noise.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't think this would make the improvements better, this should stay how it is • Oak road is already busy and dangerous. You often can't see cars coming up from Leeds road and they travel fast This puts more dangers on the children in the park. More accidents will happen If Oak road isn't used, other roads will be used as a rat run and put more pressure on roads already used at speed despite children living in those areas I get the need for change but using Oak road is not the answer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amazed that on a busy day my travel from the m62 slip road to cooper bridge roundabout can take 12 minutes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It makes the congestion a lot worse on Leeds road if we cannot go straight up Bradley road and the road leading to Bradley road in the new proposed scheme is very narrow and not good for traffic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oak Road would be far too busy, the road is already very congested as it is.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I live on Oak Road and it's a very busy road. I have young children and the park is opposite our house. I do not want traffic from Leeds road cutting across Oak RoD. This is a terrible dangerous idea affecting green space and local residents both old and young. Oak road should be a safe quiet residential road not a highway. This will also devalue my property. Cause air and noise pollution. Please rebook at alternatives plans.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please ensure lines are painted and kept up to regularly for the people who often fail to be able to go round a roundabout in the correct manner. 😞 Can you add a huge sign in capital letters saying "You have an indicator so use it!!!"
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So far as I can see there is still a pinch point by the recycled car parts place and along past the Old Corn Mill with multiple lanes coming down to one lane each way so it will just move the bottleneck along and the resulting block back will lead to the same congestion. From a cyclist's point of view until the Greenway is created the road from Cooper Bridge to the Brighouse roundabout will continue to be a death trap
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am registered blind. Do not want more traffic in front of my house which is on oak road. Dangerous for children getting to recreation ground from oak road.

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme public engagement report

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans to restrict access to Bradley road at the white cross junction are ludicrous. Oak road isn't an ideal road to deal with all the traffic. I drive an emergency vehicle and to go on oak road in blue lights at peak time would slow us down no end.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> waist of money!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wider the road the more cars it will attract.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will force cyclists to use the cycle only lane. In addition, the 'straight on' at Cooper Bridge when coming from J25 on Wakefield Road appears to then feed into a 'Give Way' junction. Will this work?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I'm still waiting for a reply to the issues I raised in 2018
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> So many junctions can be improved by allowing left turning traffic to continue. Good to see that here. Would be good to consider allowing electric cars in bus lanes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The junction is a secondary issue to the feeder road to the Brighouse M62 junction. It would be better to focus on improving the road and access from Cooper Bridge to the M62 and then review the Cooper Bridge to Bradley Barr section
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is very busy with traffic making walking and cycling pretty unappealing, noise pollution, roaring traffic resulting in safety issues, traffic fumes, its just not good, even waiting at the bus stop is particularly unpleasant. Any improvement is welcomed on these matters, although road widening only encourages more roaring traffic, more noise pollution, more air pollution. Maybe actively encourage more people back on to railways and buses and away from cars now covid has dropped. There has been no visible messages of encouragement of people back to public transport from government, nor public transport in general.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much journey time will this £75mill project save?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As with all road improvements a reduction in waiting times leads to an increase in traffic volume. While the current proposal has multiple lanes close to the junction which will give a perceived increase in speed through the junction in the context of the wider area where it reverts to the single or dual carriageways there will be a slight increase in traffic density leading to slightly longer delays for those joining these roads further out. Net result not much change, only real option reduce the need for individual journeys, not more road changes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be out of date by time it's done
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of any improvement please can you include as review of the A637 at flockton to assess the impact of m62 m1 through traffic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't travel through Cooper Bridge very often but when i do it always seems to be congested, so any improvements would be good
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This just smacks of tinkering at the edges, putting down a bit of fresh paint and changing a few priorities instead of grasping the nettle and putting in a solution that would be good for the next 20 - 30 years. I can't believe that the original "preferred option" from only 18 -24 months ago has been ditched due to few eco warriors and the need to save a few old trees. Congestion will not be significantly improved and the queues will only get moved from the current Bradley junction up the road to the junction with Oak road. Traffic coming from the motorway will still have to queue and use the roundabout the same as current so no improvements there. When cycling from Huddersfield to Heckmondwyke we will now have to travel towards Brighouse before crossing 7 lanes of traffic to finally head back in the right direction - this will not get used by most cyclists - myself included - and will just cause more hostilities between car/van users and cyclists.

<p>Go back to the "preferred option" from 2/3 years ago, build the bypass and sort this out once and for all.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would strongly object to any changes that could result in increased traffic along the B6118 as this road is not suitable for the current volume of traffic & the size of vehicles that currently travel this route. It is totally unsuitable for pedestrians on certain sections i.e. the pavements are too narrow to safely walk when large vehicles are passing and cyclists are in constant danger.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use a 'blue circle' lane at roundabouts to avoid the ridiculous situation where cyclists proceeding around a roundabout have to give way to traffic joining it - impeding progress. Crossings can be useful for pedestrians and less confident cyclists. When a cycle lane or shared-use pavement rejoins the main carriageway have a protected on-ramp. Never have a right angle turn to a give way. Use these guidelines for all your road improvements for a better experience. Use 'filter ahead' for cyclists at traffic lights wherever possible - eg opposite the 'Three Nuns/Miller Carter steak house'.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building a much larger traffic light controlled roundabout extending into the field behind the current roundabout at cooper bridge, and allowing the 3 roads, 1 from the motorway, 1 from Liversedge and 1 from Mirfield to join onto it further round, plus making the road from the motorway 2 lanes for longer, say back to tree line by the old car breakers yard would allow better segregation for destination would vastly improve the journey times at peak times.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> would re-bridging the Brighthouse line to 8 lane help to alleviate congestion on match days? plus allowing capacity for dual-carriagewaying? in readiness for the Huddersfield Line to be electrified! relocate car dealership white cottage? reroute gas services to facilitate left turning to J25 M62?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing the right turn onto Bradley Road especially for bigger vehicles seems ludicrous. Lights at the junction of Oak Road will only move the problem and dump it outside the shops (Tesco). Oak Road will be dangerous and with a playground/residents it will take a serious incident until it's realised.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think that the proposals should not go ahead as there is just too many cars on the roads around here and allowing more on the roads will just cause a hold up of traffic along other roads in the area - there are loads of traffic lights around the area to slow cars down. It's such a lot of money to be spent - it would be better to feed the starving in the UK.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a resident of oak road my concerns are reduced air quality, safety of the children as play area opposite, excessive noise, due to extra traffic using oak road, the noise as it is, is very loud but with more traffic would be excessive, interfering with our quality of living, reducing the value of my property, would expect council to install triple glazing for all residents on Oak road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking at the arrangement of the lanes, they appear to be designed based on model outputs rather than observed lane usage. I would suggest fewer merges and more effective lane use, the radii are quite tight reducing actual capacity, then where the merge occurs there will be a delay not represented in the model but is very likely to occur on the ground.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before wasting tax payers money on an unnecessary project what will not be worth it, spend the cash on getting the roads put in order like Leeds Road and Bradford Road and dozens of other roads in the Huddersfield area, that would be money worth spending.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Just get it done, it's desperate
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If traffic from Colne Bridge Road to Bradley Road went via Oak Road instead then Bradley Road could be made one-way from Oak Road enabling left-turning traffic to proceed out of there without the need to be traffic light controlled.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prefer the discounted option instead of the roundabout.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At 63 I'm a lifelong hgv driver. I wished I'd become a civil engineer. A simple and cheap way to relieve congestion is to extend the two lanes approaching the junction from the M62. This would maximise trafficflow on the green light as the present lanes are never full. The green light time could be reduced by 2 seconds and added to the time for traffic on the A62 heading west to help reduce congestion there. The A62 east is just fine, never see holdups there. Cmon guys its not rocket science!
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Looking at the proposed plan I don't think it will ease congestion much.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Preferred option shows 2 lanes in both directions from Cooper Bridge to A644 + cycle lanes either side (& impossible to see re. pavements). However no mention is made of widening the road. It is currently single lane initially after A644 junction towards CB & not wide just to put a line down the middle & call it 2 lanes. This already causes major traffic congestion back up A62 and A644. If this scheme goes ahead it is essential it includes 2 (full-width) lanes all the way from CB to A644 and that traffic light phasing at CB does not penalise local traffic from Leeds & Dewsbury to J25 in favour of Hudds to J25 traffic. Scheme also needs to prevent traffic from A62 Leeds blocking the junction from A644 Dewsbury such that when traffic lights are in A644 favour no-one can move. I am very concerned that in improving traffic flow between Hudds and J25 this scheme will make things worse for traffic from Leeds & Dewsbury, especially those travelling to J25.2. The volume of traffic from A62 to Bradley Road already backs up and needs all the flow that 2 lanes into 2 lanes at a shallow angle can provide. This scheme will require all of that traffic to turn right from a single lane at a 135 degree angle into the new one-way Oak Road. Have you really modelled the volume of traffic (in non-COVID times) and the impact this will have - especially at school times (All Saints, further up Bradley Road) and taking into account industrial estate and proposed extensive new housing? This scheme will create a massive problem for traffic in that direction (From CB, currently turning right at Bradley junction on Bradley Road.3. There are regularly quarry lorries parked up on Bradley Road before 8am waiting to turn right onto Lower Quarry Road. Presumably they aren't allowed on site until 8am. This currently causes tail-backs to Cooper Bridge and beyond on the A62 towards Leeds and A644 towards Dewsbury. On the proposed scheme the A62 would still be 2 lanes at the position where they loiter & therefore if they are allowed to continue to do this the A62 on approach to Bradley Junction is effectively turned into single lane and will undo any advantages you can achieve through the wider scheme.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I have recently moved to huddersfield and started commuting through this area - I immediately identified this as one of the worst roads I have driven on, so the changes are really welcome. Even more importantly, I always see poor cyclists and pedestrians in a fair amount of danger and looking very uncomfortable trying to use this area. I am an experienced cyclist and felt very unsafe when riding through this junction (hudds to dewsbury) to work. The changes look like exactly the sort of thing we need to make it safe - particularly in allowing crossing and getting over to the right hand turn to mirfield- and encourage less confident cyclists and pedestrians to make their journeys in a more sustainable way. I hope you can complete them as described without any corner cutting!

- As a resident of Leeds Road where the new road is going to be this will affect me majorly
We already have to put it with large amounts of traffic and pollution and cannot open our windows at the front of the house this is likely to increase .
We put up with constant traffic till late at night and from very early in the morning and have disrupted sleep already
I parked outside my house [redacted] .
With the new changes to the road layout I'm unlikely to be able to do this due to the street planting
Parking is already at a premium and sometimes we have to park streets away and walk back to our houses
I work shifts and sometimes this means late at night I'm walking home alone as I have no option
Also if I wish to travel into Huddersfield town centre direction I will now need to drive all the way down to Cooper bridge to turn around and travel back up meaning I'm adding extra time on my journey
I know this will be of no interest to you and does not affect you but one thing on top of another will affect our lives greatly
If anything the traffic needs reducing on Leeds Road on that section not increasing
There have been no reassurances for residents around parking or noise or pollution
I do not agree with the changes and the major disruption to our lives permanently.

- Please let's just get this done ASAP. It's been far too long overdue.

- The improvements should be linked to improving the current situation, and not be used to facilitate the building of even more houses at Bradley. If these houses are built, even with the proposed improvements, congestion for people who live nearby and use these routes will be even worse and totally unacceptable.

- There do not need to be any changes to the cooper bridge roads. Given the climate emergency we should not be enabling more cars etc - I say that as someone who has to use a car to get to work because there is not good enough public transport. Please do not make these changes, stop building roads at all. Thankyou.

- I do not like the proposed use of Oak Road. My husband finds driving back and forth (Birkby to Batley) via Bradley Road and Cooper Bridge for work is usually fine at the moment. Due to the declared Climate Emergency I cannot see that increasing the traffic flow will be beneficial. Before the pandemic increasing flow generally meant that a route just became more popular and so the traffic increased to match the capacity. Since the pandemic and the proposed introduction of more electric vehicles I am not convinced that individual car transport will increase as much as predicted. So either the road changes will not reduce the total amount of traffic or else if traffic reduces anyway due to other societal and financial changes the expense, disruption and loss of wildlife habitat might no longer seem necessary.

- Neither the preferred scheme nor the discounted scheme tackle the problem with the access towards Huddersfield from Leeds. A bottle neck will still occur at the Three Nuns/Shell garage junction. I also don't believe that either scheme will alleviate queuing traffic from the M62 either.

I personally travel via Brighouse from Cleckheaton to avoid this junction in the morning. It is a lot quicker as it tends to be a car park around 850-910am when I would potentially access this junction. The proposed changes do not appear to be about to improve my journey to work. Instead they look to make my journey longer as people avoid the junction especially during the unspecified works period – of which there is no indication – and the inevitable delays to the project.

From this junction, I would then need to turn right up Bradley Road, except this proposal says that this will be barred and I will have to queue in single file traffic to turn up the single lane that is Oak Road. I can imagine that drivers in the direction of Huddersfield will be over and undertaking each other on the proposed two lanes whilst jostling for an improved position in the traffic. I'm at a loss how it was considered a good idea to have articulated lorries turning right up this tight right hand bend past residential houses. If a HGV doesn't make it on the first attempt there will be further delays to all lanes in both directions whilst the driver negotiates the turn. The planners seem to have disregarded the health and property values of those who live on Oak Road. These properties will potentially become unsellable with the dramatically increased vehicle access past them.

The scheme may improve my journey home slightly as I do travel via Cooper Bridge to get home. The addition of a filter lane for M62 will make the journey towards Leeds less congested but again the junction between Cooper Bridge and the Three Nuns/Shell garage will still be a jostle for position especially if following a HGV or tractor.

Overall, I feel that this scheme falls short of its intention. I cannot see who will benefit apart from those supplying the materials to complete the project.

- dont come out with rubbish eg Oak road you ask for feed back where is the box
- The Oak road change is not going to work. The number of cars which will have to go round the other roads, because of the one way system will increase traffic flow. Too near a play area. Too near housing.
I will reply further when I have fully understood the other plans.
- Sorry but these plans don't go far enough to support cyclists safety.
- Making oak rd. one way to take traffic for Bradley Rd. is not a good idea. Putting traffic lights to enable a right turn from Leeds Road to Oak Rd. is just moving the problem from Bradley junction further along Leeds Rd. If this happens I anticipate long queues from the new lights. The right turn onto Oak Rd. from the Leeds direction is also very difficult and neither the turn or Oak Rd. are suitable for large vehicles. It will also increase journey times (and pollution) for traffic heading towards Bradley Rd. from Leeds. Blocking the bottom of Bradley Rd. will adversely affect Colne Bridge Rd where the main problem is motorway traffic. Sending more traffic on Oak Rd. will create more pollution right next to a children's play area and if the road has to be widened would this mean the loss of mature trees and green space - not helpful for a climate emergency.
- Shouldn't we concentrate on repairing what we have rather than spending money on alterations? The pollutants will go down as we change to electric cars etc. I can't see that the proposed changes will make any difference. If you want to speed up traffic, the only way I can see it happening is with flyovers.
- Congestion at Cooper Bridge is consistent; especially prior to lockdown. Work should be carried out, where possible, outside of busy periods (i.e. rush hour). It already takes me an hour to get from Leeds to Huddersfield, roadworks should not increase this further.
- it is ridiculous that you are proposing to send all traffic onto Oak Road instead of using the existing route via the bottom of Bradley Road
It doesn't make any sense at all and will cause horrendous pollution for the residents of this small street as well as safety concerns for children access the play ground

- Please don't get rid of the turn for Bradley Road it's not broken so it doesn't need fixing change the traffic light flow time the lights better
- to try and use a minor road, oak road into a shortcut is ridiculous this is a narrow road which goes by the play area. Will not save a lot of time on journey times.
- Oak Road is not a main road and trying to expect all traffic to use this route will only create even worse issues. Have you ever tried to turn right at the end of Oak Road onto Bradley Road at 5pm? Oak Road is directly across from Tesco and is already quite dangerous trying to exit from Tesco and now exiting traffic will need to be able to see traffic turning right into Oak Road and traffic continuing on Leeds Road. How will HGV traffic negotiate the right turning into Oak Road? There's also a children's play area to consider, now being next to a re-classified 'main road' how is this deemed to be safe for children? The residents of this road have had to endure the rat run for years and now the extra traffic, this really is not fair on these residents and homeowners. I can guarantee their thoughts and concerns are not being considered and this ridiculous scheme has already been signed off and agreed. The extra traffic will end up going through Bradley/Deighton as the tailbacks to get onto Oak Road will be horrendous so people will use an alternative route, which hasn't been impacted and will cause other issues for the residents of the area.....all this for extra seconds on a journey.....this is all irrelevant when there's an accident and it will then be utter gridlock. But I feel everyone who completes the survey and objects to scheme or raises concerns will be useless as the work will go ahead, so no point having a consultation or feedback survey, the deal is done. Sorry that's how I feel, you may as well remove the play area also as it will be empty and certainly not healthy for kids to be breathing fumes and playing dodge the commuter trying to get there. I see nothing positive about this scheme.
- This work does not justify the cost and only shows limited improvement for people and bikes. No improvement at all for cars.
- You are planning to move a right turn which, at present, is at a reasonable angle, causing little real disruption along Leeds Road towards Huddersfield, forcing all traffic, no matter what size, to complete a turn at an acute angle into Oak Road. Introducing this turn will entail stopping traffic leaving town travelling towards Cooper Bridge to allow these manoeuvres to be completed. Oak Road is barely suitable for traffic from Huddersfield currently wanting to turn right towards Colne Road at the Bradley Road / Leeds Road junction. There is also a children's playground on this road.

So you are still going to interrupt traffic flow, for no benefit which will be discernable to a motorist, just a bit further up the road than at present.

You are, apparently, going to increase / smooth (?) traffic flow towards Huddersfield, making it more awkward for traffic wanting to join Leeds Road as there will be fewer breaks in the traffic on Leeds Road.

You are going to increase the risk to children accessing the playground, exposing them to heavier traffic.

All this so that "Kirklees" doesn't "lose money" which, when it comes down to it, might be used for some real benefit elsewhere in the County.

If you want to improve pedestrian safety put a pedestrian crossing at either end of Oak Road.

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme public engagement report

<p>I have yet to see the hoards of cyclists who are to benefit from this change, the most I have ever seen, at one time on Leeds Road, between Cooper Bridge and Neptune Way is four, two of whom were riding on the pavement rather than in the cycle lane.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absolute waste of public money. Months of disruption will at best "save" 3 minutes of journey time. Worth neither the time nor the money.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With no right turn on to Bradley rd there will be too much pressure on Leeds rd with the extra traffic, and even more congestion turning right on to oak rd, and what about HGV's I drive one for a living and from what I can see it will cause chaos turning right on to oak rd, Leeds rd can't cope now travelling away from Huddersfield, so how's it expected to cope continually stopping for the extra traffic turning right on oak rd, and what about traffic turning right out of Tesco express when it's gridlocked, the problem is the cooperbridge roundabout not traffic turning right on Bradley rd
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take notice please of the villages affected especially Flockton and Grange Moor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel your proposals will be more disruptive and create more pollution than already exists, particularly for heavier vehicles. There would be much less disruption if a new motorway junction was created where the M62 passes under the A641.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not solving the problem of roundabout after the railway or merging traffic on A62 and road from Mirfield. Road to motorway needs to be dual carriageway. Need a plan of the area to fully understand the layout not just cross-sections.. Very poor information about your proposals.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The link road should have been built - ie s proper job The road system and quality of road is third world. Don't compromise or listen to luddites
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main problem lies with the volume of motorized traffic whether cars, buses, lorries etc, especially at peak times. Walkers, of which I am one, and cyclists are already fairly well served with the current arrangement. I support the preferred option as shown.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roundabout plan is good, waste of money to do the bridge widening and messing up the Bradley Road junction. If the m62 j25 to 24 oak Road will become the EDR for motorway traffic that can fit under the railway bridge. There is nothing that can be done to bring this up to the required standard/capacity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of some turns at crossroads looks good. Main problem is build up of traffic both ways between motorway and memorial roundabout.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed changes to Cooper Bridge are good. However the proposed changes to the lights at Bradley junction are a farce. Under the new proposals you expect HGVs and cars to turn right off Leeds road on to Oak Road to access Bradley road. Bearing in mind that there is a new industrial estate being constantly developed at the top of Bradley Road. You may end up diverting HGV traffic through Brighouse as access will be easier. This isn't addressing a problem rather deflecting it to a different area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot see how the proposed scheme changes enough of the affected roads to help. Traffic volumes will continue to increase as there are future developments in the area and the proposals only add a few extra meters of new road. Nothing is being planned to remove huge queues to and from M62 and reduce the flooding whenever there is heavy rain. Please restart the plan with completely new roads from Mirfield, Bradley and Leeds Road that create a free-flow system away from Cooper Bridge junction so it can be redeveloped for cyclists, walker's and buses ONLY.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is encouraging to see that Oak Road will become one way as it is a difficult junction to exit onto Leeds Road and will be much safer. Also great to see some investment in the recreation area which will be utilised by children and families from the estate nearby.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am against the proposals, measures should be taken to reduce or end 'growth' rather than enable it. There is a climate emergency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening the A644 would be helpful to reduce traffic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can't see how no right turn from Leeds Rd on to Bradley Road is an improvement. Traffic wanting Bradley Rd. using Oak Rd. will cause long queues on Leeds Rd when wanting to turn right. I have used this junction for over twenty years and I am not sure you appreciate the volume of traffic that turns right at this junction.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals attempt to improve 3 issues but do not measure what the development will do. Please provide an index to measure the improvements which benefit 1.Environment 2.Community 3.Economy. It will then be possible to judge and compare the second proposal with previous and subsequent proposals.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any improvement plan is welcome and long overdue. A scheme that keeps traffic moving smoothly between Leeds Road and the M62 is welcome.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have travelled from Mirfield to Bradley, and back, every day for the past 3 years - why you are proposing to stop traffic turning right up bradley road coming from cooper bridge is very bermusing. i travel at rush hour, and can't recall any problems getting from the roundabout to the lights and then up bradley road or back again. The main bottle neck seems to be coming from mirfield, towards the roundabout. I feel sorry for the residents of Oak Road, having all that extra traffic going past their homes. perhaps the focus should be on improving traffic flow through the actual round about, and not at the bradley junction.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I use the Cooper Bridge junction about 80 times a week, 4000 times a year, at varying times of day and night due to my job. Having looked at the plans I cannot see it helping much at all. Also spending millions to save two minutes at best, is not feasible. Unless you can reduce or eliminate traffic using Cooper Bridge to travel towards Bradley/ Huddersfield, all the extra lanes will do is provide parking for cars waiting to use the junction. At least 50% of the traffic turns right at that roundabout. At peak times traffic can queue all the way back to Hartshead Moor services. Added to this the new warehouses that have been built on the A62, despite objections, will vastly increase traffic. The raising of the Bridge at the bottom of Scout Hill in Ravensthorpe has also increased traffic as it is now a rat run for traffic travelling between M1 J40 and the M62 J25. In particular HGV traffic has massively increased. Traffic queues from Bradley lights all the way back to Cooper Bridge as well. If there is heavy rain the area under the bridge floods, causing more queues. The only two options I can see are to either add a road off M62 J25 roundabout going towards Bradley, possibly the roundabout next to Villa Farm Shop that leads down left passing the Asda to Huddersfield. Alternatively a new Junction off the M62 leading to Bradley and the Stadium. I believe a J24A has been previously suggested and would seem the best option. Obviously these are probably a lot more expensive options, however they would remove the need for traffic heading towards the Bradley/ Huddersfield areas to use Cooper Bridge. Also there would be little to no delays to existing traffic whilst being built.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At a time when the council says it is short of money, air pollution is noticeably bad and general maintenance of existing roads is poor, I don't think this scheme is the best use of time and money.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> computer picture a bit confusing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When are council going to realise there is just too much traffic. Making these changes and increasing the local population is only going to make things worse. Stop developing and expanding and start regenerating and getting cars off the road with better public transport links, off road cycle and walking lanes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> what are the proposed improvements, would it not help to have a map here? The plans have changed so much it is hard to keep track.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The congestion at Cooper Bridge is awful, these changes need to happen
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Your aims will not be achieved in the following points; <p>Congestion - At the present there are 2 areas of congestion your proposal will create 3.</p> <p>Road safety - risks will be increased by increase traffic flow through a housing estate alongside a children's play area.</p> <p>Air quality - will be lowered by removing mature trees and reducing green space while increasing traffic pollution.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed changes to Bradley junction and Oak Road need revisiting they will make access and travel worse for residents in the area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As with other schemes in the area in the past, you will spend millions and improve nothing (like Ravensthorpe gyratory as one example of failure), with the amount of traffic the ONLY way, is to send traffic another route, but its a victorian travel network that is never changed, "experts" will convince you that their way is best, but you will waste millions on another failure. mark my words. 45yrs of driving experience in Kirklees indicates that to me. If your ok with wasting public money as you are. then I hope you feel ok with that.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the face of the climate emergency, and with no local carbon 'baseline' assessment, no proper and suitably enforced and monitored programme of reducing highway carbon emissions locally in place, then no schemes such as this which are likely to increase levels of motor vehicle movements (the 'induced traffic effect') should be carried out whatsoever.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> email submitted, absolutely minimal rearrangement, basically dedicated link lanes, extra junction lanes by adopting narrow lanes, no loss of tree cover, minimal land take, minimal cost, improve flow within current footprint, where's the Carbon Assessment ?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Widening roads to reduce congestion makes no sense due to the well-documented induced traffic effect.https://bettertransport.org.uk/roads-nowhere/induced-traffic Has the climate impact of this road been fully-assessed in the light of Kirklees and WyCA's climate emergency declarations? If so, can the public view these assessments? Since COVID our patterns of travel have changed and so I would question the modelling undertaken for this road expansion scheme. I understand that this scheme will reduce journey times by 3 minutes only. Is it worth the expense and climate impact? Kirklees have no traffic management schemes in place so have not tried to tackle congestion at source.

- I am opposed to this road widening scheme because of the climate emergency. In North America we are seeing extreme heat and forest fires and in London and Europe we have had extreme flooding in the last few weeks. Climate breakdown is happening and my generation and those in the global south who have done least to cause it will suffer the most. I find it hard to believe that local councils are still putting forward such climate-damaging schemes and I am completely opposed to road expansion schemes in a climate emergency.

- This 2021 revised proposal is garbage and a waste of public money. Very poor value for money. How on earth can this crazy scheme be built without causing horrendous traffic delays? It does next to nothing to improve the connectivity between Huddersfield and Mirfield to M62 J25. The A644 from J25 to Cooper Bridge is woeful and totally unsafe for all but motor vehicles. We need a completely new road from J25 crossing over the river Aire, canal and railway line linking on to Bradley Road.
To call this scheme an improvement is just KMC hot air.
[redacted] MICE

- The scheme should not go ahead in its current design as it does nothing to decarbonise transport by increasing public transport use and the cycle infrastructure isn't a high enough quality to encourage significant modal shift to cycling. Private car use should be discouraged and creating more capacity will do the opposite of that.

Cycle routes should feel safe with on-road sections only appearing on quiet 20mph roads. Road crossings should be kept to a minimum and there are a high number of crossings in this design whilst heading eastward through the scheme area.

- Great improvement on original schemes. Far less damage to the environment.
- Makes little sense and hinders residents and those travelling locally

- As a local resident, these proposals are going to create a huge inconvenience - I will no longer be able to easily get to my home or to travel locally, without significant detour. I live on the stretch of Leeds Rd, below Oak Road. These proposals will mean as well as the issues above, we are also going to get a lot more traffic in front of the houses, waiting to turn onto Oak Rd. This will double the amount of stationary traffic (previously it was only towards Cooper Bridge). These proposals will create idling engines both ways and surely will make the air quality even worse than it is!

As a local resident, I do think you should have spoken to us and discussed concerns? These proposals are awful, in terms of impact on those of us already living in a congested area. These plans will create MORE congestion!

**Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic have your travel patterns changed?
Yes - please explain your answer:**

- Dont travel in as much now
- Always been a driver but cycle and walk more now
- annual mileage approx. 11000/yr. last year 4000
- as covid restrictions - no shopping, social or other none essential travel
- As You're getting past the mini round a bout on Wakefield there is always traffic congestion and to get home from work (Leeds) to come back to Huddersfield to

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme public engagement report

<p>give my wife a lift to work has totally changed and I think Cooper Bridge needs improvement.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At first I did not travel at all, as my son's nursery was closed. Now I am travelling more as my son's nursery is open and the number of days he attends has increased.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • change of workplace
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changed Job so my need to travel through cooper bridge has increased
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completely changed business and shopping travel to more local, online, Zoom meetings instead of business travel and will continue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complying with gov UK guidelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covid 19 lockdown
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covid restrictions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • covid restrictions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently working from home so not travelling much
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently working from home. Will be going back into the office soon.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dont leave home very often now
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't travel as much, and make more use of my bicycle.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't travel as often as wfh
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driving less
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer journeys
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer journeys
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fewer work journeys in rush hour
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Going out less and planning journeys to fit together, reducing overall travel.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have not used public transport is buses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hybrid working arrangement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am a student and so have been based at home some of the time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am self employed and have had less work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I cycle more now.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't travel as much
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't travel outside my home area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have been working from home more days than i have been travelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have now moved onto Bradley road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have retired and no longer travel this route to work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have travelled far less than before
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have worked more from home so have travelled less
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I only commute in to work three days a week.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I travel less for work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I work from home, but still continue to travel through Cooper Bridge regularly
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I work from home, so do not travel to work anymore
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I work from home.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I work from home. However, i live on Oak Road. I travel to mirfield for work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less car journeys, more by bicycle
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less frequent journeys
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less journeys and staying local.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less need to travel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less travel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less travel

• Less travel
• less travel
• Less travel due to covid restrictions
• Less travel for business
• Less travel in general
• Less travel into Leeds for work
• Less travel overall during most severe Covid restrictions
• Less travel to my mum in Leeds
• Less use
• Lockdown
• Lower employer demands
• Made fewer journeys. Expect to get back to daily use.
• Making fewer journeys. Essential journeys usually on foot. Occasionally by bus or train. Fewer journeys outside Huddersfield in this direction.
• More work from home
• My work pattern changed
• New job so travel through Cooper bridge twice a day Monday to Friday
• No longer commuting regularly to work - working from home
• No longer commuting to work
• No longer go shopping or to football training and matches.
• No longer going on day trips or shopping trips, mostly starting through cooper bridge
• No longer travel to work now working from home
• No longer using the bus.
• No longer work from the office in Leeds
• No longer working in this area
• Not as much travel through
• Not driving as much. But it is increasing now
• Not going out much
• Not travelling
• Not travelling as much
• Not travelling quite as much, noticed how much easier it is when there are not as many cars on the road.
• Not travelling to workplace
• not using the car as much, cycling on e bike more.
• Not visiting relatives and friends as frequently, but will hopefully soon return.
• Not working as much
• Now 3 days a week
• Now work at home so don't need to go in to Huddersfield as often
• only travel when i need to
• Only travel when necessary.
• Part furloughed so varies per week. Plan to return to as before.
• Reduce travel due to lockdowns
• Reduced but increased recently
• Reduced days going to work and back and working from home instead.
• Reduced journeys because of travel and Covid 19 restrictions.
• Reduced travel considerably.
• Reduced usage by half.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions affected regular trips.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions placed by the government to stop the spread of covid
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions to cricket facilities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retired so being shielding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the start of the pandemic i have worked from home and have not visited friends and family so have traveled a lot less
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some days I work from home
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stayed at home, video call
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staying at home and only going out when necessary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staying at home less driving
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stopped travelling to and from other towns cities , stopped travelling to meet up with friends.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stupid question, everyone's travel pattern has changed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lockdown has kept me at home.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town haven't played
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • travel less
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel less for work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to work only
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travelled from Mirfield to Halifax and back every day for work, now home based so only travel once a week
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travelled less through lockdown
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travelled less, used only one car, cycled more.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travelling less as per government guidelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Try not to travel unless necessary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Try to minimise journeys because of traffic congestion and covid responsibilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used it less as I was working from home 1 - 2 days out of the week.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the car and therefore this road less
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walk more
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was not able to visit family
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFH
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFH since first lockdown
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work and visit AA Meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work from home
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work from home 2 days per week
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work from home, travel less
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work more at home
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work more from home
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked from home up to December 2020, now retired
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from home
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from home
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from home and using online shopping more has reduced the need to use the car.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from home dor some of the time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from home mainly
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from home more
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from home so less travelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • working from home, no need to drive to Huddersfield

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from home, no need to travel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from home.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working from the office only on one day per week but this may increase as restrictions ease

**What is your main reason for travelling through the Cooper Bridge area?
(Other - please specify)**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to junction 25 of M62 or travelling along A62 to get to huddersfield
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caring duties
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Childcare
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver to area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • going to Brighouse
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I live near Cooper Bridge and also I commute to go to work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just passing through.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mix of shopping,visiting family and visiting leisure facilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel through the area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • travelling thru en-route to Brighouse
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visiting friends, work, leisure. All of them can't choose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visiting listed buidings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking and cycling for leisure and recreation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work related (HGV driver)

Appendix B: Emails

Redacted: Any information that could potentially identify an individual has been redacted from the content of this report to retain anonymity, and best practice data handling in line with our privacy statement. Redacted information includes: names, address and contact information. Where this information is relevant or necessary for a timely response to have been provided (emails), this information has been given freely, however redacted for the purposes of this report only.

Please also note that these comments have been copied verbatim from their source and have not been altered, updated or amended.

21 sets of email correspondence were received during the consultation period.

No.	Email Content	Response
1	Good evening, Please could you let me know if in the proposed plans there will still remain road side parking for the residents who live on leeds road. Kind regards	Thank you for your email. Yes, there are no plans to change the current on street parking arrangements along Leeds Road.

<p>2a</p>	<p>Hello Just looking at the cooper Bridge proposal and I have a question about the cycle path. Will this be like the greenway/route 66 ie off road? If so has any consideration been made for horse riders? Many thanks</p>	<p>As part of the A62 to Cooper Bridge project we have included segregated cycling lanes throughout the majority of the design, this means the cyclists will be separated from both traffic and pedestrians in most areas by a kerb. However, there some short areas where there isn't enough space to accommodate this and the pedestrians and cyclists will share the same space. Whist the lanes are mainly separated from traffic this will not be a greenway route and the cycle lanes mainly follow the edge of the road and will not permit horses.</p> <p>We are separately developing plans for a Bradley to Brighthouse greenway cycle route which is designed to integrate with this highway scheme, this was consulted on separately and we are now refining our designs.</p>
<p>2b</p>	<p>Thank you When you say you are separately developing a Bradley to brighthouse greenway cycle way, will this be horse friendly? Thanks very much</p>	<p>In developing the Bradley to Brighthouse Greenway, our partners, the Canal and River Trust took the position of specifically precluding horses from the canal towpath as they considered the route would not provide adequate space for them to use it safely. We are therefore not proposing to negotiate with the private land owners over which adjacent elements of the route cross to allow and encourage use by horses.</p>
<p>2c</p>	<p>Very disappointing</p>	<p>N/a</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Dear [redacted], I have received information from my Engineers of your proposed scheme at the Cooper Bridge. As far as Northern Powergrid are concerned as a Statutory Utility we have to protect our assets and ensure that the electrical network in and around the area is not compromised and ordinarily with developments of this nature as a standard procedure if this is a DCO or CPO we list a formal objection. This is purely as a means of protection and to ensure that the developer engages with our Engineers to assess the</p>	<p>Thank you for your email, yes that is correct. We have also separately engaged with all Statutory Undertakers to make C3 enquiries.</p> <p>Kind regards, [redacted]</p>

	<p>implications and affect, is any on our apparatus. In this respect this appears from reading through the web and the information received from our Engineers that you are seeking opinions on the scheme and that your scheme may be in its infancy. Would this be right so we can consider what our next steps should be? I look forward to your reply, Kind regards,</p>	
<p>4a</p>	<p>Hello The option of Oak Road is too dangerous but a better option would be to introduce traffic lights at Lower Quarry Road to access a contra-flow lane on the other side of the road next to the cause-way to Bradley Road with traffic lights at Upper Quarry Road to allow access back to the normal side of Bradley Road. Traffic coming down Bradley Road to then have a direct lane on to Leeds Road there then would be three lanes past Lower Quarry Road towards Leeds. Traffic then from Leeds or from Bradley Road would not be involved in the main lights at Colne Bridge Road. There is room to achive this. Regards</p>	<p>Thank you for your email. Unfortunately we're unable to understand the design you are trying to describe, please feel free to submit a sketch to us either by email to yourvoice@westyorks-ca.gov.uk or by post to FREEPOST Consultation Team (WYCA) (no stamp required).</p>
<p>4b</p>	<p>I have attached a drawing of my suggestion for Bradley Regards</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. A contraflow is certainly a novel solution for which to accommodate the displaced right turn from Leeds Road onto Bradley Road. Whilst technically a contraflow is feasible it does have the disbenefit of the introduction of another two sets of traffic signals at both Upper and Lower Quarry Roads. These two additional traffic conflicts are undesirable within a coordinated traffic signalled network making the smooth journey from one set of traffic signals difficult to achieve. Furthermore contraflow lanes are unconventional so much so that they do raise road safety concerns for all road users but in particular pedestrians. The introduction of a further traffic movement on Bradley Road will be confusing for all.</p>

		<p>The need to displace the Leeds Road right turn to Bradley Road onto Oak Road is to create more vehicular capacity at the main junction. The use of Oak Road achieves this aim.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>I've got a few questions after looking at the proposed plans for the Cooper Bridge and Bradley Junction scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will this scheme be redesigned again to meet LTN 1/20 as it currently fails on comfort, directness, and using advisory cycle lanes on a 40mph road? - Have the cycle routes from Huddersfield towards Roberttown been considered in this design as it requires a bicycle rider to take 11 separate road crossings? - Will the cycle routes have sensor loops for the crossings or will bicycle users be required to press beg buttons? How long will the wait time be and will they be given priority? - Why are drivers expected to cross a cycle lane to use parking bays instead of putting the cycle tracks on the other side and thus giving the safety of segregation? - Why aren't continuous footways/cycle routes utilised? - Are the cycle stop lines put ahead of vehicular stop lines to allow them to be seen by drivers or to clear a junction before turning traffic? - Is there access to the bi-directional cycle route between Mirfield and Cooper Bridge roundabout if joining directly from the bus lane on the A62? - Would you be comfortable with your 8 year old child cycling this route? - Why aren't bus lanes continues through this route where the space allows for multiple lanes when they move far more people than lanes for single occupancy vehicles? <p>Thanks</p>	<p>The scheme design is currently at an outline stage, subject to securing funding to proceed with the scheme the detailed junction designs, signals design and timings will be developed in the next stage and presented at a future consultation.</p> <p>The scheme aims to improve facilities for both pedestrians and cyclists where feasible, where possible we have kept cycling facilities away from parking bays, this is reflective on feedback received during earlier engagement with the public. However in some locations there is insufficient space to provide fully segregated facilities and this is reflected in the design, again we will keep these elements under review as the design progresses and we undertake more detailed surveys.</p> <p>Unfortunately, space constraints have prevented the inclusion of a dedicated bus lane throughout the extent of the scheme. However the scheme aims to improve journey times along this section of the A62 corridor, bus services will benefit from the journey time savings delivered by the scheme, additionally we will be incorporating Intelligent Transport Systems (traffic signals) which will allow buses to be prioritised at junctions.</p>

<p>6</p>	<p>Following the Live Stream session re. Cooper Bridge</p> <p>Question/clarification for [redacted] please.</p> <p>I logged on to the live event and did ask a question, [redacted] advised that existing parking outside the Leeds Road houses immediately prior to Oak Road would now be retained. (These are the 9 houses coming from Huddersfield, houses with front gardens same side as and just before Oak Road), however, I have just revisited the scheme drawing on the Your Voice pages, and the existing parking is not shown.</p> <p>As the houses are a row on their own, I would appreciate further reassurance (on behalf of my neighbours), that our parking has not been overlooked. Is there in fact a more up to date drawing that needs to be uploaded to the Your Voice website?</p> <p>Many thanks.</p>	<p>Apologies for confusion on the live event, we understand the area you are referring to now (on the live event we thought the reference was to the parking along Leeds Road between Oak Road and Bradley junction). You are correct that the current plans do not show on-street parking in this location. We will review our designs in this location to establish if we can accommodate additional parking there.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>As a resident of oak road my concerns are reduced road safety as children's play area opposite, reduced air quality, increased noise from excessive traffic including buses and wagons using oak road, reducing the value of my property, and I would expect the council to install triple glazing for the noise, at no cost to the home owners.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email. Our designs are currently at an early stage of development, as we progress the scheme we will explore the possibility of introducing traffic calming and/or a reduced speed limit to Oak Road. We will also undertake further environmental assessments, which we will publish during our next consultation.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>We are opposed to any increase in road space given the ambition of the Combined Authority to reduce the use of cars by 27% by 2038 and therefore consider this scheme to be a waste of public money. We appreciate the air pollution generated by queuing cars, but foresee this reducing as more electric cars are bought. Although electric cars still emit particulates, we assume this will not be a problem for cars queuing. Most additional road space generates new traffic and in the long term this will make the traffic volumes across the wider area worse and lead to new congestion</p>	<p>Many thanks for your comprehensive response, we will include this in our analysis of the feedback received and where possible use it to inform our design as we progress the scheme.</p>

<p>points elsewhere.</p> <p>Any new road built generates additional traffic, which in turn will lead to more carbon emissions. The SACTRA report 'Trunk Roads and the Generation of Traffic' (SACTRA, Department for Transport, 1994) said in its Executive Summary in para 10 "Considering all these sources of evidence, we conclude that induced traffic can and does occur, probably quite extensively, though its size and significance is likely to vary widely in different circumstances". They estimated an additional 10% of traffic is generated in the short-term and 20% in the long-term.</p> <p>More recently, the Department for Transport published "Latest Evidence on Induced Travel Demand: An Evidence Review" (WSP and Rand Europe, Department for Transport, May 2018) which endorsed the conclusions of the SACTRA report and pointed out that induced or generated traffic was more likely in situations where congestion was currently prevailing.</p> <p>We are concerned about the road widening beneath the trans Pennine railway bridge and the impact this may have on the trans Pennine railway line. We would like to think that any disruption caused to the railway will be integrated within the plans to upgrade this railway line led by Network Rail.</p> <p>We welcome the additional provision for both pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>We note the alternative plan involved removing the roundabout. We prefer this option as roundabouts are not easy places for pedestrians to cross and take up more land space.</p> <p>The scheme is on balance perhaps better than the earlier proposal to build a new link road from Bradley towards the A644 and M62 Junction 25, but it does involve expansion of the Cooper Bridge Junction's footprint and significant encroachment onto existing wooded green space. There are issues of concern around both Bradley and Cooper Bridge junctions.</p>	
--	--

<p>Bradley Junction: Residents of Oak Road will see an increase in traffic due to the rerouting of right turning traffic away from Bradley Junction and, due to the introduction of a one way system to cope with the resulting extra traffic on this narrow road, will suffer the inconvenience of detours in order to access their road. It would seem that residents of Bradley Road, between Oak Road and Bradley Junction, no longer permitted to turn right at Bradley Junction, would also be required to make significant detours for some journeys, adding to traffic on other roads, for instance, having to turn down Colne Bridge Road if coming from Cooper Bridge, then double back and cross the junction to access houses on the left of Bradley Road in the Rastrick direction near to the junction. It has been stated that residents of Leeds Road between Oak Road and Bradley Junction will need, if travelling from Cooper Bridge or Bradley Road, to continue past their houses to Brooklands, further along Leeds Road towards Huddersfield, then turn round and return to their houses back along Leeds Road. There are doubtless other examples of detours being required of local residents as a result of these changes.</p> <p>The addition of better pedestrian and cycle facilities around this junction however is to be welcomed. The separate proposed Bradley to Brighouse Greenway is a much needed addition to active travel opportunities and connected with improved cycling facilities around Bradley and Cooper Bridge junctions will make safer, and hopefully encourage, cycling between Brighouse and areas such as Mirfield and Dewsbury.</p> <p>Cooper Bridge Junction: Widening of the railway bridge (or more correctly, widening of the road under the existing two bridges) will presumably require a fairly lengthy closure of the</p>	
---	--

<p>Calder Valley Main Line railway, while new abutments and a longer bridge are constructed. This may not be an issue if the work were to coincide with the Trans-Pennine Route Upgrade, which may require a closure of the section of line over the bridge during the works, even though this section is not directly a part of the upgrade.</p> <p>Addition of segregated cycle lanes is welcome and should improve safety (there are currently shared pedestrian and cycle facilities at the junction) and the increased capacity at the junction will hopefully improve bus reliability by reducing congestion. However, the increased capacity in itself may well increase the amount of traffic opting to route via the junction as mentioned above. This effect of increased road capacity is borne out by experience elsewhere and such extra capacity is being created both through the junction and along the A62 towards Huddersfield and through Bradley Junction.</p> <p>The stated aim to support housing growth may result in even more traffic using the junction, the A62 and the A644 in future and we would stress that dramatic improvements to public transport provision in the area is needed as a matter of urgency. There is practically no public transport provision on the A644 corridor west of Cooper Bridge, either by bus or rail. Such rail services that exist are sparse and do not connect Dewsbury with Halifax for example. There is no bus service between Dewsbury and Halifax. Some of these issues may be addressed by the introduction of mass transit in West Yorkshire, but this is some way down the line.</p> <p>Dumb Steeple: Not a transport issue, but the Grade 2 listed, thought to be 18th century, obelisk known as the Dumb Steeple, rendezvous for Luddites in 1812 on the night of their attack on Cartwright's Mill at Rawfolds,</p>	
--	--

	<p>and slightly repositioned some years ago during an earlier remodelling of the Cooper Bridge junction is, according to the scheme presentation video to be relocated yet again, apparently to the north side of the new junction, even further away from its original site. Hopefully it will not be silent witness to ever increasing traffic for the next 200 years!</p>	
9	<p>What has happened to the Brighthouse - Bradley greenway? Should finished by now but not even started yet</p>	<p>Emerging schemes in development for Brighthouse and Bradley have necessitated a redesign of a elements of the scheme, and it is now intended to be on-site winter this year.</p>
9a	<p>Thanks for the update.</p>	<p>N/a</p>
10	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation with regards to the A62 to Cooper Bridge scheme.</p> <p>Please find comments from the Canal & River Trust attached. We hope you find these of use.</p> <p>Please note that Cooper Bridge crosses our Navigation, and the Trust would therefore welcome the opportunity to discuss further at the most appropriate moment, as the works could significantly impact the environment and visual quality of our waterway below the bridge.</p> <p>Kind Regards [redacted] Area Planner North East, Canal and River Trust</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback, which we will consider as we develop the design for our scheme. We will be in touch separately to arrange a meeting to discuss further in due course.</p>
11a	<p>Hi</p> <p>I have a few questions.</p> <p>How do we know how this will impact? As an example, yesterday I drove home to Mirfield and the queue started on the m62. It takes typically 10/15 minutes to get the 2 miles from the junction to stocks Bank Road. What analysis has been done to understand current traffic vs the</p>	<p>We have assessed the impacts of our proposals in accordance with Department for Transport guidance, we will continue to update our assessments as we progress the design of the scheme. We will publish the results of our final assessments at a future consultation. We have used the Kirklees Transport Model to forecasts the impacts of the scheme.</p>

	<p>expectation and also pollution levels for residents? Also any traffic monitoring - when was this done?</p> <p>We often see Stocks Bank Road being used as a cut through - drivers come down Huddersfield Road, see a queue and drive up Coppin Hall onto Stocks Bank. Will anything be done to deter this?</p> <p>Has consideration been made to the footpaths across Leeds road - at the end of Stocks Bank Road, and also behind the 3 nuns - lots of local people cross this busy road to get to the footpaths.</p> <p>Finally my main concern about this - traffic has been bad for some years. Its amongst the most polluted roads in England! Yet more and more development has been allowed including the massive warehouses up the road. How will we be guaranteed that this won't come back to bite us - that more planning is accepted as infrastructure is better? These changes are to improve the situation not more make it temporarily better until more building is done!</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>This is a model, developed initially in 2015 and updated in 2019. It is based on observations of traffic flows and travel patterns across the Kirklees district. The majority of the data for the model (Traffic Counts and Roadside Interview Surveys) were collected in 2015 with some additional traffic counts around the Cooper Bridge area in 2019 so that the model could be updated in this area and made ready for assessing this scheme. The model takes account of the volume of car and freight trips and the routes used by these trips. The model represents the existing situation and then forecasts into the future, taking account of changes in land use, car ownership etc as well as changes to the highway network. This data is then used to also predict the changes in air pollution.</p> <p>The Councils adopted Local Plan sets out the requirements to provide the jobs and homes we need over the plan period, the location of these homes and jobs has been considered through the process of the local plan. The plan contains lots of policies designed to help tackle air quality and climate change matters to promote sustainable development. The provision of new infrastructure to accommodate this growth will help both relieve congestion and improve air quality. Alongside the planning approach is the government and Councils commitment to move to decarbonise the economy and the transport we all use.</p>
--	--	---

<p>11b</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Thanks for your response. I understand what 'as is' traffic data is being used, but still don't understand what the 'to be' will look like - are you saying this is what will be published at a final consultation? Do we know when this will be?</p> <p>I understand you points about the local plan, but am still not sure how we ensure these changes are done to improve current situations, not to accept more housing. What does the local plan run to and how does this feed into any future local plans?</p> <p>I can't see any response to my other points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We often see Stocks Bank Road being used as a cut through - drivers come down Huddersfield Road, see a queue and drive up Coppin Hall onto Stocks Bank. Will anything be done to deter this? • Has consideration been made to the footpaths across Leeds road - at the end of Stocks Bank Road, and also behind the 3 nuns - lots of local people cross this busy road to get to the footpaths. <p>Thanks and regards</p>	<p>Yes we will be updating our traffic assessments as we develop our designs to ensure they reflect the final proposed scheme, once these are completed we will hold further a public consultation and present the results of our assessments. This is expected to be in the second half on 2023, but we will publish details of exact dates and how to take part closer to the time.</p> <p>The scheme does aim to both improve existing congestion, but also support the economic and housing growth in the area, the current Local Plan covers the period to 2031. As previously explained our modelling forecasts in to the future taking account of, amongst other factors, expected changes to land use, this is informed by the allocations included in the current Local Plan.</p> <p>The scheme in its current layout provides an additional lane towards Cooper Bridge between the Three nuns junction and Cooper Bridge, when coupled with the left flow link towards Huddersfield at the new Cooper Bridge roundabout this will help traffic travelling from Mirfield/Leeds to flow more smoothly through Cooper Bridge helping to reduce congestion. This should also help to reduce the need for people to rat-run through Stocks Bank, although no improvements are currently proposed on Stocks Bank Road itself. This is something we can consider further as we progress the scheme.</p> <p>The scheme also includes the provision of new pedestrian and cycle crossings both Huddersfield Road and Leeds Road at the Three Nuns junction, to enable both roads to be crossed.</p>
------------	--	--

<p>11c</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>I've not had a response to the below. Also to add a further question.</p> <p>How will any proposed changes be reviewed holistically vs the proposed railway upgrades in terms of delivery planning? I'm concerned that alternate routes will be impacted at the same time.</p> <p>Thanks very much</p>	<p>We have already met with Network Rail regarding their plans to upgrade the Transpennine Route and we will continue to work with them throughout the development of both projects to enable us to coordinate our respective construction activities with a view to minimising disruption to the local road network as much as possible.</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>I am under the impression that Kirklees MC, have shelved this scheme, as too complex and expensive.</p>	<p>As detailed on the scheme webpage earlier proposals to deliver a link road in the Cooper Bridge area have now been eliminated due to the scale of the environmental impacts, however we have now developed a new design to improve Cooper Bridge and Bradley junctions. The details of our latest design can be found in the Documents section of the scheme webpage.</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>I can not understand in times when climate change and pollution through carbon emissions are supposedly on world agendas. Kirklees wish to widen roads and get even more traffic in one place. Widening very rarely works creating just bigger car jams . Getting less traffic on the roads would be a more sensible goal. And guess what more mature trees to be felled. Every single mature tree is worth more than the planting of a large amount of saplings. And just to save a few minutes. I am disgusted by the way our wildlife trees and fauna and greenbelt areas are treated. And yes I do sometimes use the cooper bridge route to get to Leeds and would rather sit in traffic than see more and more of precious wildlife eaten up.</p>	<p>NA - this is a statement not a question, no response to be provided</p>

<p>14</p>	<p>Please find attached and below, input to the A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme consultation.</p> <p>I commend WYCA and KC for acknowledging the need to conserve established woodland, mature trees and habitat, as No1 priority in redesigning the proposed A62 Cooper Bridge Scheme.</p> <p>I broadly support the case made by Action for Yorkshire Transport and Huddersfield Friends of the Earth. Any scheme that encourages traffic growth is contrary to CERP.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I note that the proposal has not published a Carbon Impact Review and thus Officers, Councillors and Public cannot make an informed opinion. 2. I note that no supporting evidence is provided for the traffic case. In the absence, I note traffic statistics for another route into Huddersfield, that Department for Transport traffic flows (A629, M62 to Huddersfield), (1) show that Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) peaked in 2005. The latest official count pre Covid, showed, about 74% of the highest figures, i.e 26% reduction since 2005.(5). While the figures wont be exactly the same for this scheme, in the absence of evidence, the trend could be reasonably expected to be in the same order of magnitude. 3.Covid has changed the whole pattern of work and commuting. Many businesses and employees see this as an opportunity to enhance the sustainability of business arrangements, a positive outcome. The likely long term 26%+ reduction in commuting (2) and the effect on pollution reduction of the expected widespread switch to electric vehicles was seemingly not considered in justifying the scheme, now outdated by a changing world. 4. Construction will have a very significant carbon footprint, not disclosed or seemingly considered at all. A detailed breakdown of the carbon footprint is 	<p>Thank you for taking the time to share your views. We will include your response in our analysis of the feedback received and where possible take account of comments made. We will publish further detail at future consultations.</p>
-----------	--	--

	<p>needed. There is no commitment to waste reduction and re-use in the construction. Construction represents about 40% of UK waste. The scale of unnecessary junction alteration is a poor reflection of delivery of CERP, an unsustainable extravagance.</p> <p>5. While the scheme now proposed is an improvement over the former proposed scheme, given the likely traffic statistics and construction carbon footprint, only a minimal scheme optimising smooth traffic flow, is justified, such as a simple dedicated link bypassing the junction, to the A664 Wakefield Road and minor changes to junction management to smooth flow. Optimised lanes under the bridge, without bridge widening, with narrow lanes, appropriate as traffic calming and anyway slow due to the junction proximity. A modest pedestrian and cycle tunnel through the embankment would separate these from traffic and free up lane space at minimal cost and disruption. The land take of the scheme is unnecessary.</p> <p>6. The lowest intervention, lowest carbon design, ideally very simple, to the Colne Road junction in order to smooth flow, is all that is justified.</p> <p>7. I am PhD Environmental Scientist and Engineer, former diagnostics engineering design technician, with Ford of Europe.</p> <p>(1)https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/manualcountpoints/47404</p> <p>(2) https://www.financialreporter.co.uk/finance-news/working-from-home-to-remain-permanent-for-a-quarter-of-financial-services-employees.html</p> <p>[redacted] Environmental Scientist and Engineer</p>	
<p>15</p>	<p>The proposed road plans are based on the brief to improve the flow of vehicular traffic through this part of Kirklees. In line with government requirements new infrastructure has also been included to improve conditions for cycling and walking. These latter measures are,</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to share your views. We will include your response in our analysis of the feedback received and where possible take account of comments made. We will publish further detail at future consultations.</p>

<p>however, secondary to the priority of improving the flow of motor vehicles, and, as a result of this, the plans for cycling and walking are often compromised.</p> <p>The net effect of this brief is that drivers of vehicles will be encouraged to use their vehicles through Cooper Bridge because there will be less hold-ups. However, the probable result of this is that the numbers of vehicles using these roads will begin to increase. More drivers will use their cars on these roads because the road improvements and negate the initial benefits.</p> <p>This is to contradict the public statements policies of West Yorkshire and Kirklees which seeks to reduce car use.</p> <p>Reduction of private car use would be a more sustainable way of improving traffic flow but to do this there needs to be attractive alternatives for individuals who would otherwise use their car. Making attractive alternatives requires transferring the large amounts of finance designated for road building projects over to projects for Active Travel and Public Transport. By doing this the council would be proceeding in line with its WY 2040 Transport Plan.</p> <p>Countries, such as The Netherlands and Denmark, that spend large amounts of money on infrastructure that encourages Active Travel do so with the knowledge that the large numbers of people using bikes instead of their cars and are helping to keep car traffic flowing more freely.</p>	
---	--

<p>16</p>	<p>A62 to Cooper bridge scheme</p> <p>As ward Cllrs representing the Ashbrow ward we are very much aware of the need for road improvements in the area. The current road network is overstretched and leads to queues on Bradley Road and Leeds Road which has led to air quality issues in the past. We are also aware of the wider impacts of congestion on Cooper Bridge leading to the M62 junction. For these reasons we are supportive of finding ways to improve the road network to make it fit for purpose, particularly in the light of planned housing development.</p> <p>However we do want to raise some concerns with the scheme as put forward;</p> <p><u>Oak road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a negative impact on residents of Oak Road due to the increase of traffic caused by the redirecting traffic from Cooper Bridge to Bradley Rd via Oak Rd. whilst making this a one way system will stop two-way movements the overall impact will be a net increase of traffic for residents. • Improvements to pavements, parking, cycle path and park upgrades are welcome but we still believe the overall benefit is a net negative. Creating a busier road from where the park is accessed is not desirable. • It's not clear from the plans what the benefit of directing cars from via oak road is. There is no assessed option for direct access from Leeds Rd to Bradley Rd (as now). We would expect to see an alternate option without the redirection via Oak Road to see what this could achieve. • Our preference would be a scheme that does not divert traffic via Oak Road. • We need to consider the volume of traffic that will need to queue in lights on Leeds road to turn in Oak road, as this could cause congestion. <p><u>Leeds Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has consideration been given to whether a right turn from Leeds Rd into Colne Bridge Road could be accommodated? This would reduce traffic 	<p>Thank you for your email. Officer from Kirklees Council will be in touch with you to discuss the points raised in the email.</p>
-----------	--	---

down oak road or having to U-turn at Cooper Bridge.

- The negative impact on residents living on Leeds Road (between Oak Road and the junction of Bradley Road) should be noted. They will no longer be able to access their property from the Cooper bridge direction and will have to turn in Brooklands.

Cooper Bridge roundabout

- Do we have specific analysis of the direction of travel for vehicles using Cooper Bridge? If so has a relief road been considered for traffic from the M62 heading in the direction of Dewsbury been considered as an alternative to reduce the demand at Cooper Bridge.

Future Housing development

- The original scheme put forward for a link road across to the M62 junction was predicated on the basis that a scheme of that scale was required to meet the future housing demand outlined in the Kirklees Local Plan. Since then we have seen a new development at the Bradley Business Park and additional housing planned in the surrounding area due to the Calderdale local plan. Whilst these improvements may increase capacity in the road network it's not clear that they are of the scale required to deliver the Bradley housing allocation in the local plan. Whilst this not be directly linked to this scheme I think we need to understand whether this is the only plan that is expected to be delivered to support the housing plan. We do not consider that the benefits to the road infrastructure would be the same as the previous plan so would be concerned if it was viewed that these improvements could support the same level of house building.

Public transport & active travel

- We welcome the inclusion of walking and cycling infrastructure into the scheme. However, it needs to be ensured that these provisions are joined up and holistic, taking into account existing infrastructure and planned improvements (i.e. the Bradley to Brighouse Greenway).
- Whilst not directly linked to the scheme,

	<p>the need for public transport improvements to reduce the reliance on personal vehicles needs to be considered. Improvements in public transport would support the reduction in congestion (and pollution). Bradley Road in particular is poorly served by public transport with no regular bus services in place.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>17</p>	<p>Kirklees Cycling Campaign Submission (17 July 2021)</p> <p>1. Kirklees Cycling Campaign welcomes many of the proposed improvements for cycling and walking in these plans. We do, however, wish to propose improvements to be made in this scheme as listed in our detailed comments below.</p> <p>Overview</p> <p>2. This is a significant scheme at a critical road junction and major gateway to Huddersfield. It is vital to ensure that the scheme is developed through a rigorous consultation process.</p> <p>3. In our response we have taken into account that there are three large-scale development proposals, on allocated local plan sites that are well advanced in the planning. These will generate very large numbers of trips and will have a significant traffic impact on the roads and junctions within this scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bradley Park, 4,000+ houses with all vehicle access to Bradford Road and Bradley Road; • South Dewsbury Riverside, 4,000+ houses south of Ravensthorpe • Clifton Park, a business park with access to A644, between M62 junction 25 and Brighouse town centre. <p>4. Master planning of these proposals is essential to ensure that as much active travel infrastructure as possible is put in place before significant development has taken place.</p> <p>5. It is one of several schemes known to be under development, yet there is no indication of any linkages or inter-connectivity between these schemes, notably A62 Huddersfield ring road to Fieldhouse Lane, A644/A653 Mirfield to Dewsbury to Leeds, and most critically the Brighouse to Bradley Greenway.</p> <p>6. The focus of the Cooper Bridge scheme appears to be to increase</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to share your views. We will include your response in our analysis of the feedback received and where possible take account of comments made.</p> <p>We will be in touch in due course to discuss your feedback further.</p>
-----------	---	---

<p>highway capacity to enable vehicular traffic to move more quickly through the principal junctions of Cooper Bridge and Bradley Road, thereby reducing journey times.</p> <p>7. We question this time-honoured approach, which is also challenged in the draft decarbonisation strategy of Transport for the North. Our contention is that given what we now know about climate change and the urgent need for large and meaningful steps, rather than gestures to be taken, a different set of priorities are needed.</p> <p>8. Put simply, investment in and improvement to the highway network should aim to reduce car usage in favour of greater use of public transport (which is severely affected by congestion) and Active Travel. This would contribute to reduced congestion, less delays and less air pollution, contributing to achieving the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>9. The current consultation document implies an order of priority, with Active Travel and improved air quality having the least priority. We content that every highway scheme should do two things well:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• support public transport by prioritising buses over other vehicles, provision of bus stops with well designed shelters and real time information, and where relevant, improved access to bus and rail stations.• prioritise Active Travel by the provision of continuous, segregated cycle lanes which meet national standards in accordance with LTN 1/20, priority for cyclists at signal controlled junctions, and controlled crossings to link cycle routes across main roads. Where opportunities exist, off road routes should be developed to provide alternative, safe routes. <p>Cooper Bridge consultation detailed comments response</p>	
---	--

10. Kirklees Cycling Campaign is particularly pleased to see the segregated cycle tracks replacing the currently shared footway route. The following are improvements we propose:

Re: LTN 1/20

11. We do not think that the plans always manage to meet the design standards set out in LTN 1/20 particularly with regard to the principles of “Direct, Safe, and Comfortable”.

Direct Routes for Cycling (LTN 1/20 4.2.7): the cycling route through the length of the scheme heading from Huddersfield to Leeds makes 12 stages of road crossings:

- Crossing Oak Road
- A62 to 2-way cycle track
- Right turn lane off Colne Bridge Road
- Back over the A62
- Bradley Road to refuge
- Bradley Road to White Cross Inn
- Cooper Bridge Road northbound
- Cooper Bridge Road southbound to two-way cycle track
- Huddersfield Road westbound
- Huddersfield Road eastbound
- Leeds Road westbound
- Leeds Road eastbound

12. By contrast a bicycle taking priority on the road as part of normal traffic would only have to go through four junctions, and it illustrates that the plans to encourage cycling do not measure up to some of the claims associated with the scheme. We are of the opinion that more can be done to address this issue of Direct Routes for Cycling.

Comfortable (LTN 1/20 4.2.14):

13. Bicycles should also be treated as vehicles, not pedestrians. There are road crossings required for bicycles that could be picked up by sensor loops, prioritising the movement of bicycles over other motor vehicles. A good example of this can be found on Stretford Road in Manchester. Here lights are timed to

<p>allow bicycles to cross without the need to stop.</p> <p>14. Despite the encouraging council statements to the public, only one, out of a potential 12 side roads, is indicated in the plans to be continuous footways and cycle tracks.</p> <p>Safe (LTN 1/20 4.2.11):</p> <p>15. There is a significant lack of protection through some busy road stretches on this scheme. For example, there are no improvements in Bradley Road for people travelling by bicycle in either direction. The inadequate advisory cycle lanes remain and there appear to be no plans to improve the situation.</p> <p>Cooper Bridge Plans and their integration with the wider Active Travel Network</p> <p>16. It is important to see the plans for Cooper Bridge within the wider context of a West Yorkshire Active Travel network. It allows one to see whether these plans help to create good links for cycling and walking.</p> <p>Local Canal Towpaths</p> <p>17. We are disappointed that there is no recognition of the potential of the Calder Hebble navigation toward Mirfield and of the Huddersfield Broad Canal towards Deighton and Huddersfield. The Cooper Bridge plans have the potential to be a hub linking these active travel routes and we look forward to future council plans for the surfacing of these canal routes and integrating them into the local active travel network.</p> <p>Bradley to Brighouse Greenway link to Calder Valley Greenway at Leeds Road</p> <p>18. We are of the opinion that the plans for the link between Upper Quarry Road and Brooklands on Leeds Road (CVG) need to be improved. This is particularly important in the area of Bradley Road and Oak Road. Good infrastructure needs to be designed for safe crossings and for the right turns.</p>	
--	--

19. We do not think that shared-space and advisory cycle lanes are appropriate for Bradley Road.

Housing Development at Bradley Park
20. As we observed in the introduction, the proposed large housing development at Bradley Park will increase car use in the area, even if there are measures introduced to make active travel an attractive alternative.

21. We look forward to discussing the finer details of this scheme with you at a later date and collectively invite all involved in the planning of this scheme to ride through the site with us and discuss the planned changes.

Cooper Bridge Cycling Provision:
Detailed Design Notes

22. Though there is clearly much to yet be developed with this design, we would be happy to contribute on the finer details at a later stage.

23. The number of crossings could be limited by keeping the cycle tracks on the correct side of the road. For example, on Leeds Road between Oak Road and Bradley Road where access to parking is required, a cycle track can be placed on the footway side of the parking with a small buffer allowing bicycles to be safely separated from motor traffic whilst still limited the possibility of 'dooring'.

24. Alternatively a 2-way cycle track could be maintained all the way from Oak Road to the A644 junction at Miller and Carter with additional improvements to the crossing facilities at Colne Bridge Road.

25. Advisory cycle lanes outside 1265 to 1285 Leeds Road and on the opposite side between 1000 and 980 are of doubtful value. Cycle routes should be designed to provide safe space for people between 8 and 80 years old. In areas where cycle usage is generally high, it is

	<p>the age groups of 8-18 and 65+ that cycle the most. As a result, the question should be asked whether the design provides a space safe enough for a competent eight year old to ride. In our opinion an advisory cycle lanes on a road this busy and fast does not.</p> <p>26. The A62 between Oak Road and the Stocks Bank Road is in poor physical condition. The deterioration of the running surfaces and the hazardous street furniture on the shared footway does not encourage active travel.</p> <p>27. Finally, we have observation we would like to make about the way that this scheme feeds into the Bradley to Brighthouse Greenway.</p>	
<p>18</p>	<p>Good morning</p> <p>The damage to the environment and infrastructure to Cooper Bridge and Colne Bridge is going to be enormous.</p> <p>To divert traffic along Leeds Rd to turn right somewhere to Bradley Bar is ridiculous. There are far too many children to consider; parking will be an issue and the roads are not of a good quality to take such an influx of major traffic such as artics and other large vehicles; speeding will be an issue yet again introducing another potential hazard for residents in the area. Some roads are far too narrow for artics or long vehicles for such a potential diversion.</p> <p>It could be said that the council is trying to find the easiest way out of traffic</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to share your views. We will include your response in our analysis of the feedback received and where possible take account of comments made. We will publish further detail at future consultations.</p>

congestion in this area rather than spend a decent amount of money on reclaiming some land and widening the current situation - even widening the bridge would be an option. Leave Bradley Bar alone - a few hundred yards closure is not the way to keep traffic moving.

Apart from all this - that is the safety of residents and children in this area - this proposal will ultimately reduce the value of properties in this area. Good people have worked hard to own their homes in this area (even if the council does not agree) they do not deserve to be deprived of their investment.

There is a school within the diversion area, playing fields, play areas - all will have pollution issues with the amount of emissions being spread over a wider area through increased traffic flow. Noise pollution for residents. To divert to side roads to go back and join Bradley Bar at another junction will cause a major increase in both pollutants - emissions and noise - stop start is the quickest to increase these pollutants. This will cause illnesses and put the NHS under even more pressure. It is Kirklees's duty of care to protect its residents not expose them to danger!

Please consider everyone, especially the young people of this area and beyond - they are the future and we need them well.

Kirklees planners should consider the taxpayer. Our council tax is very high at present - no doubt it will go up - someone has to pay always. People are struggling to pay the current rate of council tax. Council tax debt is Kirklees's largest debt because people are struggling to cope.

I realise I am just one of many but I still live with the notion that my opinion is worth listening to.

[redacted]

<p>19</p>	<p>Morning I think one way of reducing congestion would to take a branch road off for Leeds Traffic prior to the roundabout, which would cut down on queuing time.</p> <p>[redacted] Project Coordinator (Compliance) Together Housing Group Dear [redacted]</p> <p>Kirklees Council - A62 Cooper Bridge Highways Scheme: Early Consultation</p> <p>Thank you for your notification received on the 7 June 2021 in respect of the above consultation.</p>	<p>Our proposed scheme does include additional capacity on the approach to the roundabout to enable any left-turning traffic (on all arms) to flow through the junction without having to use the roundabout itself. This will help to reduce congestion on the approach to the roundabout.</p>
<p>20</p>	<p>The Coal Authority records indicate that the line of the route is in an area of recorded and likely unrecorded coal mine workings at shallow depth. There is also a mine entry and its resultant zone of influence within the area identified. For clarity this mine entry is recorded as being adjacent to Leeds Road close to its junction with Bradley Road. We hold no treatment details for this feature and therefore its recorded position may be subject to significant departure.</p> <p>Due to the coal mining legacy which is identified as being present in the areas of some parts of the route indicated it would be advisable to obtain some form of Coal Mining Report, which should provide you with the basic coal mining information held for the site.</p> <p>Based on the content of this report it may then be necessary to obtain a Coal Mining Risk Assessment, or equivalent report, which should consider the coal mining information and legacy recorded as being present and make an assessment of the risks posed and identify what, if any, remedial measures are required.</p> <p>I hope this is helpful but please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to</p>	<p>No response provided - will follow up with stakeholder once design progressed.</p>

	<p>discuss this issue further.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>[redacted] BA (Hons), DipEH, DipURP, MA, PGCertUD, PGCertSP, MRTPI Development Team Leader (Planning)</p>	
<p>21</p>	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>There are signs around saying have your say on major roadworks for Cooper Bridge.</p> <p>Well I cannot see where I can make a comment, can you send me the comment link so I can have my say - many thanks</p> <p>regards, [redacted]</p>	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>Apologies, for the slight delay in responding to your email. Details about the proposed scheme can be found on the below link. Unfortunately the consultation has now closed (yesterday), so the online survey isn't available. I have attached a copy of the survey with the questions asked during the consultation.</p> <p>If you are able to respond with your comments by email to YourVoice@westyorks-ca.gov.uk before close on Wednesday 21st July we will still be able to take account of your feedback in our analysis.</p> <p>YourVoice@westyorks-ca.gov.uk</p> <p>Kind regards [redacted]</p>

Appendix C: Questions and answers

No.	Question	Response
1	<p>Your sub drawing shows not right turn at Bradley jn when approaching from CB to go up Bradley Road. How will this be achieved? where will traffic go to be able to head up Bradley Road</p>	<p>To achieve journey time savings along the A62 corridor we need to increase the capacity of Bradley junction. Due to the built up nature of the area we are unable to physically change the type of junction, but by removing one of the existing movements (the right turn from Cooper Bridge on to Bradley Road), we are able to increase the amount of traffic able to travel straight through the junction on each cycle of the traffic lights.</p> <p>To enable this change an additional lane along Leeds Road between Bradley junction and Oak Road is provided along with new traffic signals to facilitate the right turn in to Oak Road. The impacts on Oak Road are partially offset by changing it to a one-way road. Our traffic forecasts show that the traffic along Oak Road is expected to increase by c.110 vehicles in the peak hour which equates to less than two vehicles per minute. Changing Oak Road to a one-way road also helps to move the live lane of traffic further away from the frontages of the properties and the introduction of a new pedestrian/cycle crossing on Bradley Road, together with the removal of the right turn at Bradley provides opportunities for the vehicles to exit Oak Road more easily than the current situation.</p>
2	<p>What benefits are you wanting to achieve by diverting traffic from a road designed and built for heavy traffic (Leeds Road to Bradley Road), to a road built for light, local traffic (Leeds Road to Oak Road)?</p>	<p>To achieve journey time savings along the A62 corridor we need to increase the capacity of Bradley junction. Due to the built up nature of the area we are unable to physically change the type of junction, but by removing one of the existing movements (the right turn from Cooper Bridge on to Bradley Road), we are able to increase the amount of traffic able to travel straight through the junction on each cycle of the traffic lights.</p> <p>To enable this change an additional lane along Leeds Road between Bradley junction and Oak Road is provided along with new traffic signals to facilitate the right turn in to Oak Road. The impacts on Oak Road are partially offset by changing it to a one-way road. Our traffic forecasts show that the traffic along Oak Road is expected to increase by</p>

		<p>c.110 vehicles in the peak hour which equates to less than two vehicles per minute. Changing Oak Road to a one-way road also helps to move the live lane of traffic further away from the frontages of the properties and the introduction of a new pedestrian/cycle crossing on Bradley Road, together with the removal of the right turn at Bradley provides opportunities for the vehicles to exit Oak Road more easily than the current situation.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>An assessment was to be carried out, after a motion was passed by full Council in November'18 re any possible impact on additional traffic using the B6118, and A637 roads due to improvements. A regular "corner-cutting" taken by many between the M62 and M1. What did this assessment show?</p>	<p>In 2018 we were considering delivering a high capacity new link road which had the potential to attract traffic from across the wider district. Our current proposals are not likely to attract the same level of rerouting but will still deliver the necessary network capacity improvements.</p> <p>Our appraisal of the scheme has been carried out in accordance with DfT guidance and traffic forecasts have been developed for morning and evening peak hours as well as an average daytime hour for our expected opening year (2026) and, in accordance with guidance, for 2041 which is 15 years later.</p> <p>Forecast changes in traffic levels along B6118 Liley Lane and A637 Barnsley Road when compared to not having the scheme in place, range from between -1% (-6 vehicles) and 7% (48 vehicles) in 2026. In 2041 this changes to between -1% (-15 vehicles) and 13% (108 vehicles). This largest increase is along Liley Lane, but does not continue onto A637 Barnsley Road which sees a 7% increase (69 vehicles) in the same 2041 peak period.</p>
<p>4a</p>	<p>How many trees are to be felled in this project?</p>	<p>At this stage our designs are at an outline stage which means we can't provide a number of trees to be felled at this stage. Our designs have changed significantly since earlier proposals to lessen the tree loss, amongst other factors, and now we will not fell any of the ancient woodland and don't expect to affect the trees on Oak Road.</p> <p>Once we secure approval to our Outline Business Case we will appoint a designer and undertake our detailed environmental surveys and assessments and develop our detailed replanting strategy. The details of this work will be presented to the public as part of further consultation before the submission of our planning application.</p>

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme public engagement report

4b	<p>Thanks for the reply. I know the ancient woodland is now safe as I'm one of the protesters that helped to stop it. I'm still concerned about trees in the area and the nature reserve at Upper/Lower Quarry road. How many roads will have to be widened before you go another way? We need free public transport to get people out of their cars. Real cycle and walking facilities. We need easier access to WYCA as it is ridiculously hard to contact people or address issues. We want to do a deputation to WYCA about their attitude to the climate emergency and trees. Thank you [Redacted]</p>	<p>Our revised scheme doesn't impact the Bradley Quarry Reserve on Upper Quarry Road. Unfortunately we do need to balance finding a solution to the transport issues whilst minimising the environmental impacts, this is assessed on a case by case basis at project level, as previously explained we will seek to offset the loss of any trees and will be able to present more information on this once our designs are further developed.</p> <p>With regards to your more general issues and Combined Authority you can contact their Climate Emergency team via the following email address Netzero@westyorks-ca.gov.uk.</p>
4c	<p>Any loss of trees for a road is wrong. Kirklees council are supposed to be considering the environment in all decisions. There must be a rough estimate you can let me have. Thanks</p>	<p>Unfortunately, at this early stage of the scheme design we are unable to provide that level of information. We will provide more detail once our design and environmental assessments are completed at a future consultation.</p>
4d	<p>When such words as offsetting or mitigation are mentioned it makes me very nervous. You can't mitigate or offset mature trees. Just don't fell them.</p>	<p>N/A - this is a statement not a question, no response required</p>
5	<p>Can you please clarify what happens to traffic which requires to turn right towards the Cooper Bridge Junction at the Bradley Road, Oak Road and Bradley Junction when approaching from Colne Bridge Road.</p>	<p>Traffic will still be able to turn right from Colne Bridge Road towards Cooper Bridge junction.</p>
6	<p>As a resident, living on the stretch of Leeds Road between Oak Road and the new 'Bradley Junction', I would like to understand how the changes will impact on our daily journeys. Please can you explain; 1. How are you proposing that we get to our properties from Bradley Rd? As we wouldn't be able to use Oak Rd. 2. If travelling from Cooper Bridge, how would we get to our properties? As we wouldn't be able to get onto Bradley Road/Oak Road. Which is the</p>	<p>Vehicles will still be permitted to turn right from Bradley Road onto Leeds Road at the Bradley junction, local residents will then be able to turn around using Brooklands to enable them to use the street parking between Oak Road and Bradley junction.</p> <p>Likewise vehicles approaching from Cooper Bridge will be able to turn around in Brooklands so they can park in the direction of traffic along Leeds Road. For traffic wishing to access Bradley Road will need to turn around using the Cooper Bridge junction and then access Bradley Road via Oak Road.</p>

	<p>usual route. 3. When leaving our property, if we wanted to access Bradley Road, how would we do this? As we will no longer be able to turn right, onto Bradley Road at the new junction.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>Are you aware of the bottleneck at stocks bank road/A62 junction? The original proposal had much needed improvements to it. Please explain why you think it's ok to not fix the issue?</p>	<p>As with the previous proposal we are providing two lanes of traffic along the A62 in both directions between the Three Nuns and Cooper Bridge junctions to help provide more capacity, additionally the creation of a dedicated left turn filter lane at Cooper Bridge junction will enable traffic travelling towards Huddersfield to flow more freely through the junction to help reduce congestion in this location. We are also proposing to slightly shorten the bus lane along the A62 on the approach to the Three Nuns junction, which will provide additional capacity for traffic to pass through the junction. These improvements will help to provide additional capacity in this area and help improve the issues at the Stocks Bank Road junction.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Where can be found your measurements of traffic flows on which this new design is based? Is the intention to redesignate the residential Oak Road as part of the A62 or part of the A6107 ? What does this scheme do, if anything, for the predominant outbound (towards Cooper Bridge) queues on the A62 Leeds Road?</p>	<p>The traffic flow forecasts for the scheme are derived from the Kirklees Transport Model. This is a model, developed initially in 2015 and updated in 2019. It is based on observations of traffic flows and travel patterns across the Kirklees district. The majority of the data for the model (Traffic Counts and Roadside Interview Surveys) were collected in 2015 with some additional traffic counts around the Cooper Bridge area in 2019 so that the model could be updated in this area and made ready for assessing this scheme. The model takes account of the volume of car and freight trips and the routes used by these trips. The model represents the existing situation and then forecasts into the future, taking account of changes in land use, car ownership etc as well as changes to the highway network.</p> <p>We do not intend to change the designation of Oak Road as part of the proposals.</p> <p>There are two key changes which will help to improve journey times for outbound traffic travelling along Leeds Road. Firstly, the removal of the right-hand turn from Cooper Bridge onto Bradley Road allows other arms of the junction (including Leeds Road outbound) to benefit from traffic signals being</p>

		<p>on green for longer, which will help more traffic to pass through the junction on each cycle of the traffic signals. Secondly we are increasing the size of the Cooper Bridge roundabout, providing a dedicated left turn for traffic travelling towards the motorway and widening to three lanes on the approach to the junction all of will create more capacity and allow traffic to travel through the junction more quickly than it does at the moment.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>The option of Oak Road is too dangerous but a better option would be to introduce traffic lights at Lower Quarry Road to access a contra-flow lane on the other side of the road next to the cause-way to Bradley Road with traffic lights at Upper Quarry Road to allow access back to the normal side of Bradley Road. Traffic coming down Bradley Road to then have a direct lane on to Leeds Road there then would be three lanes past Lower Quarry Road towards Leeds. Traffic then from Leeds or from Bradley Road would not be involved in the main lights at Colne Bridge Road. There is room to achive this.</p>	<p>Unfortunately we're unable to understand the design you are trying to describe, please feel free to submit a sketch to us either by email to yourvoice@westyorks-ca.gov.uk or by post to FREEPOST Consultation Team (WYCA) (no stamp required).</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Will the playing field on Oak Road be used for parking for residents? Will the mature trees be damaged?</p>	<p>No, we have changed our designs from earlier version to keep street parking on the same side as the residential properties. Our designs are at an early stage of development and subject to further surveys and detailed design, however we do not anticipate any damage to the trees along Oak Road.</p>

<p>11</p>	<p>Traffic flowing from Bradley Road onto: a. Leeds Road (left turn). b. Colne Bridge Road (straight across). c. Leeds Road (right turn). You presently have 3 lanes approaching this junction (for approximatly 100 yards). Why not use lane 1 (near-side) for traffic heading towards Cooper Bridge (increase timings slightly if required). Use lane 2 (middle lane) for traffic heading towards Colne Bridge (road). Use lane 3 (out-side lane) for traffic heading towards Huddersfield That way there is no need to start messing around with traffic coming from Cooper Bridge (Leeds Road) wishing to turn right up Bradley Road.</p>	<p>The lane arrangement for Bradley Road has been derived based on optimum lane usage to provide maximum junction capacity. Removing the right turn into Bradley Road will further improve vehicular capacity, by reallocating the green time that would have been allocated to the right turn to other arms of the junction.</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>What are the plans for existing limited parking outside the houses nos. 1159, 1161,1163,1165,1167 and 1169 Leeds Road? I don't see them on the draft plan drawings. Will you put in dropped kerbs and allow front gardens to be made into parking spaces in this row? With the Councils plans to refurbish and repair the 1 bed dwellings on Oak Road as well, parking, which is already difficult will likely become even more of an issue. Would appreciate your comments please.</p>	<p>Thank you for your question, we will review our design in this location to establish if we can accommodate additional parking in this location.</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>What steps have been taken to count both pedestrian & cyclist usage in the area to warrant the need for what seems will be such a large outlay for this type of 'traffic'?</p>	<p>Pedestrian and cycling surveys will be undertaken in the next stage of design to inform our detailed design. However, the scheme aims to cater for future demand, not just current usage of the network and also needs to comply with the latest design standards and guidance as far as practicable. In July 2020 the government published new guidance for the incorporation of cycling facilities and our latest designs are reflective of this. Additionally the West Yorkshire Combined Authority has published its Transport Strategy 2040, which sets out its ambition to significantly increase the number of journeys made by sustainable means, such as walking, cycling and public transport. As such the scheme aims to improve upon the existing facilities to help improve cycling and pedestrian connectivity across the wider area.</p>

<p>14</p>	<p>How will air quality be improved for the residents of Leeds Road with the addition of a third lane of traffic? Traffic currently flows freely into Huddersfield (I live here and see it each day) Your plans will now have THREE lanes of stationary traffic. (With out a shadow of a doubt there WILL be queues) This is the worst idea in the history of bad ideas. How on earth does this meet your objectives for any of the residents?</p>	<p>The requirement to widen Leeds Road is driven by the need to remove the right-turn movement from Cooper Bridge onto Bradley Road, rather than to change the flow of traffic to Huddersfield on Leeds Road. However, by widening Leeds Road the traffic travelling in to Huddersfield will be moved further away from the frontages of the properties which will help reduce pollution concentrations at those properties. Additionally, the new proposed signals at the junction with Oak Road, which will control the traffic travelling towards Huddersfield will only stop traffic infrequently (to allow traffic in/out of the cul-de-sac at the junction or for pedestrians/cyclist to cross, so there should be limited times when that lane of traffic will be stationary.</p> <p>Subject to securing funding to proceed with the scheme we will undertake further environmental assessments as we develop our detailed design and will present these results at our future consultation.</p>
<p>15</p>	<p>How will the removal of mature trees on Leeds Road improve air quality? How will you counteract their removal?</p>	<p>We have significantly changed our designs to reduce the number of trees needing to be felled and our designs are currently at an outline stage so we will continue to look for opportunities to minimise the impact on trees where possible. However, we are not able to completely avoid tree loss, as we develop our designs we will also prepare our mitigation plans which will detail our replanting proposals that will be adopted to offset the loss of trees. This information will be shared at future consultation events. However, by widening Leeds Road the traffic travelling in to Huddersfield will be moved further away from the frontages of the properties which will help reduce pollution concentrations at those properties.</p>
<p>16</p>	<p>How will residents of Leeds Road join to the carriageway into Huddersfield? Will there be a diversion via Cooper bridge? How does this meet your objective of improving travel times?</p>	<p>Leeds Road residents situated between Bradley junction and Oak Road will need to travel to the Cooper Bridge junction to turn around to travel in towards Huddersfield. Whilst we understand this is a longer journey for those residents the scheme aims to improve journey times along the A62. In 2019 (pre-pandemic) the Annual Average Daily Traffic shows over 22,000 vehicles travel on this section of the A62 each day, with this predicted to increase to more than 27,000 by 2026, therefore whilst there may be slightly longer journeys for a small number of residents the scheme will improve journey times for the majority of road users.</p>

<p>17</p>	<p>How do residents of Leeds Road return to their houses from Mirfield? Will they now have to go via Brooklands? How will this affect this highly residential area? How does this improve safety?</p>	<p>Yes vehicles travelling from Mirfield wishing to park outside the properties on Leeds Road between Bradley junction and Oak Road will need to use Brooklands to turn around. In proportion to the volume of traffic using the wider network the number of vehicles required to make this manoeuvre is relatively small and not expected to have a significant impact on Brooklands in terms of traffic volume or safety.</p>
<p>18</p>	<p>With the volume of traffic currently going up bradley Road from Cooper Bridge, How are you expecting that volume of traffic to go up oak Road with the amount of residents and business cars parked along there? Isn't this going to cause excessive tail backs from oak Road onto leeds Road especially during peak times?</p>	<p>Our design for Oak Road exceeds the minimum width required for a one-way road in current design standards to cater for the traffic additional traffic, additionally dedicated parking facilities will be created to allow for the street parking. Our designs are currently at an outline stage and we will develop them in more detail as we progress the scheme, we have also undertaken initial traffic assessments, which again will be updated and refreshed as we progress the scheme to inform the design.</p> <p>However, the removal of the right turn at Bradley junction means there will be significant gaps in the traffic travelling on Bradley Road towards Bradley Bar, which should create ample opportunity for traffic to exit Oak Road and minimise tailbacks onto Leeds Road.</p>
<p>19</p>	<p>Is there an intention to prevent the traffic light Grand Prix from the lights at the Bradley junction inbound on Leeds Road by reducing the speed limit to a 30MPH and the introduction of a safety camera?</p>	<p>At this stage we don't intend to reduce the speed limit on Leeds Road or install a safety camera.</p> <p>Kirklees install safety cameras at high risk sites, where there is a history of personal injury collisions occurring, where speed has been identified as a causation factor. The aim is to preventing further collisions / injuries occurring. There is currently a criteria in place for assessment of sites, which is undertaken in Highways Safety, and ratified by the West Yorkshire Casualty Prevention Partnership who manage all West Yorkshire safety cameras.</p> <p>This approach is in line with the Partnership strategy, DfT and Government Guidance, and the criteria can be found: http://www.safetycameraswestyorkshire.co.uk/frequently-asked-questions/camera-equipment-and-site.</p>
<p>20</p>	<p>are you planning on creating an electric car charging infrastructure for on street parking residents? I can't purchase an electric car because there is no infrastructure at the moment</p>	<p>Our current plans do not include provision for on street charging points, but this is something we can consider as we develop the scheme.</p>

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme public engagement report

21	Will you be able to turn right into colne bridge road when coming from huddersfield	Access arrangements onto Colne Bridge Road will remain as they are at the moment, so traffic will need to continue to access Colne Bridge Road via Oak Road and Bradley Road.
22	If you are planning traffic lights at oak road to enable traffic to turn right from leeds road doesn't this just cancel out the delays you are trying to prevent when currently turning right into bradley road. It's just moving the issue further up leeds road	The proposed signals at the junction with Leeds Road and Oak Road which will control the traffic travelling towards Huddersfield will only stop traffic infrequently (to allow traffic in/out of the cul-de-sac at the junction or for pedestrians/cyclist to cross) so there would be limited times when the traffic will be stationary.
23	When you ask for feedback on your proposed plans back in 2018. I raised the issue of the high volume of traffic that turns left of Leeds road going down to colnebridge backing up onto Leeds road due to the narrow bridges causing a lot stop start traffic waiting for on coming vehicles to give way. How do you plan to overcome this problem so the rest of your plan will work successfully.	Separately to this scheme the Council is working with Network Rail as part of their Transpennine Route Upgrade plans to arrange for this bridge to be replaced with a wider bridge to address this issue. Subject to Network Rail to securing the consents they need, we expect this work to take place in parallel to our scheme being constructed.
24	Has anybody considered doing away with traffic lights altogether at the Bradley Road / Leeds Road / Colne Bridge Road junction and constructing a round-a-bout instead? No need to widen Bradley Road (beyond 2 (two) lanes towards Leeds & the M62 motorway No need to widen Leeds Road (both directions) beyond 2 (two) lanes, No need to widen Colne Bridge Road beyond 2 (two) lanes, towards Cooper Bridge / Bradley Road / Huddersfield No need to send traffic (from Huddersfield) on a residential Street (Oak Road) past children's & family's recreation area towards Kirkheaton No need to send traffic (from Leeds & the M62 motorway) on a residential Street (Oak Road) past a child & family recreation area up Bradley Road If you do consider a round-a-bout, please don't screw it up by putting traffic lights around it (look at the	Unfortunately, there is insufficient space, due to the built up nature of the area, to accommodate a roundabout of the required size in this location.

	<p>Fitzwilliam Street / Leeds Road / Gasworks Street junction)</p>	
<p>25</p>	<p>Not one of your responses for any of these questions asked, by myself or any other author, show ANY tangible benefits for any of the local residents on Leeds Road, Oak Road, Bradley Road or Brooklands. How are you meeting ANY of your objectives FULLY for your Kirklees residents?</p>	<p>As explained in previous answers, our initial environmental assessments forecast an improvement in local air quality in the vicinity you are referring to. Additionally, we will provide improved pedestrian and cycling facilities, with additional crossing facilities and improved signal timings to create a better experience for pedestrians particularly when crossing Bradley junction. We will also improve the Oak Road playground facilities as part of the scheme and create formal parking bays along both Leeds and Oak Road.</p> <p>The strategic aims of the scheme which are published on consultation page are the outcomes we aim to achieve by delivering the scheme to benefit both the Kirklees district and wider Leeds City Region.</p>
<p>26a</p>	<p>You are planning on moving free moving traffic that filters right onto Bradley Road from the white cross junction, to a traffic controlled junction further up the road into oak road. This will slow traffic down, increase stationary traffic and seems increasingly unnecessary at solving a proper that clearly isn't there. Oak road residents will have a huge increase in traffic. Leeds Road will have a huge increase in stationary traffic. Residents now have to go either to Cooper bridge to turn round, or through a residential estate. On what realistic mode are your plans built? All your answers are littered with phrases such as "should" or "we don't expect" Is this massive project based on prediction only?</p>	<p>We have assessed the impacts of our proposals in accordance with Department for Transport guidance for appraising transport schemes. We will continue to update our assessments as we progress the design of the scheme and we will publish the results of our final assessments at a future consultation.</p> <p>Our assessments to date have been undertaken using the Kirklees Transport Model to forecasts the impacts of the scheme. This is a model based on observations of traffic flows and travel patterns across the Kirklees district. The model represents the existing situation and then forecasts into the future, taking account of changes in land use, car ownership etc to enable us to assess future traffic conditions with and without the scheme in place. The results of our initial assessments demonstrate the scheme will deliver journey time savings along this section of the A62 corridor and will offer High Value for Money, in accordance with government guidance.</p>

	<p>What tangible evidence do you have it will improve for anyone? Show us the facts and prove it will work.</p>	
<p>26b</p>	<p>Hi Thanks for your response. I understand what 'as is' traffic data is being used, but still don't understand what the 'to be' will look like - are you saying this is what will be published at a final consultation? Do we know when this will be? I understand you points about the local plan, but am still not sure how we ensure these changes are done to improve current situations, not to accept more housing. What does the local plan run to and how does this feed into any future local plans? I can't see any response to my other points: • We often see Stocks Bank Road being used as a cut through - drivers come down Huddersfield Road, see a queue and drive up Coppin Hall onto Stocks Bank. Will anything be done to deter this? • Has consideration been made to the footpaths across Leeds road - at the end of Stocks Bank Road, and also behind the 3 nuns - lots of local people cross this busy road to get to the footpaths. Thanks and regards</p>	<p>Yes we will be updating out traffic assessments as we develop our designs to ensure they reflect the final proposed scheme, once these are completed we will hold further a public consultation and present the results of our assessments. This is expected to be in the second half on 2023, but we will publish details of exact dates and how to take part closer to the time.</p> <p>The scheme does aim to both improve existing congestion, but also support the economic and housing growth in the area, the current Local Plan covers the period to 2031. As previously explained our modelling forecasts in to the future taking account of, amongst other factors, expected changes to land use, this is informed by the allocations included in the current Local Plan.</p> <p>The scheme in its current layout provides an additional lane towards Cooper Bridge between the Three nuns junction and Cooper Bridge, when coupled with the left flow link towards Huddersfield at the new Cooper Bridge roundabout this will help traffic travelling from Mirfield/Leeds to flow more smoothly through Cooper Bridge helping to reduce congestion. This should also help to reduce the need for people to rat-run through Stocks Bank, although no improvements are currently proposed on Stocks Bank Road itself. This is something we can consider further as we progress the scheme.</p> <p>The scheme also includes the provision of new pedestrian and cycle crossings both Huddersfield Road and Leeds Road at the Three Nuns junction, to enable both roads to be crossed.</p>
<p>27a</p>	<p>Please give me the numbers and percentage of traffic travelling east from the direction of the M62 which go to each of the 3 routes which</p>	<p>Travel patterns do vary depending on the time of day amongst other factors, but presently approximately 37% of traffic from Wakefield Road travels on towards Three Nuns junction at Cooper</p>

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme public engagement report

	come off the roundabout, ie toward Huddersfield, Mirfield and Leeds.	Bridge and the remaining 63% (c. 500 vehicles) turns right towards Huddersfield in the morning peak period. In the evening peak period the split is more equal with approximately 49% existing towards Three Nuns and 51% travelling towards Huddersfield.
27b	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>1. The different routes at the 'Three Nuns' corner may be important in planning alternatives to the approach to the roundabout from the west. How does traffic split there, either toward Leeds or to Mirfield?</p> <p>2. I am told there has been a modification of lanes carrying traffic from the west approaching the roundabout. Could you send me a link to any sketch showing the latest, please?</p>	<p>A copy of the scheme layout drawing can be found on the Your Voice webpage at https://www.yourvoice.westyorks-ca.gov.uk/cooperbridge, this can be zoomed in show the lane allocation in the area you mention.</p> <p>Now the public consultation has finished the Q&A facility has closed, comments are being analysed and we will shortly publish a report summarising the feedback received. Our design is also being reviewed to take account of feedback where possible. Subject to securing funding to proceed, a further consultation will be held in 2023 on our final designs and traffic assessments which will give another opportunity to see our proposals and ask questions.</p>
28	Why is there a need to stop traffic (particularly local residents) from turning left onto Bradley road from Leeds road?	As part of our design we need to include improved cycling and pedestrian facilities, this helps to make it safer for those already travelling by these modes, but also encourages increased usage of sustainable modes of transport in future. By banning the left turn we are able to allow cyclists to travel at the same time as the traffic travelling towards Cooper Bridge. Keeping the left turn creates a conflict between vehicles and cyclists which could result in accidents. Additionally, we are able to improve the experience for pedestrians by allowing them to cross the whole of Bradley Road at the junction without being held on traffic islands for long periods.
29a	You have not made Oak rd Bradley safe infact with the new layout it is going to become at least twice as bad with congestion and the people on Oak road will on fact have more emissions, noise other pollution s from wagons and other articulated traffic going on a small road. As i am a property owner on Oak road it will be very difficult to park outside my house and dangerous with the amount of traffic that will go on that road. You have not listened to the residents that went to the original meeting and i don't think any of you care	<p>As our designs are developed we will update our transport modelling and undertake further environmental assessments which we will publish as part of our future consultation.</p> <p>However, our initial assessments have shown that by removing the two-way movements from Oak road, the traffic is kept further away from the frontages of those properties which helps to improve pollution concentrations compared to the current layout. Following feedback from our previous public engagement we have also updated the design to retain parking on the same side of the road as the properties.</p>

	<p>about us just as long as you lot get your own way as you are definitely not listening to people that live on that road.</p>	
<p>29b</p>	<p>As i said you have not listened to the residents because your answer to the situation is unbelievable ,you have not grasp what we are saying , there is going to be more traffic going on that road even though it's going on one direction , every mode of transport will be constantly going on Oak road and as i said the noise , the emissions are going to be triple what the are now . As for articulated vehicles they will be going on that road well into the early hours of the morning as they are coming on at 4am and this is now .</p> <p>With all this it is going to impossible to get across the road to the park because of the amount of traffic which will be 24/7 days a week. The safety of people and children are at risk with this scheme . I would also state that this would also affect the value of everyone's property on the road, Who would like to live on a road with constant traffic and how could we sell our homes now with this decision hanging around our necks!!!, IMPOSSIBLE.</p> <p>You will have seen the Examiner last week regarding the Article on Oak road and how the residents on the road have not been involved in any decisions or been able to make their views heard because you know what the answer will be !!, And that is a done deal passed by the Kirklees council regardless what the residents say.</p> <p>I am not in agreement with the</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to share your views. We will include your response in our analysis of the feedback received and where possible take account of comments made. We will publish further detail at future consultations.</p> <p>The recent consultation was an initial opportunity for the public, including Oak Road residents, to share their views on our proposals. Now the consultation has closed we are reviewing the comments received and will consider how we can make amendments to our proposals to address issues raised, where possible. We will also continue to engage with local ward members during this period to discuss issues raised by residents and agree how we can communicate any further changes to local residents.</p> <p>As reiterated in previous answers initial assessments show the changes to Oak Road will improve air quality for the properties along Oak Road, compared to not having the scheme in place. However these assessments will be updated and published at a future consultation subject to the project securing funding to progress its design.</p> <p>The government has published guidance regarding the compulsory purchase process which also includes compensation mechanisms for those affected by projects, including in cases where properties are affected by the use of a project (in this case the road). You can find the guidance at Compulsory purchase system guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</p>

	<p>answers to my previous question.</p> <p>I hope i get a reply back quicker than the first time i contacted you as i am going to get in touch with the Examiner reporter with what you have commented on with your feeble excuse to justify putting a one-way traffic flow on Oak road.</p> <p>Very disappointed with your reasons as i said before it's a done deal with Kirklees.</p>	
<p>30</p>	<p>What will happen to the businesses on Leeds Road? Will Marstons Chicken shop and the car dealer have to close?</p>	<p>We have met with the businesses affected by our proposals and will continue to work with them as we develop our designs to minimise the impacts on them.</p>
<p>31</p>	<p>There was one opportunity for the public to speak with planners via a YouTube video that took place at 5.30pm one evening. Why haven't there been more chances/times available to do this? You have effectively excluded all commuters and those that work by holding it once at this time. The last time there were planning consultations, the public were allowed to view plans over a much longer period and in person. This could have happened and been a covid safe event - why has it not?</p>	<p>Unfortunately, due to the uncertainty and regularly changing government guidance regarding managing events during the pandemic it has not been possible for us to safely plan and hold face to face events during this consultation. The risk of having to cancel events at short notice due to changing guidance or staff testing positive beforehand would have resulted in the public being unable to access the project team at all. For these reasons an online live streamed event was provided instead, this is consistent with how the council has communicated key messages throughout the pandemic. The event was held after working hours to allow people to view it live, but is available to be viewed afterwards for those who were unable to attend.</p> <p>A six week period has been provided to allow ample opportunity for the public to access our materials</p>

		and ask questions via the website if they were unable to attend the live event. This is consistent with our previous public consultation which was open for seven weeks (an extra week due to it being over the Christmas period).
32	What are you hoping to find out for a very limited range of questions in the questionnaire? How will this be a true representation when the questions only serve to ask “if things will improve” with your plans. These are very basic questions to a survey with very major implications. What do you hope to find out and how?	<p>The survey will help us to understand the profile of journeys and journey purpose for those who respond to the survey and collate consistent responses to gauge views on the changes proposed for all modes of transport within the scheme extents.</p> <p>A comments box is provided for anyone who wishes to provide additional feedback.</p>
33	You state in the answer to my previous questions that traffic will be moved further away. Please can you clarify the distance it will move from and to and what this difference is?	<p>Your question doesn't clarify the location you're referring to and at this stage our design is at an outline stage, so exact measurements will be determined in the next stage of design once more detailed site surveys have been undertaken.</p> <p>However, in the case of Leeds Road where we are constructing a third lane which will move the traffic travelling in to Huddersfield away from the property frontages, the new centre line for that lane will be approximately 3.5m further away from the houses on that stretch of road.</p>
34	Our main goal in every action should be to tackle climate change and reduce emissions of CO2 if we want a future for our planet and for our kids. How do you think that increasing traffic by extending this road will contribute towards this goal?	<p>Currently, year on year traffic growth is predicted to rise. Our preferred scheme seeks to tackle the issues of today whilst having one eye on the future. The move away from fossil based fuels to more environmental friendly power sources will still require road space. Currently we do not have a enough space in which to accommodate all modes of travel. In the future it is hoped that there will be a switch to more sustainable modes of travel in which case road space reallocation can be considered.</p>
35	Do any of your plans involve the changes to the allotments off Bradley Road?	<p>No there are no plans to make any changes to the allotments as part of the project.</p>

<p>36</p>	<p>Having been outside and measured the distance that you've stated in your plans when you implement these changes I'm now going to be opening my car door into 40 mph traffic and not into the current cycle lane which is a buffer zone to the traffic. There are only a few cyclists on this route with plenty of opportunity for me and the other residents of Leeds road to get out of our vehicles. Do you think it's a good idea to remove the cycle lane in its current form in the interest of safety of the local residents or are you (clearly) not bothered so long as your plans go through. So far no ones voice has been heard from what I can see as you lot certainly seem to have all the (wrong) answers b</p>	<p>Design standards have changed since the advisory cycle lane was implemented on Leeds Road. If we wish to make any changes to the cycling facilities on this stretch of road we will need to comply with latest standards, ideally providing segregated cycling facilities where possible. When we engaged with the public in 2018 we showed a revised design with the cycle lane remaining on the same side as the properties between the footway and parking area, which complies with current standards. Feedback received at that time from some residents reflected they didn't want to cross a cycle lane to access their vehicles. For that reason the latest designs have changed to show a two way segregated cycle lane on the opposite side of the road. We are unable to provide a segregated facility on the outside of the parking area and the scheme aims to provide safer cycling facilities where possible to encourage use of sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>The measurements presented at this stage are indicative, however our proposals comply with street parking facilities provided nationally and in this case provide a wider parking area than the minimum standards.</p> <p>The consultation which closed on the 18th July was an opportunity for people to share their views with us. We will now review the feedback received to take account of those views where possible, we will consider the points you have raised as part of that work.</p>
-----------	---	--

Appendix D: Paper survey

Major Road Improvements: A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme

We are developing a scheme to reduce congestion and support local growth in the Cooper Bridge area. We have considered a number of potential solutions, taking into account current levels of congestion and future traffic increases from expected growth and potential new developments in the area.

We propose to make a series of changes to the existing roads around the Bradley and Cooper Bridge area. We want to know what you think of our proposals to help us understand the views and thoughts of local residents, business owners and road users. Before you complete this survey, it is important that you view our proposals by visiting:

www.yourvoice.westyorks-ca.gov.uk/CooperBridge.

These forms will be collected by the West Yorkshire Combined Authority and processed on behalf of Kirklees Metropolitan District Council in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. The data collected will be held only for the duration of the consultation phase of the project. Please view our privacy notice on the last page.

Q1. Before the COVID-19 pandemic how often did you travel through the Cooper Bridge area?

(Choose any one option)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more days a week | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 day a week | <input type="checkbox"/> At least once a year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 or 4 days a week | <input type="checkbox"/> At least once a fortnight | <input type="checkbox"/> Not used in the last year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 days a week | <input type="checkbox"/> At least once a month | <input type="checkbox"/> Never |

Q2. When you travelled through the Cooper Bridge area, what was your usual mode of transport?

(Choose up to three)

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Car driver | <input type="checkbox"/> Bus | <input type="checkbox"/> Walking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Car passenger | <input type="checkbox"/> Motorcycle | <input type="checkbox"/> Something else |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Taxi | <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle | |

If something else, please state:

Q3. Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic have your travel patterns changed?

- Yes No

If yes, please explain your answer:

Q4. What is your main reason for travelling through the Cooper Bridge area?

(Choose any one option)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I am resident in the surrounding area | <input type="checkbox"/> Visiting leisure facilities/activities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Work / work related (commuting) | <input type="checkbox"/> Visiting health facilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School / training / education | <input type="checkbox"/> Visiting friends/family |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Going shopping | <input type="checkbox"/> Something else |

If something else, please state:

Q5. Please rate the <u>existing conditions</u> for the following:						
Cars	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Very poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
Pedestrians	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Very poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
Cyclists	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Very poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know

- | We expect the proposals we are developing will achieve our aims to: |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relieve congestion and improve journey times and reliability. • Improve road safety. • Improve pedestrian and cyclist facilities to encourage use. • Support the improvement of air quality. • Support economic growth. • Support housing growth. |

Q6. Please rate the <u>proposed improvements</u> for the following:						
Cars	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Very poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
Pedestrians	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Very poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
Cyclists	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Very poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know

Any further comments:

About you:

Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback. The following questions are optional but will go a long way towards helping us better understand the opinions of different people. All information will be handled and dealt with in line with the Data Protection Act 2018, as detailed in our privacy notice (at the end of the survey).

Do you identify as:

<input type="checkbox"/> Male	<input type="checkbox"/> Female	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	--

Which age category do you fall within?

<input type="checkbox"/> 15 and under	<input type="checkbox"/> 16-24	<input type="checkbox"/> 25-29	<input type="checkbox"/> 30-39	<input type="checkbox"/> 40-49	<input type="checkbox"/> 50-59	<input type="checkbox"/> 60-69	<input type="checkbox"/> 70-79	<input type="checkbox"/> 80+	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	--

Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?

<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, limited a little	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, limited a lot	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
-----------------------------	--	---	--

What is your postcode:

How did you hear about this engagement exercise? (e.g. Local Ward Councillor / poster / press release / social media / website / real-time display / electronic road signs etc)

Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback.

Return completed forms in an envelope to: Freepost Consultation Team (WYCA)
and include additional sheets if necessary



Find out more

westyorks-ca.gov.uk

West Yorkshire Combined Authority

Wellington House

40-50 Wellington Street

Leeds

LS1 2DE

All information correct at time of writing.

A62 to Cooper Bridge Corridor Improvement Scheme

Cabinet Briefing

Scheme Objectives

To relieve congestion, improve journey times and reliability (incl. bus)

To support economic and housing growth (including the phased delivery of Bradley Park)

To improve road safety

To improve pedestrian and cyclist facilities to encourage more use

To support the improvement of air quality




Scheme Background

- In 2018/19 the council held a public engagement on three potential link road options, which would have provided a new road between Bradley Junction and A644 Wakefield Road
- Whilst there was some support for those schemes, concerns were raised about their environmental impacts, particularly the loss of Ancient Woodland
- Instead new online options were developed to maximise the capacity of the existing network.

Alternative options

The built-up nature of the area means there are limited ways to improve the network without significant demolition of properties. Therefore, the options considered:

- A larger roundabout at Cooper Bridge (preferred option)
- A gyratory at Cooper Bridge (see image)
- Whether to widen Cooper Bridge Road (preferred option)




Option selection


In addition to the appraisal of each option a number of other factors have also been considered in selecting the preferred option:

- Future maintenance – the roundabout is a standard design for which maintenance routines are established. The gyratory design will present traffic management challenges during maintenance
- Ease of use – the roundabout is a recognised familiar to the travelling public, the gyratory is a complex arrangement which has potential to cause confusion for road users which could have safety implications.
- Active Travel – the roundabout is a less convoluted design for pedestrians and cyclists to navigate, which aligns with aspirations to encourage Active Travel


The Preferred Option




The Preferred Option



The Preferred Option



The Preferred Option



Consultation

- Held from 7th June to 18th July 2021.
- Public consultation was undertaken to gather feedback on a preferred option and the perceived impact of this for car users, cyclists and walkers.
- A total of 424 responses or comments were received during the consultation. A consultation report is attached to the Cabinet report.
- Views on the proposals - Existing conditions for car users, cyclists and walkers were generally viewed poorly respondents' views were much more positive overall when considering the impact of the proposed improvements for car users, cyclists and walkers.

Economy & Neighbourhoods Scrutiny

Panel – 24 August 2021


The following comments and recommendations raised by the Panel were

- (i) The Panel notes the key concerns of residents of Oak Road and recognises the importance of these concerns being understood and responded to as the scheme develops.
- (ii) That clear metrics need to be demonstrated that can enable the measurement of the impact and success of the scheme in areas such as air quality and traffic flow.
- (iii) That consultations be undertaken with Elected Members in all wards impacted by scheme particularly in respect of the effect on existing and potential traffic flows.
- (iv) That it is important to recognise within the Cabinet report, the Council's commitment to tackling climate change and measures to encourage modal shift to public transport and active travel.

Key Issues

- This scheme is of sub-regional significance in terms of its wider benefits and in terms of the scale of investment. At the same time there is potential to work with local business and residents to place shape elements of the scheme as it progresses.
- The need to support housing and economic growth – the scheme itself is allocated in the Council’s adopted Local Plan (TS1) as well as identified housing and employment allocations in the area. Fit for purpose transport infrastructure that supports our economy and supporting growth.
- The impact of the Oak Road and Bradley Road proposals, particularly for local residents with additional traffic here seen as particularly problematic and plans needed to mitigate impacts by working with local residents as the scheme develops
- Future environmental issues around carbon impact, air quality, flood risk need careful consideration as the scheme moves forward. Once funding to progress the scheme is secured, we will also proceed with further environmental assessments and modelling of the scheme impacts including noise and air quality.

Specific Issues at Oak Road



In order to mitigate some of the issues raised by the residents on Oak Road during consultation we are now considering

- a 20mph speed limit on Oak Road
- traffic calming features on Oak Road
- a 7.5tonne weight limit on Oak Road

Further engagement with residents, emergency services and road safety auditors will be undertaken in the next stage regarding these suggested amendments

Programme/Next Steps

Activity / Milestone	Date
Public Consultation	7 June to 18 July 2021
Scrutiny	24 August 2021
Cabinet	12 October 2021
Submit Outline Business Case to Mayoral Combined Authority for development funding	Late 2021
Community engagement / design development	2022 onwards
Submit Full Business Case to Mayoral Combined Authority for full funding	Spring 2024
Anticipated start of works	Summer 2024
Anticipated Completion of works	Autumn 2026

Summary

- This is not the final decision stage on this project. The submission of the outline business case to the Mayoral Combined Authority will allow further work to commence on developing the scheme further.
- This scheme is of sub-regional significance in terms of its wider benefits and in terms of the scale of investment. At the same time there is potential to work with local business and residents to place shape elements of the scheme as it progresses.
- There is a need to support housing and economic growth in Kirklees and address current transportation issues in the area – doing nothing is not a realistic option.

Summary

- The scheme itself is allocated in the Council's adopted Local Plan (TS1) as well as identified housing and employment allocations in the area. Fit for purpose transport infrastructure that supports our economy and supporting growth is a key outcome for our residents and businesses.
- We will keep listening and responding to residents' concerns, and the decision Members are being asked to make allows this to be the case. The council will work with local residents to refine the design in and around Oak Road and Bradley Road as the scheme develops.
- Future environmental issues around carbon impact, air quality, flood risk will also need careful consideration as the scheme moves forward. Once funding to progress the scheme is secured, we will also proceed with further environmental assessments and modelling of the scheme impacts including noise and air quality.