

### **Objection 1**

Objects, stating the bus lane is unnecessary based on regular use. Raises concerns about loss of trees and wildlife, access issues for residents, safety at Chain Bar, and further disruption from road closures and diversions. Highlights warehousing and impact on existing bus services. States a bus lane will make driveway access unsafe and create difficulties for buses approaching the roundabout. Says the proposed crossing will worsen delays and increase traffic on Wyke Lane.

---

### **Objection 2**

Objects to the bus lane, stating traffic has increased due to poor planning around the industrial site. Highlights the importance of trees. Questions how buses will safely navigate the roundabout and raises concerns about lack of clear information.

---

### **Objection 3**

Highlights the limited benefit of a bus lane given the low number and unreliability of buses. States the scheme would cause over 12 months of disruption and environmental damage. Raises concerns about loss of trees, increased pollution, and motorway noise. Calls for traffic lights at Chain Bar.

---

### **Objection 4**

Objects due to resident parking issues, lack of proper consultation, impact on disabled access, and concerns about safety, disputes, property value, and unnecessary changes given the current road conditions. Says bike lane already exists which does not get used. Notes there is no existing disabled access, parking issues are existing constraints from school drop offs/pick ups, teachers parking, and residents parking on a first come basis.

---

### **Objection 5**

Objects to bus lane. States that no plans or maps were provided, therefore not possible to fully understand or respond to the proposal.

---

### **Objection 6**

Highlights that traffic has already improved due to the recent third lane at Chain Bar. States bus lane is unnecessary due to low bus frequency. Raises concern about roadwork disruption.

---

### **Objection 7**

Raises concern about safety, existing confusion and near collisions at Chain Bar, saying further changes would make things worse.

---

### **Objection 8**

Raises similar concerns to previous objections. Questions the need for the scheme, citing existing layout changes at Chain Bar. States that further changes would add confusion and raise safety issues.

### **Objection 9**

Objects to the proposed Bus Lane, says it will provide minimal benefits and cause disruption.

---

### **Objection 10**

Says traffic lights at Chain Bar would remove the need for the scheme. Raises concerns about congestion on Wyke Lane and Mill Carr Hill from diverted traffic and HGVs.

---

### **Objection 11**

Raises safety concerns for cyclists, objects to tree loss, believes consultation was insufficient, highlights risks due to narrowed lanes for HGVs.

---

### **Objection 12**

Objects to the bus lane, calling it unnecessary and costly. Instead, suggests traffic lights and red light cameras.

---

### **Objection 13**

Raises concerns over the value of spending on a bus lane with existing bus laybys, questions its impact on traffic flow.

---

### **Objection 14**

Opposes the bus lane, stating it will worsen traffic and shows no consideration for local residents. Objects to HGV traffic impact and loss of trees needed for wildlife. Criticises previous road changes and calls for pothole repairs instead.

---

### **Objection 15**

Includes protected species like little owls. Highlights decline in birds and insects. States the work is being planned during nesting season.

---

### **Objection 16**

Says the bus lane isn't needed and money should be spent on something more useful. Believes it will cause more traffic and accidents at Chain Bar. Concerned about trees being cut down.

---

### **Objection 17**

Objects to the bus lane, arguing the real issue is lack of traffic lights at the roundabout junction, not congestion on the road itself. Highlights environmental concerns, poor bus service reliability, and community opposition.

---

### **Objection 18**

Need for a Puffin crossing, safety concerns with lane narrowing, environmental damage from tree removal, disruption during construction.

---

### **Objection 19**

Objects to bus lane or puffin crossing, environmental damage, disruption to residents and businesses, and no clear benefit to road flow.

---

### **Objection 20**

Objects on behalf of elderly and disabled residents at 101–119 Bradford Road. Highlights limited car park space, frequent misuse by non-residents, and lack of enforcement. States proposed double yellow lines are discriminatory and will impact access and quality of life. Notes: Currently existing advisory cycle lane with no yellow markings. Also a car park is available at the end of the row of bungalows for residents and visitors.

---

### **Objection 21**

Objects to the bus lane, construction disruption, environmental damage, and increased congestion.

---

### **Objection 22**

Objects to the scheme due to safety concerns with driveway access, increased HGV traffic, and loss of greenery supporting local wildlife. Highlights low bus usage and calls for traffic lights at Chain Bar instead to improve flow.

---

### **Objection 23**

Objects to the proposed bus lane due to the unreliable service, environmental harm from tree removal, increased traffic and danger on Wyke Lane, disruption during 12-month roadworks.

### **Objection 24**

Opposes the bus lane, disruption from construction, potential tree removal, and long-term inconvenience for residents and businesses. Raises concerns about increased congestion.

---

### **Objection 25**

Objects due to disruption from construction, environmental damage, increased congestion for drivers.

---

### **Objection 26**

Objects to the planned scheme, citing ongoing disruption from previous roadworks and poor maintenance. States Bradford Road now operates efficiently after traffic light adjustments.

---

### **Objection 27**

Objects to the proposed bus lane, says lack of notification to residents, the irrelevance of the bus lane given traffic issues at Chain Bar roundabout, environmental damage from tree removal.

---

### **Objection 28**

Concerned about existing congestion due to heavy goods vehicles and traffic from the M62.  
Believes the bus lane will cause dangerous manoeuvres for buses crossing three lanes to enter the roundabout.  
Opposes the new crossing/bus stop.  
Objects to tree and hedge removal.  
Concerned about increased air pollution.

---

### **Objection 29**

Opposes the bus lane and puffin crossing. Argues the road needs traffic lights and red light cameras instead. Objects to tree and hedge removal due to environmental and wildlife impacts.  
Highlights that the bus lane will not ease roundabout access and raises concerns over increased noise.

---

### **Objection 30**

Logged an objection against the bus/cycle lane through Bradford Road to Chain Bar. There is one bus service on this route and feels this is not needed at all.

---

**Objection 31**

Objection to the proposed Bus Lane being added to Bradford Road.

---

**Objection 32**

Objects to bus lane due to removal of trees and hedges, addition of traffic lights, and major disruption to the community. States prolonged roadworks distressing.

---

**Objection 33**

Raises concerns about repeated disruption following recent lane changes and utility works. Questions whether the performance of the new 3-lane layout has been properly assessed. Suggests pausing the scheme to allow time for audits and evaluation. Highlights ongoing queuing and safety issues.

**Objection 34**

Questions the logic of the bus lane, stating it will slow down the roundabout and waste money. Highlights the lack of traffic lights at the junction as the real issue.

---

**Objection 35**

Objects to the bus lane due to unnecessary disruption, impaired traffic flow from recent changes, existing walking and cycling routes, environmental concerns over tree removal.

---

**Objection 36**

Objects to the bus lane due to ongoing congestion from recent roadworks. Says there's no need for a lane on only part of the road and suggests traffic lights at Chain Bar would be a better solution.

---

### **Objection 37**

Summarises that traffic has improved since the three-lane entry was added to Chain Bar, so a bus lane now seems unnecessary. Notes the 268 doesn't run frequently enough to justify it. Suggests average speed cameras would be more useful.

---

### **Objection 38**

Objects to bus lane citing unnecessary disruption, limited bus use, recent road improvements, environmental concerns over tree removal, and preference for traffic lights.

---

### **Objection 39**

Says the scheme will cause unnecessary disruption with no benefit to residents. Highlights safety issues from previous changes, increased traffic on Wyke Lane, and lack of consultation. Calls for traffic lights instead of extra lanes.

---

### **Objection 40**

Concerned about impact on green space and trees. Suggests traffic lights, speed cameras, and resurfacing the road would be a better use of funds.

---

### **Objection 41**

Bar, not along the route itself. Highlights recent improvements have resolved congestion and raises concerns about environmental impact.

---

### **Objection 42**

Highlights safety concerns for cars, cyclists, and pedestrians. Says the bus lane would cause more disruption, as buses would need to cut across 3 lanes to reach the A638. Believes it would make it almost impossible for Oakenshaw drivers to access Chain Bar. Objects to the removal of trees.

---

**Objection 43**

Objects due to lack of need with only one unreliable bus service, disruption to residents and wildlife, and concern over changing the character of the area.

---

**Objection 44**

Objecting to the proposed bus lane, says unnecessary with only one infrequent bus service. It would worsen congestion at Chain Bar, harm wildlife by removing trees.

---

**Objection 45**

Opposes the scheme due to lack of need with only one unreliable bus service, potential tree removal, and long-term inconvenience for residents and businesses. Raises concerns about increased congestion.

**Objection 46**

Objects due to lack of updated data and fair consultation, concerns over safety, environmental harm.

---

**Objection 47**

Suggests preserving the existing treeline along Bradford Road by removing only the undergrowth to widen the road, placing the cycle and pedestrian routes behind the trees to protect green infrastructure.

---

**Objection 48**

Objects due to loss of mature trees, increased congestion, negative environmental impact.

---

**Objection 49**

Objects highlighting the negative impact on car users, increased congestion, unreliable buses, environmental damage from tree removal, and lack of consultation.

---

### **Objection 50**

Objection to bus lane due to unnecessary disruption, environmental damage from tree removal, increased congestion.

---

### **Objection 51**

Objects to the bus lane plans in Oakenshaw, stating buses are rarely seen while traffic from cars, vans, and lorries is constant.

---

### **Objection 52**

Highlights need for a Puffin crossing, safety concerns with lane narrowing, environmental damage from tree removal, disruption during construction.

---

### **Objection 53**

Objects to the bus lane due to lack of need, environmental harm, construction disruption and poor value for money.

---

### **Objection 54**

Highlights the limited impact a bus lane would have given there is only one bus route, with minimal time savings. States the bus would still face delays merging at the roundabout.

---

### **Objection 55**

Objects to the scheme due to disruption, loss of trees, and increased congestion.

### **Objection 56**

Objects to the proposed order due to resident parking issues, lack of proper consultation, impact on disabled access, and concerns about safety, disputes, property value, and unnecessary changes given the current road conditions. Says bike lane already exists which does not get used. Notes: there is no existing disabled access, parking issues are existing constraints from school drop offs/pick ups, teachers parking and residents parking on a first come basis.

---

**Objection 57**

Raises concerns about delays, especially for key workers. Highlights low bus use, existing speeding issues, and calls for speed cameras instead. Opposes removal of hedgerows due to noise and air quality concerns.

---

**Objection 58**

States the scheme should be properly assessed before further changes. Says no clear benefit but would cause a year of disruption and environmental damage.

---

**Objection 59**

Objects due to limited bus service, highlighting Chain Bar as the real congestion issue, raising safety concerns, environmental and heritage impacts.

---

**Objection 60**

Objects due to loss of trees and increased congestion.

---

**Objection 61**

Objects to the proposed bus lane, says no benefit to congestion or bus services, and raises concerns about safety, environmental damage, and impact on local wildlife.

---

**Objection 62**

Objects to the proposed bus lane on, citing past traffic issues, school delays, unnecessary cost given poor bus service, and environmental damage from tree loss.

---

**Objection 63**

Highlights lack of consultation with Oakenshaw, questions reliability of bus services, safety of proposed layout, and loss of trees. Calls for traffic lights at Chain Bar instead of a bus lane.

---

**Objection 64**

Objects to the proposed bus lane, stating the listed benefits lack evidence and the scheme will cause more disruption, pollution, and safety issues.

---

**Objection 65**

Opposes the bus lane, stating traffic is rarely heavy outside of M62 incidents and calling it a waste of money. Objects to tree removal, citing noise reduction, dust control, and wildlife habitat.

---

**Objection 66**

Objects to the bus lane, stating the number of buses on the route does not justify the disruption. Objects to tree removal.

**Objection 67**

Raises concerns over lack of consultation with Oakenshaw residents, and poor timing of public engagement. Highlights safety risks at Chain Bar, conflict with HGV traffic, and environmental impact from loss of trees. Questions the justification for lane serving one unreliable bus route and calls for updated data post-recent road changes. Notes lack of equality impact assessment and potential harm to disabled residents. Opposes disruption during construction, potential diversions, and increased rat-running through Wyke Lane.

---

**Objection 68**

Objects to bus lane due to unnecessary disruption, environmental damage, safety risks, lack of benefit for limited bus use, and concerns over increased traffic on unsuitable local routes like Wyke Lane.

---

**Objection 69**

Objects to bus lane due to expected long-term disruption, tree removal, increased congestion.

---

### **Objection 70**

Objects to the bus lane on Cleckheaton Road, citing the need for traffic lights at Chain Bar roundabout, concerns over tree removal, lack of consultation.

---

### **Objection 71**

States traffic has improved with the extra lane and that the bus lane will not benefit traffic. Raises concerns about potential corruption and warns that residents will push for an investigation if the project proceeds. Highlights environmental concerns and disruption to travel.

---

### **Objection 72**

Objects due to potential environmental damage, disruption caused by construction, increased congestion, lack of community engagement, and concerns over the impact on road users.

---

### **Objection 73**

Objects to bus lane, long-term disruption, tree loss, increased congestion, minimal benefit to bus users.

---

### **Objection 74**

Objects to tree removal and long-term inconvenience for residents and businesses. Raises concerns about increased congestion.

---

### **Objection 75**

Raises concerns about disruption to daily life, congestion, environmental impact, and lack of community consultation.

---

### **Objection 76**

Objects due to disruption from more roadworks, safety issues with traffic management.

---

**Objection 77**

Questions need for walking and cycling improvements with the Greenway nearby. Notes recent changes at Chain Bar have improved flow.

---

**Objection 78**

Opposes the lane proposal, criticising repeated roadworks, poor planning, suggesting better traffic light timing as a simple solution. Raises concerns over loss of wildlife and trees.

---

**Objection 79**

Objects to the bus lane given traffic issues at Chainbar roundabout, environmental damage from tree removal, disruption during construction.

---

**Objection 80**

Objects on basis the proposals will increase traffic through Wyke's narrow roads near a school, with no consultation, and risk congestion backing onto Chain Bar.

---

**Objection 81**

Objects due to the limited bus service, disruption caused by construction, loss of trees and wildlife, increased congestion, and negative impact on road users and the environment.

---

**Objection 82**

Objects due to lane changes, loss of green space and wildlife, disruption from prolonged roadworks, existing safety risks at Chain Bar, and poor bus reliability.

---

**Objection 83**

Highlights need for a Puffin crossing, safety concerns with lane narrowing, environmental damage from tree removal, disruption during construction.

---

**Objection 84**

Opposes the bus lane, citing disruption from construction, potential tree removal, and long-term inconvenience for residents and businesses. Raises concerns about increased congestion.

---

**Objection 85**

The 268 bus is unreliable and not frequent enough to need a bus lane. Suggests traffic lights at Chain Bar instead. Against cutting down trees.

---

**Objection 86**

Objects to the bus lane on Bradford Road, citing discrimination against elderly and disabled residents who rely on parking directly outside their homes due to mobility issues, limited car park spaces, and no proper consultation notices displayed. Request for disabled parking instead.

**Note:** Currently existing advisory cycle lane with no yellow markings.

---

**Objection 87**

States the poor bus service is due to cancellations, not congestion. Notes the disruption of more roadworks and questions why traffic lights at the Oakenshaw entrance haven't been considered as a simpler solution.

---

**Objection 88**

Objects due to increased congestion during and after construction, loss of countryside.

---

**Objection 89**

Opposes the bus lane, citing disruption from construction, potential tree removal, and long-term inconvenience for residents and businesses. States increase in congestion.

---

### **Objection 90**

Raises concerns about disruption from construction, loss of trees, and long-term inconvenience to residents and businesses. States increase in congestion.

---

### **Objection 91**

Opposes potential tree removal, and long-term inconvenience for residents and businesses. Raises concerns about increased congestion.

---

### **Objection 92**

Opposes the project due to destruction of wildlife, loss of trees, increased noise, and vehicle pollution.

---

### **Objection 93**

Opposes the bus lane due to limited bus service on the route and disruption from long-term roadworks. Highlights damage already caused to local wildlife and trees by nearby developments. Raises concerns about pollution, motorway noise, and visual impact. Suggests traffic lights at Chain Bar as a better solution.

### **Objection 94**

Objects to proposed traffic regulations on Garden Avenue, stating residents from numbers 1–6 rely on nearby parking due to age, mobility issues, and blue badge use. Says impact on homes accessed via a walkway has been overlooked and says losing parking would not allow them to live there.

---

### **Objection 95**

Objects to the proposal, stating there is only one infrequent bus and very few cyclists using the route. Highlights existing congestion during peak times and believes the scheme will worsen delays for regular commuters.

---

### **Objection 96**

Says there is no need for the scheme due to unreliable bus service and low usage. Raises concerns about loss of trees, impact on wildlife, and increased pollution.

Highlights safety issues for buses merging at the roundabout and believes cyclists avoid the area. Supports traffic lights at Chain Bar instead.

---

### **Objection 97**

Raises concerns about lack of consultation, disruption during construction, and safety issues accessing the driveway due to traffic and HGVs. Highlights impact on school commutes, increased risk from narrowed lanes, and loss of vegetation.

---

### **Objection 98**

Responds with limited mobility. Highlights difficulty crossing the road, lack of benefit from the crossing location, and dangers for vehicles entering and exiting driveways. Criticises the planned removal of trees.

---

### **Objection 99**

Raises concerns over daily disruption to school runs and work, safety issues accessing their driveway, and the impact of further roadworks. Highlights loss of vegetation, increased pollution.

---

### **Objection 100**

Concerns that the bus lane is unnecessary due to unreliable service, flawed cost-benefit data, and environmental harm from tree removal. Warns it would worsen congestion, create safety risks with HGVs, and force buses to merge dangerously at Chain Bar. Suggests traffic lights as a better solution.

---

### **Objection 101**

Highlights objection to closing the Northgate–Market Street slip road in Cleckheaton. Says it helps drivers avoid the busy Crown Street/Westgate junction, which is already hazardous for pedestrians due to poor visibility and multi-directional traffic.

---

### **Objection 102**

Objects to the proposed bus lane, citing lack of need, safety concerns with three lanes, environmental impact from tree removal, and disruption during construction. Suggests traffic lights at the junction as a better solution.

---

### **Objection 103**

Says loss of essential resident parking due to zig-zag lines outside property 225, existing parking already limited due to school pickups and zone entry use, safety concerns from past vehicle incidents, and request for resident permit scheme instead.

### **Objection 104**

Objection to the bus lane due to destruction of tree barrier, increased emissions from buses and HGVs, lack of traffic lights at Chain Bar junction.

---

### **Objection 105**

Objection to the bus lane due, says not needed.

---

### **Objection 106**

Objects to the proposed bus lane due to unnecessary disruption for one bus service, frequent traffic delays already experienced during minor works, and concerns over the loss of trees and impact on local wildlife.

---

### **Objection 107 to 143**

37 objections were received in the form of a standardised letter. The letter raises concerns over the need for the bus lane, highlighting the limited bus service, safety issues, environmental damage from tree and hedge removal, disruption to residents and businesses, and lack of consultation. All signatories express opposition to the proposal and request alternative options be considered.