

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 11 January 2026 23:53
To: DC Admin; Cllr John Lawson; Cllr Kath Pinnock
Subject: 2025/65/93234/E Oakenshaw Cross

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Anonymous

My memories are mostly of walking over or driving past Wyke Lane and glancing up to look at the Monument and observing with a little smile how it looked like a cul-de-sac and how clever that was to deter some drivers until recent times with satnavs. Once you remove all the objects there currently it's an invitation to speed and lorries to risk going up there. As a child I would walk past it with my Grandma to fetch eggs from one of the farms. We had to be careful on the pavement between the Garden of Rest and the Cross as it's so narrow. As an adult I once had to throw myself against the building as I hated a vehicle being close. The mirror clipped the back of my coat.

Length and width restrictions should be imposed up Wyke Lane. I'd say nothing bigger than 3.5T and 20 miles per hour speed restriction to match the Bradford section of Wyke Lane.. As the Council and National Highways will not regulate a system how satnav companies receive changes to road restrictions, it does not deter trucks from going up because of it already being 20mph at the top despite what the Deputy Chair Cabinet Councillor said on his visit.

The Monument can be put back in its original place if Nick Grimshaw's document with assistance from Ian Ridley is considered again.

There are three sides of the Cross roads that are tapered/recessed which I assume is because of the Cross. The side that gets knocked is where the 4th glance stone was removed for a gas lamp in past. The side of the road there is not set back enough for vehicles to turn easily down Cross St or negotiate going around the Cross site a bit wider. If the pavement was on the other side of the tree then that area could be widened to allow for vehicles to turn down Cross St or continue their route down Wyke Lane.

The other day I observed the parked vehicles in Cross St and someone driving up in a determined way to not stop and another vehicle on Wyke Lane trying to turn down Cross St. The vehicle coming up on the wrong side of the road because of parked vehicles would not turn into the gap but forced the vehicle on the correct side of the road to have to reverse back up Wyke Lane. The vehicle coming up Cross St. did not go around the site, instead it insisted on using the same part of the road that the other vehicle had reversed into. Just enough space.

If there was a raised brickwork style circle around the Cross site, then this would force vehicles to slow down but not be too noisy for residents around the Cross site.

If the road surface was lowered then the three glance stones would serve their purpose and the Cross could be raised on a plinth with some ironwork around the base. Then it could take less space at ground level than it did (certainly does now with the concrete blocks which were shunted out of place within 15 minutes of original installation. If road surface can't be lowered then can glance stones be raised and Cross put on a plinth still?

Should the terraced housing on Cross St and the semi-detached on right of Wyke Lane have the grassed area as a permeable parking space (to still have greenspace absorbing rainfall to not force traffic to be in middle of road when negotiating the Monument site?

Wyke Lane should be returned to being a narrow opening at the bottom coming up from Bradford Road but probably left wide for entering Bradford Road. This will deter long length trucks from thinking it's a continuation of Bradford Road when they're going to Low Moor (have seen them drive up Wyke Lane to go down Cross st to re-enter Bradford Road that way or down Greenside to old Post Office on their way to Low Moor or just to turn around as they had intended to exit elsewhere on Chain Bar (fatigue coming off motorway)? These trucks often put their wheel grooves into the grassed area on Cross St so the Cross is not so safe on there if the vehicles will remain parked on Cross St and bottom of Wyke Lane.

I do not understand the point of road safety audits if they are just advisory, but it is difficult to have placed objections or comments on here without the road safety audit being one of the the documents provided.

The Cross subterranean area was inadequately investigated by archaeologists to determine what if anything needs documenting or salvaging there (we of course wouldn't have known about the Medieval/pre-Medieval stone circle if the steps had at least been left or returned to protect the stone circle underneath. IN the meantime that stone circle is exposed to nature and human elements for the first time since 1702 and probably earlier. I still do not know what type of stonework that is or how old it is. Quite clearly unrelated tot he Monument we are familiar with. How do we know the Stone Circle wasn't designed by travelling stonemasons brought by Romans or trained local stonemasons? Why is there no report from Archaeologists for us to read to help us make an informed comment about Kirklees Council's intention of tarmacking over history to have a straight road up. That Stone Circle deserves more respect than to hide it again. Proper protection and kept in Oakenshaw please.

I think if the Kirklees Highways had "been working with us" then some of the questions/ suggestions im asking and others are, would already be known and would not be being asked or stated if they really were unsuitable or known.

Kind Regards