



## Report to Policy Committee

**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** *(Lisa Blakemore, Senior Transport Planner)*

**Tel:** 07785384192

**Report of:** *Executive director of City Futures*

**Report to:** Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

**Date of Decision:** *15<sup>th</sup> June 2022*

**Subject:** *Report objections to the Traffic Regulation Order for Crosspool 20mph*

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? <i>(488)</i>				
Has appropriate consultation taken place?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has a Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-				
<i>“The <b>(report/appendix)</b> is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph <b>(insert relevant paragraph number)</b> of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).”</i>				

### Purpose of Report:

To report details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Crosspool, report the receipt of objections to the Traffic Regulation Order and set out the Council's response.

**Recommendations:**

Make the Crosspool 20mph Speed Limit Orders as advertised, Speed Limit Order as amended in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Inform objectors accordingly.

Introduce the proposed 20mph speed limits as advertised.

Introduce part time, advisory, 20mph speed limits on part of Lydgate Lane

**Background Papers:**

**Appendix A:** consultation letter

**Appendix B:** Proposed scheme boundary

**Appendix C (at the bottom of the report):** consultation responses

Lead Officer to complete:-		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: Damien Watkinson
		Legal: Richard Cannon
		Equalities & Consultation: <i>Annmarie Johnson</i>
		Climate: Jessica Rick
	<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>	
2	<b>SLB member who approved submission:</b>	<i>Kate Martin</i>
3	<b>Committee Chair consulted:</b>	<i>Mazher Iqbal and Julie Grocutt</i>
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Committee by the SLB member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> <i>Lisa Blakemore</i>	<b>Job Title:</b> <i>Senior Transport Planner</i>
	<b>Date:</b> 30/05/2022	

## 1. PROPOSAL

In February 2011, Full Council adopted a motion 'To bring forward plans for city-wide 20mph limits on residential roads (excluding main roads)'. This led to the adoption of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy by the Cabinet Highways Committee on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2012, the long-term aim of which is to establish 20mph as the maximum appropriate speed in residential areas of Sheffield. Each speed limit is indicated by traffic signs and road markings only. They do not include any 'physical' traffic calming measures. To date 23 20mph areas have been completed

The Strategy was updated on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2015, in part to better define how individual roads would be considered suitable for the introduction of a 20mph limit. Broadly speaking, residential roads on which average speeds are 24mph or below will automatically be considered suitable. The inclusion of roads with average speeds of between 24mph and 27mph will be considered on a case-by-case basis using current Department for Transport guidelines. Roads on which the average speed is above 27mph will not be included unless additional capital funding can be identified for appropriate traffic calming measures to help encourage lower speeds.

The Initial Business Case for the introduction of these 20mph speed limits was approved at Transport Board in June 2020.

This report details the consultation response to the introduction of these 20 speed limits, and a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit on Lydgate Lane outside Lydgate school, reports the receipt of objections and sets out the Council's response.

## 2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE ?

- 2.1 There is a proven relationship between motor vehicle speed and the number and severity of injury collisions. The Department for Transport's 20mph Research Study (November 2018) found that the introduction of sign-only 20mph speed limits did not lead to a significant change in collisions in the short term but concluded that further data is required to determine the long term impact.

Over the longer term it is anticipated that a gradual increase in compliance with the 20mph speed limit will lead to a reduction in collisions, helping to create safer communities.

- 2.2 These schemes represent a step towards influencing driver behaviour and establishing 20mph as the default maximum appropriate speed in residential areas. This will contribute to the delivery of:

- Policy 4 of the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2018-2040 (Make our streets healthy places where people feel safe)

- The Council's Transport Strategy (March 2019) A safer and more sustainable Sheffield (Sustainable safety, safe walking and cycling as standard )
- the Fairness Commission's recommendation for a 20mph speed limit on all residential roads in Sheffield.

### 3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

3.1 The intention to introduce each 20mph speed limit has been advertised in the local press, street notices put up throughout each affected area and letters delivered to all affected properties inviting residents to comment on the proposals (see Appendix A). The Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, local Ward Members Statutory Consultees have been informed about the proposals.

3.2 The Council has a legal responsibility to comply with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996. This states that "*An objection [to the making of a Traffic Regulation Order] shall be made in writing*".

All Traffic Order advertisements state that objections can be made by email, as do the notices placed on street. Regrettably, the leaflets delivered door-to-door did not make this clear however recipients may still have made an objection by other means and therefore did not lose their opportunity to make their views known.

The Regulations stipulate that "*Any person may object to the making of an order by [...] the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the date on which the order making authority [publicises the order].*" However, comments and objections received after the closing date are normally added to the collation of responses and duly considered

#### CONSULTATION REPONSES

There have been 149 responses to the consultation, 14 of these were objections and are detailed in Appendix C below.

Officers have replied to all residents with an acknowledgement or answering specific questions and clarifying the proposals if required so that the residents are fully informed before making formal approvals/ objections to the scheme

Many respondents said that the scheme is unnecessary. Paragraph 2.1 above sets out the reason for reducing the speed limit.

One comment asks why the scheme is being progressed and questions the accident data. The Council policy is to introduce the 20mph speed limit in all suitable residential areas of the city irrespective of the accident record. It will undoubtedly take time for people to alter long established

habits, but even a marginal reduction in average speeds will, over time, contribute to the creation of safer streets.

The scheme's possible contribution to air pollution was questioned. The Department for Transport's 20mph Research Study (November 2018) found that although empirical evidence is weak, inconclusive or complex, (sign only) 20mph limits have the potential to positively affect vehicle emissions, air quality and noise levels, through:

- a reduction in average speed and top percentile speeds;
- smoother, more consistent driving speeds;
- small-scale displacement of traffic; and
- a modal shift away from car.

This suggests that the introduction of 20mph limits is unlikely to have had a negative impact on air quality.

One comment suggests that 20mph schemes have a negative effect on the safety of cyclists. There is no evidence to support this and Cycle Sheffield support this scheme

A few comments suggested that the scheme is pointless without speed humps/ cushions etc. Traffic calming can be very effective in keeping vehicle speeds low and reducing the number and severity of accidents, but it is also extremely expensive. Cuts to funding from Central Government for transport related projects mean we can no longer afford such schemes.

One comment asks whether alternative options have been explored, cost benefit analysis and risk assessments conducted. The cost of this scheme has been discussed above and the Outline Business case (OBC) that was approved in January 2022. This document discussed other possible options with estimated costs. It is council policy to introduce 20mph limits on all suitable residential areas, so this was the preferred option put forward and accepted at this OBC stage. The Outline Business case also included a risk analysis

Several comments asked why a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit hasn't been proposed on Manchester Road as it has on Lydgate Lane. During the feasibility stage, the design team looked at including this restriction on Manchester Road. However, they had concerns about the flashing sign's proximity to a signalised crossing and deemed it unsafe to install. The design guidance also supports these concerns. In addition to this, the footways at this location are too narrow to allow the installation of such signs and still leave a safe passage for children

A few people have asked about the cost of this scheme, and this is detailed in section 7 of this report

## OTHER CONSULTEES

South Yorkshire Police have stated "...Looking at the areas concerned we don't have too many concerns. If it becomes apparent that the limits are not self-enforcing or the change results in a significant number of complaints, then we will expect you to consider additional measures to secure a reasonable level of compliance

No response has been received from South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service or the Yorkshire Ambulance Service or South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive

Sustrans and Cycle Sheffield support the proposals

## 4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

### 4.1 Equality Implications

- 4.1. Overall, there are no significant differential, positive or negative, equalities impacts from this proposal. Safer roads and reduced numbers of accidents involving traffic and pedestrians will fundamentally be positive for all road users, but particularly the young and elderly. No negative equality impacts have been identified.

### 4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2. The Outline Business case for the Crosspool 20mph scheme was approved by the Transport Board in January 2022.

The scheme will be funded by the LTP.

The total capital cost of this scheme is £104,186 and is as follows:

£13,273 transport fees (including TRO costs, consultation costs)

£23k Amey design fees

Estimated constriction cost £60,000

HMD fees £6500

Procurement strategy cost £1000

Post build speed surveys £500

The estimated commuted sum cost for the scheme's future maintenance (revenue implication) is £57,000

### 4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3. The Council is under a duty contained in section 108 of the Transport Act 2000 to develop policies for the promotion and encouragement of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport, and to carry out its functions so as to implement those policies. These policies and the proposals for their implementation together comprise the local transport plan (to which the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy is considered to be pursuant)

and the Council must have regard to any guidance issued by the Secretary of State concerning the content of such plans

The Department for Transport guidance 'Setting Local Speed Limits' encourages local authorities to consider the introduction of more 20mph speed limits and zones in urban areas that are primarily residential areas to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists. This applies particularly where the streets are being used by people on foot and on bicycles, there is community support and the characteristics of the street are suitable. The guidance recognises that traffic authorities have powers to introduce 20 mph speed limits that apply only at certain times of day where a school is located on a road that is not suitable for a full-time 20 mph limit, and notes that the government has also given local authorities the power to place signs indicating advisory part-time 20mph limits.

The Council as traffic authority has the power to vary speed limits on roads (other than trunk or restricted roads) by making speed limit orders under section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the 1984 Act"). The procedure in relation to consultation and notification, which is set out in Schedule 9 of the Act and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, must be followed and proper consideration given to all duly made representations. Those representations are presented for consideration in this report. The Council is empowered to place traffic signs indicating advisory part-time 20mph limits via their inclusion in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 (Diagram 545.1).

In exercising the aforementioned powers, the Council is under a duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) as per section 122 of the 1984 Act. In doing so the Council must have regard to the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises, the effect on the amenities of any locality affected, any applicable national air quality strategy, the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant. The Council is considered to be fulfilling this duty in implementing the proposals in this report.

#### 4.4 Climate Implications

- 4.4.1 Lower speed limits can reduce air pollution through lower vehicle emissions and also reduce noise.

The provision of 20mph speed limits and zones should have an overall positive effect on road user safety, air quality and reduced impact on the natural and built environment in the county

The potential for reduced emissions will contribute to the overall resilience to climate change.

#### 4.4 Other Implications

- 4.4.1 There will be an expectation from residents that, as a consequence of introducing the 20mph speed limit, motor vehicle speeds will reduce however there is a small risk that this won't happen. Surveys to monitor motor vehicle speeds in each area will be carried out once the schemes have been in place for several months. If in time speeds remain unaltered, and subject to the availability of funding, additional measures will be considered to improve compliance with the new limit.

### 5. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1 In light of the objection's received consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Crosspool. However, such a recommendation would run contrary to the delivery of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. This would also mean that pedestrian and cyclist safety would not be improved, and this would be detrimental to the Council's Active Travel ambition and vision of Safer streets in our city.

### 6. **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 The adoption of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy established the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed limits in all suitable residential areas. Reducing the speed of traffic in residential areas should, in the long term, reduce the number and severity of collisions, reduce the fear of accidents, encourage sustainable modes of travel and contribute towards the creation of a more pleasant, cohesive environment.

The Cabinet Individual Executive Member has made it clear that 20mph speed limits should continue to be introduced in residential areas in accordance with the City's 20mph Speed Limit Strategy as funds allow.

Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Crosspool be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety or sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

It is also recommended that a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit school be introduced Lydgate Lane outside Lydgate Primary school for the same reasons.

## Appendix C Objections

<b>1</b>	<p>I am writing in objection to the proposed 20 miles per hour speed limit change in the Crosspool area, in response to your letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022.</p> <p>Firstly, let me preface my objection by making it clear that as a father of two young children attending Lydgate Infant and Junior schools, I am fully supportive of changes to our roads to improve safety for both pedestrians and vehicle occupants provided these changes are evidence based. Therefore, I fully agree with and support part of the proposal to introduce 'part time' 20mph limit on the roads outside of our schools.</p> <p>However, the full proposal to reduce speed limits to 20mph on almost all residential roads within Crosspool, without physical traffic calming technology appears un-evidenced, excessive, and unlikely to drive real change in driver behaviour.</p> <p>I would hope Sheffield City Council could respond to the following questions and suggestions with detailed, fact-based responses as I am sure many residents have similar concerns:</p> <p><b>1) What evidence or data were used to arrive at this proposal?</b> The letter I received on 3<sup>rd</sup> February covered what the proposed change was but contained very little to no supporting evidence as to why this change makes sense to implement now. Specifically, I refer to:</p> <p><b>a.</b> No data were provided to indicate the number of collisions that occurred in recent years involving pedestrians and motor vehicles on the roads identified that resulted in injury to either party, specifically within the speed range 20-30mph, where speed was recognised by the police as being a major contributing factor to the incident. <b><i>What data is this proposal based on?</i></b></p> <p><b>b.</b> No risk assessment was included in the pack to residents. Was a risk assessment carried out and if so what risks and control measures were identified in this process? Our national health and safety systems through legislation such as the Health and Safety at Work Act, 1974 require all organisations to carry out risk assessments and reduce risks to levels as low as reasonably practicable. <b><i>Who carried out a risk assessment and decided that a 20mph limit in such an extensive region with no physical traffic calming measures other than signage was both reasonable and practicable?</i></b></p> <p><b>c.</b> Vehicle safety has continued to improve markedly over the last half century with modern cars required to pass increasingly stringent tests for both occupier and pedestrian protection. New vehicles now often including technology to avoid collisions or speeding. I appreciate that the number of vehicles on the road has increased during the same period, but most of the residential roads included in the proposed 20mph zone have very low traffic density. <b><i>Given that vehicles are becoming safer why does reducing the speed limit now make any sense?</i></b></p> <p><b>2) What cost benefit analysis has been carried out on this proposal?</b> You confirm in your letter that financial considerations were made in respect of this proposal, specifically the decision to proceed with signage only and no physical traffic calming measures to limit cost.</p>
----------	---

	<p>However, no specific costs or benefits were provided in the pack to evidence this decision. As council taxpayers, residents expect that their considerable contributions are used responsibly. Further to this, Sheffield Council reminds residents in its annual summary letter and in this proposal itself that finances are stretched. <b>What methodology was used to derive a positive cost benefit for this proposal to ensure council tax contributions are being spent responsibly?</b></p> <p><b>3) What other or alternative proposals have been made to improve road safety in our area and how was this proposal prioritised above these?</b> As a resident who uses both the road network and pavements on a daily basis, there seem to be a number of alternative, potentially more valuable improvements that could be taken to improve road safety in Crosspool and its surrounds. Outlined below are some suggestions for improving safety in areas that have seen road traffic collisions in recent years:</p> <p><i>a. <b>Cross road intersection at Manchester Road / Stephen Hill Road</b> – suggestion to widen the section of Stephen Hill Road prior to the junction to introduce a left filter lane. Introduce traffic lights and a crossing to improve traffic flow at busy times of the day and safety for pedestrians attempting to cross in this area.</i></p> <p><i>b. <b>Double parking on Crookesmoor Road between Barber Road and Roebuck Road</b> – This area is potentially very dangerous, having both high pedestrian and traffic density for long periods of the day. This is compounded by vehicles parking on both sides of the road. Suggestion to limit parking to one side of the road in this section and introduce free parking for residents on the site currently being used for Covid-19 testing.</i></p> <p><i>c. <b>Junction of Hagg Hill / Bole Hill Road</b> – there have been several incidents on this stretch of road in recent years. Suggestion to improve signage on this section of road to make it clear that vehicles travelling up hill have priority and which sections of road require drivers to give way or stop. Also, consideration could be given to providing a safe run off area where the stone wall is currently erected on the north-east corner of the junction to give protection to any vehicles that over-shoot the junction due to poor road conditions snow / ice, which happens regularly.</i></p>
2	<p>I strongly object to the introduction of the proposed 20mph limit in the Crosspool area, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence that 20mph speed limits reduce accidents is limited [some studies indicate more accidents]</li> <li>• This is partly because they do not reduce speeds very much because on narrow residential roads most drivers travel at well below the 30mph limit, and those reckless drivers who do not continue to drive recklessly</li> <li>• They can cause an increased hazard for cyclists because vehicles are moving too slowly to allow cyclists to move out to change lane or turn right</li> <li>• Driving below 20mph increases harmful emissions per unit of road length. In the long run this will probably cause more damage to health and life than the supposed benefits from reduced accidents</li> <li>• the only situation in which I can see a justification for 20mph limits is on main roads in the immediate vicinity of schools with lights operating [just] at the start and end of school days in conjunction</li> </ul>

	<p>with flashing yellow lights</p> <p>A much better improvement in road safety would be achieved in the Crosspool area by improvements to the roads themselves, for example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic lights at the Lydgate Lane/Manchester Road junction with filters for pedestrians/cyclists</li> <li>• construction of an inset parking bay for buses along the Tapton School playing fields on Manchester Road, preferably of sufficient size to accommodate several buses; more ambitiously, widening of Manchester Road at this point so that a similar inset bus bay could be created on the other side of the road</li> <li>• operational speed cameras on Manchester Road</li> <li>• construction of a footpath at least 1m wide alongside the allotments down Back Lane</li> <li>• removal of fallen leaves from footpaths and roadsides along the main roads</li> <li>• restriction of parking along the top of Carsick Hill Road and its junction with Ivy Park Road</li> <li>• no parking on Manchester Road outside Stephen Hill Methodist Church</li> <li>• a ban on parking on and driving onto pavements</li> <li>• more gritting in the winter</li> <li>• more school crossing patrols</li> </ul>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p>I hereby formally object to the proposed 20mph speed limit area in Crosspool. The current 30mph limit should be enforced more rigorously rather than forcing all drivers to drive at a snails pace. If you can provide any evidence of accidents in the area to back up your proposal and claims then I would be happy to reconsider my objection. I do agree with the Part time limit of 20mph at Lydgate Infant School.</p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p>I live on Cairns Road in Crosspool and am writing to register an objection to the proposed Crosspool 20mph speed limit.</p> <p>I feel that the extent of the area included in this proposal is absolutely unnecessary. Possibly a part time limit around the entrance to Lydgate First school may be a good idea.</p> <p>It would be far better to spend the money on campaigns to persuade parents from using the car to take and collect pupils to and from school, and to provide much better public transport links in Crosspool.</p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p>I am writing to register my formal objection to the planned 20 mph speed limits in parts of Crosspool.</p> <p>The plan is for the majority of minor side roads in Crosspool to have this new speed limit.</p> <p>In the first instance, the majority of these side roads have lots of parked cars on them and are of relatively short length, so it is highly unlikely that you can even attain the 30 mph speed limit. And I am not using this as an argument to lower the speed limit.</p>

	<p>When was the 30 mph speed limit actually set? I suspect it is many decades ago, and this speed limit has worked perfectly fine for these many decades.</p> <p>The quoted 3 main reasons for lowering the speed limit are:  lower speeds reduce the severity of injuries for anyone involved in collisions  Some collisions will be avoid all together  People are more likely to feel safe when walking and cycling</p> <p>These 3 reasons seem to be 'nanny state' or 'big brother state', or specifically in this case 'Sheffield Council State' pursuing an ever increasing risk free world.  Human life will always involve risks, to try and obtain a risk free world is to try and get blood out of a stone - it will never happen.</p> <p>You may argue that the number of occurrences of accidents has increased. I suspect this is purely down to the increased population in Crosspool.  The likelihood of the occurrence is the same, but due to the increased numbers of people the frequency increases.</p> <p>If you wish to lower the speed limit 'to reduce the severity of injury', why not reduce it to 1 mph? Or better yet, lets remove motor vehicles from our roads?  I would put it to you that the majority population of Crosspool drive at a speed appropriate for the road and the road conditions, and within the speed limit.</p> <p>The 3rd reason is purely subjective. Different individuals, may or may not feel safe depending on many things that are occurring in their immediate environment.  I would point out that pedestrians should be on the pavement, and motorist do not drive on the pavement. So pedestrian should generally feel safe irrespective of the speed of the car on the road.</p> <p>I believe people should be given the opportunity, freedom, respect and right to act as the responsible vehicle drivers that they are, rather than continual, ever increasing minor diktats issued by Sheffield council.</p> <p>I do not want my children and grandchildren to live in a future Sheffield where they can do nothing because, on the grounds of health and safety, freedom had been completely removed from them in the pursuit of zero risk.</p>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed 20mph speed limit for the Crosspool area as totally unnecessary.</p> <p>I could understand there being a 20mph limit outside a particular school during certain times but not a 20mph blanket limit across the area which is not justified..</p>

<p><b>7</b></p>	<p>I am writing to register my objection to this proposal for 20mph speed limits in Crosspool. As a local resident who regularly drives and walks around the area and having a young child myself, I do not see the speed of drivers to be an issue as the roads are not wide enough to allow drivers to do more than 20-25mph anyway. As a taxpayer I will be very annoyed if my money is going towards ineffective and unnecessary signs throughout Crosspool.</p> <p>There are issues with driver behaviour around the schools but limiting speed will only make a difference around Lydgate where there is a busy main road. In contrast, the parents driving their children to Tapton and King Edwards schools are creating a hazard by parking illegally on blind corners, in front of driveways and leaving their cars idling (creating a build-up of toxic gases) that is putting the children and local residents at danger during school start and finishing times. However, reducing the speed to 20mph will make absolutely no impact on these issues. It is not possible to drive more than 20mph around these schools anyway due to the roads being particularly narrow here so putting up 20mph signs is a total waste of money and will not make any improvement to our local environment and safety.</p> <p>In particular I take issue with the choice of these measures as the letter provides no research evidence of there being a general speed issue in Crosspool nor provides evidence of the effectiveness of the proposed signs. I would like to know what evidence you have that this is actually an issue (i.e. number of accidents, speeding fines issued in the area etc.)? I would also like to know what evidence you have that this proposal to put up a few signs actually has been proven to reduce accidents and danger?</p> <p>The only part of the proposal that I agree with is the part-time 20mph limit at Lydgate Infant School, however this <b>must</b> be accompanied by legal enforcement; for example, with a speed camera. I understand the financial limitations that the council are under, however there is no point in tokenism and making a change that is not going to be effective. If there is only a small pot of money, then it would be better spent only creating a part-time 20mph limit around Lydgate school and actually backing this up with a speed camera.</p>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p>I have just received a copy of your 20mph plan for the Crosspool area.</p> <p>My comments are as follows :-</p> <p>The plan I received is illegible ( even using a magnifying slide )</p> <p>How can residents comment on a plan that is unreadable . Or is this a deliberate act on your part ?</p> <p>The Council web site does not mention a Crosspool plan or is it hidden under the name of another area.</p>

	<p>Why are you wasting Council tax payers money at this time when everyone is facing extreme rising costs just to survive.</p> <p>The only saving grace is that you are not intending to install speed bumps which increase pollution and damage to vehicles and buildings as you well know.</p> <p>Can you prove how many injuries and accidents will be saved by your 20 mph plans ??</p> <p>You have been elected to help the residents of Sheffield and you should realise this and not attempt to inflict your stupid ideas on the people who pay your wages !</p> <p>The idea of 20mph areas very close to schools is reasonable but you blanket plans fo areas are ridiculous.</p> <p>You should at least have the decency to tell us how much your plans will cost and put it to a referendum vote</p> <p>Cancel these nonsensical plans at once.</p> <p>This is OUR money NOT yours to spend on vanity projects and the like.</p> <p>Some readable plans would be helpful!</p>
<p><b>9</b></p>	<p>I object to this proposal. Instead you could clamp down on the selfish school people causing obstruction of school roads including darwin lane. 30mph limit is fine. Its the selfish school people parking across my driveway and blocking me in i object to.</p>
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p>I would like to voice my opinion to the proposed works which I assume will come at a considerable cost to the council tax payers of this city.</p> <p>Could you please stop wasting public funds on things that don't need doing. The majority of roads in Crosspool are so cluttered with double parked vehicles that it is already impossible to do 20mph never mind exceed that speed, if there are accident hot spots then concentrate your efforts in the immediate vicinity and not the entire area.</p> <p>The last time your department put its mind to making Crosspool safer it resulted in the installation of the most dangerous zebra crossing in Sheffield. The crossing at the junction of watt lane and sandygate road is deadly for pedestrians because when a van pulls up to the junction pedestrians have to walk out behind it and the cars coming off sandygate road can not see them until they are in the middle of the road.</p> <p>I also note in your letter that you state that funding from central government has been cut but yet you still found funds to redesign the</p>

	<p>broomhill shopping centre so there is now no parking available. You also found the funds to make the transport corridor from the east end of Sheffield to hillsborough a single lane while converting the other lane in to a cycle lane which was hardly ever used and at the same time stranding emergency vehicles, the whole scheme caused gridlock for weeks until it was abandoned. There was already an existing cycle lane for that route so why your department threw tens of thousands of pounds at this folly then had to pay again to remove it is incomprehensible.</p> <p>Please stop wasting huge amounts of money on ridiculous projects and use the funds for improving the services which really require funding like social care and education, even this public consultation must have cost a fortune but it could turn out to be money well spent if it stops your department wasting more money on daft schemes.</p> <p>As for the Crosspool project, it isn't broken so it doesn't need fixing, when many families are struggling with their day to day finances it really is annoying when the local authority seems intent on wasting money, please stop.</p>
<b>11</b>	<p>I am writing to object to the extension of a 20mph area in Crosspool as per letter issued on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022.</p> <p>Recently the Highway Code has been changed to give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. I do not believe increasing 20mph areas is necessary with all the changes.</p> <p>In addition, Crosspool streets are narrow, with loads of cars parked on the pavement and on the roads. Sometimes it is not even practical to drive even at 20mph without causing accidents with other vehicles.</p> <p>Therefore, I strongly object to any extension of 20mph areas in Crosspool area.</p>
<b>12</b>	<p>My wife and I object to you proposals of 3<sup>rd</sup> Feb 2022. We have lived at our address for a few months less than 40 years and cannot recall an incident when the 30mph limit has been abused. When our children were young and played safely on the road a car travelling on the road was inconvenient to them. Our grandchildren will now use the local park instead. As a former sixth form college chemistry and physics teacher at at A level I suspect that reducing car speeds will increase local carbon dioxide. Obviously, car idling in traffic ques during rush hours wouldn't change. Calculations could be made. As a careful and very experienced car driver I am pleased you have no intention of placing speed humps. We endorse your considerations to safe walking. The pavements I have always found safe. I do a lot of local walking. We would recommend you divert the funds you would save on signage to providing either lollipop assisted crossing outside Lydgate School (is there no longer one) or on permanent traffic lights (as there is for the junior school). We believe this will be well spent City Council Money.</p>

<p><b>13</b></p>	<p>I would like to object to your proposed measured for the following reasons:</p> <p>It is an additional expense added to council tax at a time the council should be saving money not spending more</p> <p>No data is available to support any increased safety aspect</p> <p>As a point of interest orange speed bumps on Crookes seem to have decreased safety as a number of elderly residents treat them as crossing points</p>
<p><b>14</b></p>	<p>We received this today. You have a temporary reduction to speed limits on Lydgate Lane during school drop off and pick up.</p> <p>Why hasn't this been applied to the stretch of Manchester Road which has exits for Lydgate Juniors, Tipton and King Edwards?</p> <p>The pavement is very narrow and gets full very quickly. I've been pushed into the road accidentally several times.</p> <p>Whilst the rest of the stuff is helpful, this is what is really needed: A20mph zone from Tesco to the end of Lydgate ending after Shore Lane.</p> <p>The road is so busy, the pavements really narrow and there's always so many children everywhere. It needs speed reductions between 7.45-9am and 2.45- 4.00.</p> <p>All the rest of the stuff is helpful, but there's no change to the most dangerous road in the area.</p> <p>he more I look at your map the more I think you've failed to take any action in the most dangerous areas.</p> <p>Manchester Road outside the schools and Tesco, the bottom of Lydgate Lane where people have been killed in the past, Lydgate Lane at the junction with Cross Lane.</p> <p>20 mph on the side roads won't have much effect. It's these areas where it needs action. You've prioritised side roads over dangerous main roads.</p> <p>The issue is the busy dangerous roads. Putting a 20mph on Ringstrad Crescent, isn't going to slow down or make the traffic less dangerous in Manchester Road.</p> <p>It seems a pointless exercise in its current format</p>

This page is intentionally left blank