

Objections

1.	<p>My wife and I are writing to object to the proposed introduction of a blanket 20mph speed limit in our area (and all the other areas shown on the website).</p> <p>There has been no public vote on this and although you have contacted us as a form of consultation, I feel that we are facing a fait accompli as far as the introduction goes. Everyone I've spoken to in our area thinks it is a totally ridiculous proposal. We have already received a leaflet through our door from the Green party urging us to insist for the addition of Crimicar Lane and Fulwood Road "In the new 20mph area". It's their usual anti-motorist stance which has already killed the city centre and now they want to expand their campaign to the suburbs. To suggest that we drive at 20mph along Fulwood Road demonstrates that they must live in a parallel universe. The emissions created by a car driving in a lower gear at this speed will be higher than that produced at 30mph in an appropriate gear.</p> <p>"Lower speeds help make neighbourhoods safer".....the Fulwood/Lodge Moor/Ranmoor roads are already safe. My wife and I don't feel at all unsafe when walking around the areas now with the current limits.....you paint a picture of cars racing around Fulwood creating death and mayhem. The majority of road traffic accidents and collisions in our area have nothing to do with excess speed, more to do with human error, incompetence and undue care. Crashmap.co.uk shows various crashes in the area, mainly at road junctions with very few as a direct result of excess speed. The ones involving serious injury are generally due to alcohol, or hooligan driving. Neither of these types of driver are likely to have heeded a 20mph speed limit anyway.</p> <p>We have no problem with 20mph zones in the vicinity of schools....drivers should already drive with care and attention in high pedestrian density areas....and in my experience generally do.</p> <p>My wife and I have each got over 40 years driving experience and drive sensibly at a speed commensurate with road conditions. Sometimes in areas with lots of parked cars, high numbers of pedestrians 20mph may be too fast. We object to being treat like mindless hooligans who need to be directed by a blanket limit. In current times there are too many people who see danger everywhere and wish to impose their minority views on all of us.</p> <p>I have to drive to Darnall to my place of work and go out during the day to visit suppliers and customers (Green party take note....we can't all work from home....and no, I won't be using my bike). The effect on the UK's productivity, which is already very low, would be decimated if every council imposed these limits. We need a dynamic transport system to help the country grow and generate the tax revenues that pay for council departments to spend. Slowing everything down doesn't help those of us who create the wealth to succeed. We may as well live in caves and use horses and carts to get around. The council department roads budgets would be better used repairing potholes which pose a far greater risk due to vehicle damage and risk to cyclists than littering the areas with 20mph signs.</p>
----	---

	<p>Enforcement of these 20mph zones will no doubt become the responsibility of our already hard pressed police forces. The public resentment which would ensue would only reduce the respect for the police which is already at a low point. I will continue to drive at a speed which is commensurate with the circumstances and take my chance with the potential speeding ticket.</p>
2.	<p>In response to your letter dated 02/11/2023, I wish to add my views to SCC Strategic Transport Proposed 20mph Speed Limit in Fulwood.</p> <p>Whilst I support any moves to reduce the speed limit around schools in the area, I note that Nether Green Juniors is completely overlooked with Fulwood Road 'Out of the planned zoning' altogether. This is a bad oversight, particularly outside a very busy junior school with many hazards I can identify.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bus Alighting/Stop right outside the school gates. 2. Buses coming from the opposite direction. 3. Public House Car Park 'Traffic' Entering & Exiting next door. 4. Petrol Station traffic entering & exiting both sides next to pub. There is busy footfall around here particularly @ peak times & extremely busy traffic. 5. Traffic turning left on Nethergreen road onto Fulwood Road 6. Vehicles turning & entering & exiting Tom Lane onto & Off Fulwood Road. & yet there is no reduction in speed limit here? <p>This is utter madness & needs addressing to protect the children @ the school & pedestrians & other vehicle users.</p> <p>Slayleigh Lane. Top to bottom is currently 30mph with your plan to reduce to 20mph. This is not going to have any effect as vehicles come down from Hallam Grange Road doing 40 mph + down the road. To even remain @ a steady 20 mph on a descent, a driver would need to be breaking, Top to Bottom. Those drivers that stick to 30mph or under will continue to do so. Those that don't will also continue to do so.</p> <p>Questions</p> <p>Who is going to police 20 mph? Traffic Cameras? The Police? Will fines be issued? <u>Are you planning on erecting 20mph signs with NO enforcement?</u></p> <p><u>Check your speed flashing policeman showing your speed might be a good idea on this stretch as I think they are effective, in at least jogging drivers awareness to check their speed.</u></p> <p>I support the proposal specifically around school buildings, but I object to the 20mph reduction on Slayleigh Lane, for the reasons stated above. Fulwood Road, itself needs to be reduced to 20 mph around the schools.</p>
3.	<p>I am writing this email as an objection to Sheffield City Council's proposed 20mph speed restriction for the Fulwood area.</p> <p>The reasons for my objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your letter states that by reducing the speed limit down to 20mph will make our neighbourhood a safer place for all in particular children. As a resident who lives very close to Hallam Primary School, I have to point out that the majority of school children are dropped off and collected by their parents each day in vehicles, which causes congestion at the end of our road which is a cul-de-sac off

	<p>a cul-de-sac. I therefore think that Sheffield City Council have got their facts totally wrong as children do not walk to and from school as I did, but are chauffeured by their parents. Therefore, if you wish to encourage children to walk to school perhaps it would be a more sensible approach to make it more difficult for parents to drop off and pick up their children in cars and persuade them to walk. This would reduce the number of vehicles in the area and ease congestion at the end of our roads. Therefore reducing the number of cars parked which causes the end of my road to be congested twice a day during term time. Reducing the speed limit to 20mph will not solve this problem. Neither will putting double yellow lines at the end of the roads as this will just make parents park further down our very small road.</p> <p>2. As a resident for nearly 11 1/2 years I would like to know how many serious accidents there has been involving pedestrians and vehicles during this time. I am not aware of any instances where a serious collision has taken place nor of anyone suffering serious injury.</p> <p>3. I have noted on the map you have provided that Fulwood Road and Crimicar Lane are not within the 20 mph zones, but will remain 30 mph. This obviously coincides with these roads being part of the bus routes for the 120 and 83a buses. You will also be aware that there are indeed schools and nursery's on these roads. If Sheffield City Council are making the case that 20mph speed zones are required to make 'neighbourhoods safer, more pleasant places for all, particularly children' why have these roads been omitted from the plan? If you drive along these roads you will see more people walking and cycling on these routes than any other roads in the S10 area including University students walking to lectures. So I would like to know why these busy roads have been left out of the plan? Or do Sheffield City Council not want these pedestrians to feel safe whilst walking or cycling?</p> <p>4. This appears to me that it's the councils way of trying to eradicate car usage in the S10 area. Fulwood is a very hilly area and anyone who has ever tried to walk and cycle these roads can only do so if you are very fit. If you drive around Fulwood during the day, you will be very lucky to see anyone walking or cycling or indeed in their cars. It is one of the quietest areas in Sheffield.</p> <p>Why has Sheffield City Council singled out S10 for this scheme? Does S17 or S11 not have schools and areas that people need to feel safe walking and cycling?</p> <p>5. The emissions that cars will expel will be greater at lower speeds as cars will not get out of 2nd gear especially when climbing the hills. This surely will cause more pollution for those people who want to walk and cycle especially children.</p> <p>I strongly object as this is an ill thought out plan which is full of contradictions.</p>
4.	<p>I write to object to this on the grounds of practicality and cost.</p> <p>Practicality I live on Brooklands Avenue which is a steep hill. Trying to get up this hill whilst driving at 20 mph is difficult. The situation is worse in winter when snow and ice are present as it is difficult enough then to drive up the hill. You do need to have a bit of a run at the hill up to 30 mph to successfully get up it.</p> <p>Other areas of Fulwood are hilly and will be similarly affected. It is very difficult to drive at 20 mph in a modern car and I say this with mine being just a 1 litre car.</p>

	<p>Your attention is drawn to the speedometer trying to get the speed down to 20mph and is therefore taken away from looking out for hazards such as children running into the road.</p> <p>Cost My understanding with a sign-only 20 mph area is that this is not legally enforceable. Why therefore waste the costs involved in putting up the signage when many councils are struggling financially and in risk of bankruptcy?</p> <p>The only sensible thing about the 20mph proposal was that the main roads (Fulwood Road and Crimicar Lane) were left with the 30mph limit. Limiting these down to 20mph would have impacted public as well as private transport. These are the main arteries for buses into and out of Fulwood. Crimicar Lane is a steep, winding road with lots of parked vehicles. The comments I sent earlier about driving at 20mph drawing your attention from the road to the speedometer would very much apply on this road increasing chances of hitting a stationary car or running over a child or animal that runs into the road from behind a parked vehicle. People's attention need to be kept firmly on the road in these circumstances.</p> <p>I have added this additional comment since I have in the last few days received a flyer from the Green Party asking people to request, in defiance of common sense, inclusion of these two roads into the 20mph speed limit proposal.</p>
5.	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the proposed 20mph Speed Limit Area in Fulwood.</p> <p>The main reason is, this area is already experiencing very heavy traffic, especially during the hours of school run, when parents rush to drop off their children at school and then continue to drive to work and get their workplace in time.</p> <p>The proposed 20mph Speed Limit Area in Fulwood will slow down the traffic during rush hours over the whole area and reduce the capacity of the roads, which will significantly increase the stress for parent drivers and cause more road accidents given the even higher stress level experienced by the drivers.</p>
6.	<p>Thank you for your letter proposing a 20mph speed limit in Fulwood. I do feel that the proposed new speed limit covers a larger area than required. A 20mph speed limit for school roads is a good idea, however I feel that such an extended area of 20mph that you are proposing is unnecessary. I'm not aware of frequent accidents in the area to support this significant change to surrounding roads. I would therefore like to object to your proposal and feel that the money needed to introduce this change would be better spent in repairing the many potholes on Sheffield's roads.</p>
7.	<p>I am a resident, parent and grandparent. I use Fulwood roads both as a driver and pedestrian. Any legislation should strike a reasonable balance if it is to have the support of users including those we seek to attract to our city whether residential or business. I find your proposals do not meet this criterion so object to them.</p> <p>My suggestion would be that you adopt flashing lights in the vicinity of the 3 schools as you have done on Ringinglow Road (when flashing the speed limit becomes 20mph). This enables traffic to move efficiently but alerts drivers to take care and reduce speed when children are arriving at or leaving school.</p>

8.	<p>Thank you for your letter proposing a 20mph speed limit in Fulwood. I do feel that the proposed new speed limit covers a larger area than required. A 20mph speed limit for school roads is a good idea, however I feel that such an extended area of 20mph that you are proposing is unnecessary. I'm not aware of frequent accidents in the area to support this significant change to surrounding roads. I would therefore like to object to your proposal and feel that the money needed to introduce this change would be better spent in repairing the many potholes on Sheffield's roads.</p>
9.	<p>I have some comments about the proposed 20mph zone in Fulwood, Sheffield.</p> <p>The scheme is clearly ill-thought out and not based on facts firstly because the Fulwood Greens tells me that most of the serious and fatal road accidents in the last 24 years have happened on Fulwood Road and not on the other roads in Fulwood that you propose to include in your 20mph scheme with no thought of Fulwood Road. This is not an excuse to just include Fulwood Road with all the current roads in the 20 mph plans, or even extend to other roads such as Crimicar Lane. Instead you should be focussing on actual issues that make a difference instead of a big headline scheme that delivers a lot more inconvenience than safety to local residents. Just because 20mph zones are the current trend, it does not mean they are automatically suitable for whole areas. Your proposal has not looked at each road in the area and given a reason for making that road 20mph. The roads in the area are so different that a 20mph zone is not suitable for all of them, but you have lumped them all together without proper thought. This is simply not right.</p> <p>Some roads in the area need proper improvement, such as Slayleigh Lane. Despite being a route to the schools and having two sports centres on it, the road does not have a footpath that goes all the way up one side of the road without interruption. If you want to walk on a path all the way up or down the road you have to cross over part way, potentially putting yourself in the path of traffic without a pedestrian crossing. The natural place to cross at the ends of the footpaths is where the road bends and visibility is obstructed by a white cottage next to the road. This situation is totally unnecessary because there is a lot of grass verge along the road so it would be easy to make a footpath that goes all the way up and down just one side. Additionally, the top and bottom of the road need proper crossings for pedestrians because it is a well used road and a well used walking route to and from the schools. A specific crossing would stop cars to allow pedestrians to safely cross, but a 20mph zone at the top of the road does not actually stop cars to allow pedestrians to cross safely. You have not included these obvious safety improvements in your plans, showing that you have not properly thought out the safety proposals you are making.</p> <p>Other roads in the area need no improvement, such as Hallamshire Road. It has footpaths along both sides with one side having a very large grass verge that keeps pedestrians well away from the road. It does not need to be limited to 20mph, as it is a better than average residential road, so the current nationally recognised residential 30mph limit is appropriate. You have not put forward any specific arguments why a road like this needs to have its speed limit reduced, showing again that you have not properly thought out the safety proposals you are making.</p>

Parking is the main problem near Hallam Primary School and this means the junctions for Hallam Grange Rise, Hallam Grange Road and Hallam Grange Crescent need parking restrictions. There may also be a case for a 20mph limit on those three roads only, as they are the ones predominately used for school parking and where the greatest concentration of pedestrians will be, but not any of the other roads in Fulwood as it gives little or no benefit for a few minutes twice a day (see above statistics for Fulwood Greens) at the expense of inconveniencing residents every hour of every day.

At least two other roads need additional work to make them safe, if you are serious about improving safety in the area rather than inconveniencing residents with a blanket approach that is clearly not relevant for the whole area. If you actually look at the whole area properly and objectively, you may find other specific areas that do actually need improvement.

One road is Barncliffe Road. The junction nearest Hallamshire Road may need a pedestrian crossing. Although it is a relatively safe route because it is a straight road with grassed areas next to the pavement, it can have a number of people crossing the bottom of Barncliffe road on the way to school. So a crossing may benefit pedestrians by making cars and buses actually give way to pedestrians, which would not automatically happen with the alternative 20mh zone proposal. However Barncliffe road as a whole is a through route and a bus route so it should be kept at 30mph to keep traffic moving and avoid inconveniencing drivers and people using the buses. Another way of improving safety on Barncliffe Road is to restrict parking half way along on the brow of the hill. Cars parked on one side of the road allow traffic to keep moving but where cars are parked on both sides of the road on the brow of the hill, cars have difficulty seeing what is coming and someone has to give way at short notice. This should be dealt with appropriate restrictions on that small part of the road only, and not an inappropriate restriction for the whole road.

Another area is the Redmires Road bus stop at the top of Hallam Grange Road which is used by school children as well as local residents. Cars turning out of Hallam Grange Road onto Redmires Road have their view obscured by buses at the bus stop as well as the brow of the hill. This is a dangerous situation but has not been considered in the safety proposal. MOVE the bus stop away from the junction. It is common sense and there are a lot of grassed verges further along the road that could be used for the bus stop instead. It is pointless claiming to make Fulwood safer, particularly near a school, and then leave a dangerous situation at the edge of the area just because it is at the edge of the area. The people going to the school use that junction as well as other roads near the school so they should all be made safe and not just the easy ones.

You have made a proposal for a blanket approach that is simply not appropriate. It was easy for you to make the blanket proposal as it is the least amount of work, and it will be easy for some people to agree to a blanket approach because they know some parts could be improved but are not aware that it is possible to just address the areas that need improving in a number of different ways because you have not identified specific areas that need improvement and given options and reasons why. This is unfair. Your written notification just gives the reason for the scheme as being

	<p>lower speeds make the area safer. This is an unfair assertion firstly because the nationally recognised safe speed limit in residential areas is 30mph and you have not given any specific reasons why this whole area should be treated differently.</p> <p>Secondly, the proposed improvements to footpaths, crossings and bus stop locations I have identified will do more to improve safety by keeping pedestrians safely on footpaths, stopping traffic completely when people cross roads, and improve visibility for traffic at junctions. They will give real results in safety both in practical terms and visual messages that this is a residential area with priorities for pedestrians, but you have not even thought about these. Your plans clearly need more work as a simple blanket approach without proper consideration and thought does not really help anyone. The people of Sheffield deserve better than that.</p> <p>So, please use common sense, previous accident statistics, specific information about the make up of individual roads, and the specific experiences of Fulwood residents to make Fulwood safer, rather than just one big mess that has come about due to a one size fits all idea that is not appropriate for the whole area.</p>
<p>10. 3x</p>	<p>I write to raise objections to the proposed 20mph speed limit area in Fulwood.</p> <p>There is no need for this reduced speed limits, it is simply part of Sheffield City Council's continued fight against cars and aim to make the residents of Sheffield's lives more difficult.</p> <p>You are trying to encourage people to use public transport, if that transport is even slower than it currently runs, this will only serve to discourage use of public transport.</p> <p>The proposed size of the area is entirely disproportionate to your aim. Reducing the speed limit to areas only surrounding schools is entirely understandable and I would support. But a wide spread 20mph zone is entirely unnecessary and unenforceable.</p> <p>You state you wish to encourage people to walk and cycle more. The main road in and out of lodge moor and Fulwood is Fulwood road, which rightly remains outside the proposed 20mph limit. Therefore, your plan will most likely have no impact. Furthermore, one of the main reasons cycling is a less frequent mode of transport for a lot of people is the fact Fulwood and Lodge Moor involve a significant amount of hills. A factor the Council seem to conveniently forget.</p> <p>You say the reason for this proposal is to make neighbourhoods safer but provide no evidence to support this rationale. Under the Freedom of Information Act please provide the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many accidents within the proposed speed reduction zone which resulted in injuries have occurred within the last 12 months. 2. How many reported collisions within the proposed speed reduction zone that have occurred within the last 12 months. 3. Data showing people are not walking or cycling due to safety concerns within the proposed speed reduction zone. 4. All data which the council uses to support the implementation of the 20mph speed reduction zone. 5. Estimated cost of implementing the speed reduction zone.

	<p>6. All internal emails, letters, memos and meeting notes in which this proposal was discussed and decided upon.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving the above information which I presume the council holds to support this proposal.</p> <p>Can I please ask that you hold in person meeting to discuss these proposals also. It would be useful for face to face meetings to discuss the proposals and understand your reasoning, which besides generic sweeping statements are lacking in your letter.</p>
11.	<p>I write to object to the 20 mph speed limit proposal for the Fulwood area. The proposal includes no supporting evidence of the problems that the reduced speed limit is intended to address.</p> <p>There is no indication of how its effectiveness will be measured. Small roads coupled with daytime parking means vehicles are already moving at reduced speeds naturally. Spending on signage to achieve what is already in place seems a poor use of scarce Council resources.</p>
12.	<p>With reference to your letter dated 2.11.2023, I write to oppose the suggestion of a 20mph limit throughout the Fulwood area.</p> <p>In the immediate vicinity of schools, I am in full support of a 20mph limit (though preferably only during school hours), but a blanket coverage of the entire area is completely over the top and unnecessary.</p> <p>I'm not sure what the statistics are for pedestrians or cyclists injured by vehicles in the proposed area are, but I haven't personally heard of any incidents in my time living here.</p> <p>The costs of implementing this new limit will not be small, I imagine, and I strongly feel that these funds could be better spent elsewhere in the city.</p>
13. X2	<p>I would like to express my opposition to the proposed blanket 20mph speed limit in Fulwood.</p> <p>While much in favour of this limit outside schools and hospitals, I do not think they are helpful or necessary throughout an entire neighbourhood. A recent study by the Department for Transport found no evidence of a significant drop in the number of crashes and casualties after the introduction of 20mph.</p> <p>As the Transport Secretary said, putting in place "blanket" 20mph speed limits means drivers are less likely to slow down on roads where there is a school or children are playing. He said widespread use of a 20mph limit "damages the ability" for the zones to have an impact on roads where a lower speed is required for safety reasons because drivers are "less likely to comply"</p>
14.	<p>We cannot support the new speed limit because it will only be effective if it is policed properly and the 20 mph limit enforced. We never see police around Fulwood so there is little likelihood that resources will be available to enforce the limit.</p>

15.	<p>I would like to strongly oppose any plans to impose a 20mph limit on Redmires Road or Sandygate Road. I think this is unnecessary and would lead to more congestion, frustration and accidents. I would be happy for a 30mph limit to be imposed on the stretch of Redmires Road north of Hallam School (currently 40mph).</p> <p>I would be happy for a 20mph limit to be imposed on side roads in and around schools, which is reasonable and should help safety.</p>
16.	<p>Thank you for sending me details of the council's proposed 20 mph zone in and around Fulwood. This e-mail is to register my objection to the proposal.</p> <p>First, I object to the lack of concern shown up to now by the Council for the views of local residents. I cannot recall seeing these substantial measures mentioned in candidates' manifestos in recent local elections. (It may be that the proposals have been discussed at a local area committee, but that is no substitute for proper democratic accountability.)</p> <p>The obvious solution for the present proposals would be to have a referendum in the area affected, as was done recently in Ilkley. (Ilkley residents voted against imposing a general 20 mph zone by a majority of about 3 to 1.) At least, having a referendum might provoke a proper discussion of the pros and cons of the idea.</p> <p>Basically, when speed limits were first introduced, it was considered that 30 mph was a reasonable maximum speed in a built-up area. Since then, of course, car brake technology has advanced greatly, so just maintaining the 30 mph limit means that roads are much safer than in earlier times.</p> <p>The present proposals are justified by the assertion, probably true, that there will be fewer accidents at lower speeds. No doubt there would be even fewer at 10 mph, or 5 mph. Clearly, a balance needs to be struck and to get that right requires careful thought, based on data. Unfortunately, no figures are given in the Council's letter for the number of accidents happening at present in the area covered by the proposed restriction zone (I suspect that it is quite low). Nor is there any consideration of less drastic ideas. For example, a 20 mph limit just near schools and around the starting and finishing times. (There is also the question of how to get motorists to concentrate on the road rather than their speedometers, otherwise a 20 mph limit could even lead to more accidents.)</p> <p>A referendum might force the Council to think again about whether this draconian restriction is worthwhile. I hope that they will think again anyway.</p>
17.	<p>I have received notification of the intention to reduce the speed limit in Fulwood to 20 mph.</p> <p>There is no justification for such a reduction and I refer you to the lack of evidence that this will bring any benefits to residents, pedestrians, schools or businesses in the area. According to South Yorkshire police data there have been no accidents of any note this year and only a handful of slight accidents (5) in the area you propose over the past 5 years. Zero fatalities. Zero serious injuries.</p> <p>This is simply a waste of public money and I object to money you are spending whilst increasing council tax and the way you are arbitrarily implementing this change.</p>

	<p>This will adversely impact on the length of time it takes commuters to go through the area, particularly those on buses and you have provided no evidence or justification for this change. If you want to make a real change, then reduce Hallamshire Road to 30mph that goes past the golf course and towards Lodge Moor - and save some money. Total waste of time and money.</p>
18.	<p>I/we object to the proposed 20 mph speed limit being introduced in the Fulwood area.</p> <p>The proposed 20 mph limit is totally unnecessary in this area.</p> <p>Traffic speed is already restricted in built up areas due to cars parking on both sides of the road and volume of traffic at busy times, and as far as we are aware the current 30 mph has not led to any accidents that could be avoided with a 20 mph limit,</p> <p>Cars are not designed to crawl around at such a low speed when it is not necessary - they use more fuel in lower gears and in effect this causes more wear and tear on car engines. Fulwood, along with a lot of areas of Sheffield, is very hilly. Residents especially the older generation and commuters need to get to their destination by car. Public transport is good for travel to the city centre but to get anywhere else a car is needed. Walking is not an option for many people due to the hilly nature of the area. Many journeys are impossibly long by bus and do not take you to where you have to go. We feel that this policy is an attack on car usage and an abuse of power.</p> <p>A better plan to make cycling safer would be to regularly check roads for pot holes.</p> <p>and clean the streets of debris and leaves that makes cycling more hazardous.</p> <p>Likewise pavements can be made safer in the same way. We agree with 20 mph limits near schools to safeguard children when it is their starting and leaving times. The council tax money could be better spent on road improvement projects.</p>
19.	<p>As a resident of the area, I am against the 20mph limit for the following reasons- I feel strongly that the area marked is far bigger than necessary, really a ' sledgehammer to crack a nut.' I feel it is unfair to impose such a limit over a large area on early morning and evening traffic when the limit is mostly to benefit the schools in the area. This is a valid consideration as Nether Green and Hallam schools are both on busy roads, but it is a very sweeping move to have the restriction apply at all times. Why can a limit not be enforced in the vicinity of the schools at morning and afternoon start and finish times, and not 24/7? A Clearway is in operation on many roads at busy times, but not all day/every day. This seems to be strictly observed as it is considered reasonable. A blanket limit is not reasonable.</p> <p>I hope these points will be taken into consideration.</p>
20.	<p><u>Proposed 20mph area Fulwood – Objection</u></p> <p>Thank you for the recent letter advising of a proposal to designate much of Fulwood to a 20 mph area.</p> <p>Please record my objection to the proposal on the following grounds:-</p> <p>Emissions will increase: While vehicle speed reduction will reduce emission generation, the reduction emission output from a 10mph reduction of a low speed will be small, whereas the increase in duration of journey will be 50%. Furthermore, congestion is likely to increase, so total amount of airborne pollutants if road use remains constant must go up, probably by about 40%.</p>

	<p>Emergency Service Access may be impeded: Congestion is a recognised consequence of 20mph zones. (see comments about Wales) and it is foreseeable that some emergency service journeys will be impeded if congestion increases. This could lead to loss of life. The absence of congestion mitigation measures in the proposal increases the likelihood that congestion will increase.</p> <p>Negative impact on small local business: Journey time is a significant factor in shopping decisions. Reducing road speed from 30mph to 20mph increases all journey times in the zone by 50% even where no congestion follows. It is foreseeable that small businesses in the area, particularly local shops, will be adversely affected. The loss of local shops of course would be inconvenient for non-drivers, and require residents to travel out of area more often, the opposite of a desired decrease in road use.</p> <p>Negative impact on our culture of freedom and respect for law: Long established principles of allowing UK residents to choose their lifestyle, combined with an expectation that where laws are made, those restrictions to freedom are absolutely necessary, are increasing eroded by prescriptive rules, sometimes championed by disproportionately small sections of society. The need for 20mph zones is controversial, but will have significant impact on residents and users of Fulwood. There will be people who disregard the 20mph limit, eroding respect for law generally. (for an extreme example, the consequences of US prohibition are well documented) Furthermore, for freedoms in society to be robust, it needs to be clear that restrictions are only in place when the need is over-riding, which is not established with 20mph zones.</p> <p>Reduction in accident rates is not guaranteed: I write as a qualified H&S practitioner, and am keen to support road safety measures. I recognise the wealth of data that indicates within 20mph zones there can be measurable reductions in accident frequency. There are also areas where there has been no measurable change recorded, and in some cases the reduction has been attributed to big changes in traffic volume – in other words all the risk went somewhere else, which is not the same as overall accident reduction. I have not yet seen a robust rationale for such accident rate reduction in Fulwood as a consequence of implementing a new zone. For example, the few serious accidents in our area that I am aware of were all associated with grossly excessive speed, the perpetrators were not observing the limits already in place. The new zone would have no impact on those cases.</p> <p>In conclusion, my view is that the proposed zone would definitely increase emissions and significantly inconvenience residents and users. It may also cause reductions in economic activity and contribute to erosion of respect for law. In return there is a hoped-for (but not explained) reduction in accident rates.</p> <p>All right-thinking people want to prevent injury and loss of life, but in a free and risky world we also must accept that effective society agrees to tolerate known general risks, and to accept the consequences when the worst happens. (for example, bees stings can be fatal to some 5 people per year, 9 child deaths related to peanuts,(UK data) but we have no initiatives to eradicate bees or ban peanuts) This principle of balance needs to be upheld at local and national government level.</p>
21.	<p>In theory and in the context of public safety, a twenty mile an hour speed limit does make complete sense for certain areas, but taking into consideration human frustration and nature which no law or regulation will change and in practice and</p>

	<p>in reality, a speed limit of twenty mile an hour, again in theory, could undoubtedly cause more unnecessary accidents (quite wrongly!) by overtaking frustrated drivers.</p> <p>For the purpose of this speed restriction proposal I have driven at twenty miles per hour myself and I must say at this speed, it does feel to be at a crawling pace and again to repeat, taking into account human nature, I very much doubt it will be adhered to.</p>
22.	<p>Thanks for sending through the plans for the proposed 20mph zone in Fulwood. I believe that it is unnecessary however, and that there are more important road safety issues in the area.</p> <p>As someone who has lived in the area for a decade, and who regularly walks into the city centre for work, I have never felt unsafe while walking on the pavement. I do feel unsafe on my journey in many other ways however, which are not addressed by the proposed speed limit zone (see below). Given that there are no accompanying proposals to enforce the new speed limit, such as through fixed cameras or average speed zones, then it will most likely be widely ignored as seen in other areas and as a result be a waste of valuable taxpayer money.</p> <p>Likewise, as parents who walk their child to and from Nether Green Infants School each day, we have never felt it unsafe for the children. I am aware that the school is organising a pressure group to have the speed limit extended to Fulwood Road, but this in no way represents the views of all parents. The biggest problem with regards to child safety is parents badly parking vehicles on Stumperlowe Park Road and Fulwood Road, but this has nothing to do with speed. Cyclists speeding and failing to stop at the pelican crossing are also a regular hazard. There may be a case for a time limited 20 mph zone between Nethergreen Infants School and Nethergreen Junior School during morning drop-off and afternoon collection, but there is no need to lower the speed limit during the other 23 hours of the day.</p> <p>Higher priority road safety issues in the area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The double parking along Nethergreen Road, Oakbrook Road, and Rustlings Road makes it difficult and dangerous to drive or cycle along, hinders the good progress of the busses, and is especially dangerous for pedestrians (especially children) to cross as vehicles are often travelling on the wrong side of the road. One side of these roads should be given double yellow lines. - The traffic calming islands on Endcliffe Vale Road actually pitch cars and cyclists headlong against each other and I have seen many near misses. This road is frankly dangerous during rush hour and, ironically, would benefit from an enforced 20 mph zone and zebra crossing points. - The junction of Hangingwater Road, Gladstone Road and Fulwood Road is dangerous to cross for pedestrians given that there is no gap between one set of lights turning red and the other turning green, alongside very regular jumping of the lights by cars and cyclists. I have almost been hit here on several occasions, and a pelican crossing is well overdue. Given that this is a key route to and from the schools in the area it is shocking that a crossing has not been installed already. - The junction of Hangingwater Road and Fulwood Road is too wide. Many drivers turning left onto Fulwood Road do not seem to want to stop at the junction, and so simply accelerate out of the junction ahead of oncoming traffic. Given that this is adjacent to school, such behaviour is dangerous. Narrowing the

	<p>junction so that it is a regular turn, forcing cars to stop, would be a simple remedy.</p>
23.	<p>I bought my current home in Fulwood some 30 years ago, so I know intimately the area to which you are referring.</p> <p>I have never been one to resort to objecting about things (this is in fact my debut) but your proposal for Fulwood is, for both me and my wife, effectively the 'straw that broke the camel's back'. It is the latest in what has sadly developed into a litany of poorly thought through, politically motivated, counterproductive and counterintuitive decisions your grandiosely titled department has made in recent times. The fact that your proposal would affect me personally on a daily basis merely adds piquancy.</p> <p>My attitude to matters such as this is to follow the true meaning of the precautionary principle viz innovations/changes with the potential to cause harm should not be introduced unless compelling, empirical evidence exists to demonstrate very clear net benefits of the change.</p> <p>Your proposal not only fails to do this, it barely even makes an attempt to do so save for a very few generic, weasel words. Is the area a dangerous one...what are the statistics for accidents, fatalities etc and how are these trending? This is just one of many questions that should be asked and answered but your proposal is silent and gives the clear impression that there has been no proper analysis or evidence based analysis. If you contest this view I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Such an analysis should also include the potential harms and downsides of introducing a blanket 20mph limit across the whole area, rather than just (say) around schools, which are very few in number and around which I believe the risks are already well contained. Studies indicate that additional traffic congestion, increased emissions, environmental downsides, increased journey times leading to frustration and poorer driving standards are just some of the harms...with concomitant psychological and mental health impacts. These should be included in the analysis and factored into the assessment.</p> <p>Instead, what we clearly have here is a politically driven decision which seeks to impose your own particular (ideological rather than evidence based) view of the world on the citizens you purport to represent. I find this approach offensive...it is overreach and not what you should be doing.</p> <p>For the above reasons (which are not exhaustive), please treat this email as a strong OBJECTION to your proposal. I can but hope that you will be more respectful of your citizens' contrary views on this occasion than you have been in the recent past, where your approach seems to fly in the face of the fact that you are part of the City Growth department.</p>
24.	<p>I am writing to bring up some concerns over the new plans for the 20mph areas in Fulwood. I think the idea of reducing speeds and risk is strong, and I am supportive, but, looking at the plans, it seems there is a misnomer about both the risk areas and, therefore, the remedy. I have lived in Fulwood for over a decade, walk my dog at different times of the day and have a decent appreciation of the roads cars' speed and where they do not in the area. I also have researched where injuries and fatalities from RTAs have taken place. The issues I have with the scheme are:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cars are rarely travelling fast within the new 20mph zone except on some bits of Slayleigh Lane. Usually, this is during quiet times for pedestrians. • Cars are regularly speeding well in excess of 30mph on Fulwood Road (that is during quiet and bust pedestrian times) • The serious/fatal road traffic accidents have almost all been on Fulwood Road in the last 25 years • You underestimate the schools aspect in your analysis, since, while you mark-up three schools with two requiring travel via Fulwood road on your map, there are a further three schools (Notre Damme, High Storrs, and King Edwards) that school children use Fulwood road to get to. <p>Given this, I can't support the current proposal. It would be far cheaper and more effective to introduce measures to drop the speed of traffic on Fulwood Road on its own than to introduce the new scheme and not include Fulwood Road. The new scheme is not materially reducing risk within the area, and just adds implementation costs and (ugly) signage to areas they are not needed.</p> <p>The only way I could support the scheme is if there were also measures including Fulwood Road, such as extending the new 20mph zone to include it, or implementing measures to force a reduction in traffic speeds.</p>
25.	<p>Dear Madam/Sir, I am writing to express my objections to the proposed 20 mph limitation in Fulwood. Equally, I object changing the speed limit to 20 mph along the Fulwood Road and Crimicar Lane.</p> <p>I see this as a pointless change as in this area usually often you can drive with this speed or even less.</p> <p>Instead, I would like to encourage the Council to concentrate on really important aspects that can make our life better:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - make the bus 120 (FirstBus) more reliable. Currently this service might be possibly the most unreliable service in Sheffield. More reliable bus services would reduce the number of cars on the roads. How is it possible that the Stagecoach buses are always in time? Stagecoach uses hybrid buses that are 1-2 years old, while First is using 12-15 years old buses. Buses are scheduled to arrive every 15 minutes, instead we have to often wait 45 minutes for a bus. This service is completely useless. - resurface the roads in Fulwood, currently the roads are covered with enormous potholes. - increase the green areas
26.	<p>I Think first step should be to make sure drivers are restricted to 30mph as currently lot of drivers go well above 30 mph</p>
27.	<p>I'm responding to your letter dated 2nd November 2023, inviting my feedback about introducing a new 20mph zone in the Fulwood area. Thank you for the opportunity to respond.</p> <p>With my University education not even needed here, and instead just applying common sense, I think it is impossible to understand the true justification of the proposal.</p> <p>What analysis has shown it necessary to slow the traffic down in this entire neighbourhood to 20mph? In the past three years, have there been any significant traffic-related accidents or deaths in this zone? We certainly don't hear about such things around the Crimicar Lane area, so I am very much of the opinion there isn't a proper metric being collected and being used to scientifically derive a proposal that makes sense - it just looks like a brainfart of an idea that</p>

	<p>renders hypothetical advantages we are supposed to buy into, and a good story for the next political newsletter.</p> <p>As it stands, I suspect this proposal is likely raised from the desire of Amey to generate revenue from weak justifications of general improvement to reduce RTA's. I note their map just shows three schools in the area and ignores other sources of RTA risk which I will now disclose.</p> <p>Just "thinking aloud" some points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Already there are speed restrictions of 20mph around schools and rightly so, but why treat differently the roads in the vicinity of private creches and care homes for the elderly? They should have been marked on the map! - It is all very well to put up signs that impose new speed limits, but unless you enforce the penalties, they are ignored and ineffective. - Making an exception of Crimicar lane (30mph) is likely to make drivers prefer that "high speed" route! - We give respect to cyclists more than ever today and I suspect 20mph limits are desired for their benefit. However, I'm puzzled why cyclists don't have to comply with the regulations enforced upon motor vehicle drivers, i.e. cyclists aren't required to permanently display their identification, they aren't required to have insurance, and aren't required to pass any mandatory test of road-user worthiness. IMHO, cyclists generally choose a "vehicle" which makes themselves vulnerable on the road, yet nobody wants to intentionally injure them; We seem to go to great lengths to accommodate them safely on our road networks, to the detriment of everyone else. - I think e-scooters and e-bikes are an increasing real problem for much the same reasons I outline about cyclists, with the additional problem their riders can speed dangerously and interchangeably between road and pavement. The lithium batteries pose great fire risks too. Surely, there is some legislation work to be done to reduce a real risk of injury and to me, this is a more worthy campaign of today! <p>I digress, so back to the 20mph issue in the Fulwood area...</p> <p>Sure, there are drivers that intentionally speed in this area - I have friends at Roper Lane farm who regularly experience cars crashing through their drystone walls. See attached pictures of their most recent experiences. One of my elderly neighbours lost their life at Crosspool by a mid-aged driver failing to see the 30mph limit and her walking out onto the zebra crossing. Truly shocking, several years ago.</p> <p>I think there is a genuine problem of speeding along a well known loop that the boy racers like to take via Sandygate lane, Redmires road, Soughley lane, Brown hills lane, Roper lane, Fulwood Head road, Fulwood lane, and Ringinglow road.</p> <p>This is easily fixed by installing speed humps or cameras in the appropriate locations - I would suggest looking into this if you want to reduce RTA's effectively in the Fulwood/Lodgemoor area.</p>
28.	<p>I was very disappointed when I saw your communication regarding the proposed new 20mph speed limit in the Fulwood area. I have already cancelled planned</p>

	<p>trips to North Wales because of its recent imposition of similar speed limits, and was horrified when I heard that you are considering the same for the Fulwood area.</p> <p>I am a very careful driver and never had any driving penalties for speeding or anything else. I must admit though that I find it very difficult staying below 20mph in areas of Sheffield where that limit applies. I find that I spend a lot of time watching my speedometer, along with watching the road surface to avoid potholes, and consequently can't be giving as much attention as I would otherwise be doing to whatever else is happening on the road and pavements around me. If I stop watching my speedometer for a while, when I then look back my speed has often crept up to 23 or 24 mph and I have to slow down again. I would hate to get a speeding penalty, having never had one in 47 years of driving!</p> <p>When I was brought up in the 60s and 70s we were taught that road and traffic was dangerous, and to be careful and respect it, a lesson which has served me well all my life. Hopefully this lesson is still taught to children. I would worry though that too many 20mph areas could lead to a false sense of security and less urgency regarding safety when walking or playing near roads.</p> <p>Another issue is that, at 20mph or less, cars will never get out of 2nd or 3rd gear so their engines will do more revolutions per mile resulting in more pollution, damaging the local environment as well as long term damage to the planet.</p> <p>Please do not introduce the proposed 20mph limit in the Fulwood area.</p>
29.	<p>I am emailing to register my objection to the proposed introduction of a 20 mph speed limit in Fulwood.</p> <p>The grounds for objection are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Most people in Fulwood drive their children to school judging from the congestion around Hallam Primary School, particularly at the top of Stumperlowe View so it will make little difference to making the area a more pleasant place especially for children. 2) Hardly anyone cycles in Fulwood and when they do the roads are usually quiet and I have never witnessed any incident involving a cyclist in the Fulwood area. 3) Lower speeds will increase emissions from cars thereby decreasing the air quality in the area and raising respiratory disease in children. 4) I cannot remember the last time witnessing a road traffic collision in the Fulwood area. <p>This is a total waste of limited council resources.</p> <p>However, if the Council is to proceed with this unnecessary policy then I hope to see it extended to cover all roads in the Fulwood area to include the bus routes on Fulwood Road and Crimicar Lane. These are the most congested roads and it does not make sense to exclude them.</p>
30.	<p>I am writing to object to the proposal to impose a 20mph speed limit in Fulwood as set out in your letter dated 2 November 2023.</p>

	<p>Whilst it is widely accepted that injuries sustained from an accident being less severe if the speed of the travelling car is slower, I am unsure as to what evidence exists for some collisions being avoided altogether and on what evidential basis the council has for asserting that people will feel safer with slower speed limits.</p> <p>Has the council investigated alternative means of satisfying the three objectives listed such as adding pedestrian crossings to sites where multiple collisions have taken place? Have other solutions indeed been considered at all? Have the reasons for previous collisions in Fulwood been investigated and considered when making these proposals? How many of these collisions would have been avoided say for example one or both parties had not been distracted by mobile phones?</p> <p>It is disappointing that SCC has taken the stance of banning things as a way to alter motorists behaviour instead of taking the more positive approach to educate all road users and pedestrians about using the roads more safely. As a teacher of primary school aged children, it would seem to me that the limited resources available to SCC would be better spent on employing road safety personnel to go into schools and educate children and young people as pedestrians, cyclists and future motorists on the importance of road safety which would incorporate far more than just driving more slowly.</p> <p>I notice from the proposal that SCC has chosen not to disclose the cost to the taxpayer of enforcing the proposed 20mph speed limit area or consulted residents in what they would feel would help to make roads safer for the benefit of all road users. Indeed nowhere in your proposal do you refer to who or what has prompted this particular course of action over and above others. Please could you clarify what research has actually been undertaken to come to this as a way forward? There is also no mention in your proposal about how or whether the speed limit will be enforced which may well render the initiative costly and wholly ineffective.</p> <p>I wholeheartedly applaud the SCC's desire to improve road safety. It is just very difficult to understand from the proposal how or whether this will actually be achieved.</p>
31.	I would like to register my objection to the proposal. It is an unnecessary use of government money
32.	This is to formally object to the above proposal as set out in your letter of 2 November from Tom Finnegan-Smith. I trust this is all that is required at this stage but please let us know if you require any additional information.
33.	<p>I am in possession of your plan for the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit and accompanying letter.</p> <p>In my view, the proposed extent of the speed limit is broader than necessary to achieve the desired result, and therefore I'd like to object and request that more targeted proposals are produced. I do not disagree with the aims of the scheme but my view is that the scheme goes farther than justified as proposed. I make the following representations:</p> <p><u><i>Nature of the area under the proposal</i></u> Fulwood has a crime and antisocial behaviour rate significantly below the average for Sheffield, a higher education level than the national average. The</p>

indices of multiple deprivation (IMD, 2019) reports that Fulwood is in the least deprived decile in the country.

Likely as a result of the nature of the area, there is practically no antisocial driving and roads are safe. Your letter did not give any data on injuries or collisions within the proposed area, but I would expect these to be much lower than the Sheffield average. This data ought to have been supplied as it has significant bearing on whether the scheme is likely to achieve its aims.

Drivers in the Fulwood area, given its undeprived nature, are very likely to drive having regard for road conditions, the presence of children and pedestrians crossing the road. In my view, it would make sense to trust drivers to travel safely and select their own speed, within the existing limits. In some cases, safe speeds are below 20mph, but in others, they will be above and a blanket approach does not allow driver judgement.

Cycling is not common in Fulwood, likely as a result of the hilly topology, and, in my view, is not a relevant consideration for this proposal.

Main roads in the area

The area encloses Hallamshire Road, Barncliffe Road, Slayleigh Lane and Hallam Grange Road. These are the main arteries for traffic, including service bus traffic. They are wide roads and, in the case of Slayleigh lane and Hallamshire Road, there are segregated pedestrian footpaths for most of the length. They are also well-distant from schools and play areas. In these senses, they have similar characteristics to Fulwood Road and Crimicar Lane, which are excluded from the plan: they are roads where motor traffic is dominant and risk to pedestrians is minimal.

If Hallamshire Road, Barncliffe Road, Slayleigh Lane and Hallam Grange Road were excluded from the 20mph zone, there would be less disruption to motor vehicle travel with minimal effect on the scheme's aims. If that had been the proposal, I would be unlikely to have submitted an objection.

Alternatives to broad 20mph speed limits

There are alternatives to the 20mph limits proposed. The importance of protecting children from accidents is highlighted in the proposal, and is a laudable and important aim. I note that three schools exist in the proposed area.

An alternative to a large 20mph extent would be to limit the 20mph zone to the region around these schools, particularly the streets where children are likely to be moving in groups. Children in groups are less likely to be attentive to road conditions as a result of distractions from peers and excitement for school and home. If these areas were accompanied by flashing warning lights for drivers at, for example, 8.30-9 and 3.15-3.45, the effect on road safety might well be more pronounced than from the proposed scheme, without the need to affect driving in a wide area.

Summary

My points above may be summarised as follows

1. Please provide and consider data on traffic collisions in the proposal area compared to the Sheffield average, as this has significant bearing on whether the scheme will achieve its aims

	<p>2. Consider excluding Hallamshire Road, Barncliffe Road, Slayleigh Lane and Hallam Grange Road as these are arterial routes with low pedestrian risk</p> <p>3. Consider, as an alternative, limiting 20mph regions to school pedestrian routes and installing blinking lights to cover times for high pedestrian traffic (e.g. the start and end of the school day)</p>
34.	<p>I would like to make comments about both the process and the proposal.</p> <p>PROCESS</p> <p>I believe that in any consultation the process should be inclusive, fair and transparent. I do not believe this to be the case in this process for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The letter advising of the consultation arrived addressed to the Homeowner. It was in a plain white envelope and gave no indication of the sender. It looked very like, and to all intent and purpose presented as, a piece of junk mail. Therefore when I opened it I was very surprised to find something of this importance enclosed.</p> <p>If the City Council genuinely wish to consult the public and hear their views they should do so in an open and transparent manner. This felt like a process which the City Council want to implement with as little consultation as possible as it is likely that many people will have disposed of this letter without opening it not realising the importance of its content.</p> <p>2) The letter made reference to and included a plan. The plan showed a boundary which could have been of anywhere. The quality and size of font of the plan was so small that it was impossible for anyone without a magnifying glass to work out where even the boundary was, let alone which roads within the boundary that would be affected. Again, this shows a complete lack of transparency in this process.</p> <p>The letter did say that 'if you struggle to read the plan, you can find it on our website' I duly went to the website but again found navigating it very difficult (and I am used to using IT systems) and failed to find any plan let alone one I could read and therefore study. I emailed the City Council and asked for the link which was provided to me. Only to find the same plan which was no more readable than the paper one.</p> <p>Eventually after some more searching I found a narrative document which listed all the roads covered by the proposal. It feels that if the City Council honestly wanted the views of those who will be affected by this scheme, then they should have included this with the initial consultation letter.</p> <p>As you will gather I feel that this consultation is flawed and has not been inclusive, fair or transparent. Everyone affected should be able to feel that they have at least had the opportunity to comment. It feels that this is unlikely to be the case on this occasion which is a best disappointing.</p> <p>PROPOSAL</p> <p>I would support the implementation of 20mph speed limits into areas directly around schools in an attempt to make those areas safer for children and their families.</p> <p>However, I do not support the scale and size of the area within which these speed limits are proposed. It seems to go far beyond those areas where there are</p>

	<p>schools and feels as if it is disproportionate to the likely risk. Indeed the speed restrictions as proposed may well lead to poorer driving by some people frustrated by those observing the limits and may causing greater rather than less risk.</p>
35.	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to be consulted on the proposed 20mph limit.</p> <p>In summary, I do not have a problem with 20mph being enforced on Hallam Grange Crescent around Hallam School and similarly around Nethergreen Infant School on Stumperlowe Park Road. I also have no issue, in principle, with it being limited to narrow and minor side roads or cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>However, I do object to it being enforced as a blanket broadly across the area. This will impact many connecting routes and/or bus routes. For example, Hallamshire Road, which is plenty wide enough with the verges for any children to be safe (incidentally my children of 5 and 8 walk to school along Hallamshire Road and I have no issue with it being 30mph).</p> <p>I understand that for simplicity, and to reduce costs, it is easier to sign 20mph across a broad area by focusing on the routes in and out (with lower cost lamp post repeaters) but I think it would be best just to have very specific and limited 20mph zones in potential black spots - like around schools.</p> <p>For this reason I must object to the current proposal.</p> <p>For me it would make more sense to target speeding by drivers doing 35/40/45 mph in a 30mph than punish those who adhere to the speed limit and drive around at no more than 30mph with a line of cars right behind them. In fact I believe this problem will only be worsened if the limit is reduced to 20mph - in my experience those strictly adhering to a 20mph limit suffer from terrible tailgating. This adds stress and pressure to those sticking to the limit and causes frustration and more dangerous driving by those behind.</p>
36.	<p>As per your communication inviting feedback on the proposed 20mph speed limit in parts of Fulwood I am writing to raise various objections. The reasons for my objections are as follows:</p> <p><u>Evidence</u> You have not offered any evidence that this change will have the outcomes that you claim it will. You have simply asserted that it will. Whilst official statistics are not readily available for the specific area in question (only at Local Authority level) websites such as www.crashmap.co.uk suggest that the great majority of serious accidents occur on the main arteries not in scope of this proposal. If this website captures all relevant events then the roads covered by the proposal encounter around one serious collision per year (and as far as I can tell no fatalities in recent years). Furthermore, without a detailed assessment of those incidents it cannot be assumed that a 20mph speed limit would have altered any of these outcomes.</p> <p><u>Evaluation</u> Owing to the very low level of incidents it will not be possible to attribute any observable change in accident numbers to the 20mph policy. I have carried out several impact assessments for various Government initiatives and where the baseline number of events (i.e. accidents) is in single digits, as they are in this case, you would not be entitled to claim that any observed reduction will be due to the policy as opposed to the normal variation that we see over time.</p>

	<p><u>Ideology</u> Given the above, this proposal is not due to a clear and over-riding need for government intervention. Rather, this proposal is likely motivated by an emergent ideology that sees personal use of motorcars as something to be opposed. In a democratic society any political party is free to campaign on that prospectus. However, driving is currently a legal freedom and it is incumbent upon Local Authorities to accommodate, perhaps facilitate, and certainly not impede legal freedoms. Indeed, there are plenty of legally permissible behaviours that each of us may profoundly object to but we have to respect the freedom of our fellow citizens to take advantage of those freedoms should they wish. To do otherwise is a form of authoritarianism.</p> <p>There may be other arguments against this proposal such as the increased emissions owing to driving at a less fuel-efficient speed. However, this is a complicated subject heavily dependent upon the specific usage and layout of individual roads so I do not employ those arguments. However, for similar reasons neither can it be claimed this proposal will be beneficial in terms of emissions and pollutants.</p> <p>In short, the claimed benefits in your communications (reduced severity of injury and reduced number of collisions) arguably cannot be made for this specific proposal and certainly cannot be evidenced to the standards outlined in the Treasury's Magenta Book (an evaluation guide that is used across government).</p> <p>The final claim in your communication, that people will 'feel safe' (not necessarily 'be' safe) raises an interesting ethical issue. It is reasonable to curtail freedoms if that constraint will definitely avoid material harm. However, there are few precedents where individual freedoms are restricted in order to change public perception. Imposing measurable harm (longer driving times, possibly lower fuel economy) upon one person for the (hypothetical) psychological benefit of another person is, I would suggest, beyond the authority of a city council.</p> <p>Finally, I note that the default speed in a lighted area is 30mph. Exceptions are justly made for nearby schools and areas prone to crowding, but exceptions are not generally made for areas simply because they are residential. Proof of this is to be found in the fact that the main arteries retain a 30mph limit and are commonly residential roads themselves. In one sense it is counter-intuitive that a lower speed limit is imposed upon roads with a lower traffic density and lower overall risk even though in some instances the width and layout of the road is not dissimilar to that of the main arteries.</p> <p>I do not doubt that, despite your mailshot, Sheffield City Council has already made up its mind on this policy and any objections will be dismissed. Indeed, I suspect that this message will not even be read and little heed will be paid to analytical and ethical concerns I raise. Nonetheless I wish to register these objections and request that they, along with other people's views, are given due consideration. Ideally, the Council will publish a summary of the consultation, refuting or acknowledging each point made and accounting for its final decision whichever way that decision may go.</p>
37.	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed blanket 20mph speed limit area across the majority of the Fulwood area of Sheffield.</p> <p>I suspect this letter and objection will have no effect on the proposal as the decision has already been made by the city council officers who are advising the elected members.</p>

My reasons for objecting are the proposals are not evidence based and there is no evidence presented of the scale of the problem in the Fulwood area; or the actual benefits or costs of the proposal.

The proposed 20 mph speed limit in Fulwood should be about reducing fatal accidents (and serious injuries) particularly children in the Fulwood area.

There is no evidence presented in the proposal of the number of road traffic accidents in Sheffield in the last three or five years, even though road casualty statistics have been assessed as National Statistics, indicating compliance with the Code of Practice for Statistics. (For example there were 1,695 fatalities in 2022 in Great Britain in 2019; 29,795 KSI, 136,002 casualties reported by the police in 2022), the majority of whom were car occupants and motorcyclists. (In 2022, 46% of fatalities were car occupants, 22% were pedestrians, 21% were motorcyclists and 5% were pedal cyclists. In 2022, 55% of casualties were car occupants, 14% were pedestrians, 12% were motorcyclists and 12% were pedal cyclists. Overall, in 2022: 75% of fatalities and 62% of casualties of all severities were male; 3% of fatalities and 10% of casualties were aged 16 years old and under; 25% of fatalities and 29% of casualties were aged 17 to 29 years old; 23% of fatalities and 7% of casualties were aged 70 years old and over.)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/reported-road-casualties-great-britain-provisional-results-2022/reported-road-casualties-great-britain-provisional-results-2022#casualties-by-age-and-sex>

There is no evidence presented that there is excessive speeding in the current 30 mph zones in Fulwood, Sheffield. What is the average speed in the areas affected by the proposed zone?

There is no evidence presented of the environmental impacts of reducing the speed limit from 30 pm to 20 mph. Will this increase or reduce emissions from cars with petrol and diesel engines? Will a 20 mph speed limit mean cars are able to drive at a more constant but lower speed without accelerating or decelerating?

There is no evidence presented of the economic impacts. Will the reduced speed limit increase or decrease travel times in the area?

There is no evidence of a cost-benefit analysis. What is the cost of putting up new speed limit signs? How will the 20 mph speed limit be enforced?

The geography of Sheffield is not really suitable for cycling. As a walker and cyclist myself, a reduced speed limit is not what would make me feel safer, rather it is better street lighting and smoother road and pavement surfaces (without pot holes in the roads). As a cyclist crossing Supertram track lines is one of the most hazardous activities and I have witnessed a number of injuries to cyclists caused by the Supertram tracks.

Speed limits around schools, old people's homes, GP surgeries, hospitals should be lower than 20 mph. I note that the proposed 20 mph speed limit does not include the Fulwood Road adjacent to Nether Green Junior School.

I do not object to 20mph speed limits in principle. What I do strongly object to is the lack of evidence presented by Sheffield City Council of the costs and benefits of the proposal. Based on the information presented it is impossible to make an evidence -based informed choice about the proposed 20 mph speed limit area.

	<p>Therefore, on the evidence presented (or lack of evidence presented by the City Council) I object to the proposed blanket 20mph speed limit area across the majority of the Fulwood area of Sheffield.</p>
38.	<p>I am writing to object to the proposal to impose a 20mph speed limit in Fulwood as set out in your letter dated 2 November 2023.</p> <p>The three reasons you give for the proposal in your letter are more akin to general statements of intent rather than properly considered objectives that the 20mph proposal will solve. Those three statements could equally apply to support proposals to ban cars altogether, ban cyclists from the road, or erect barriers all along our pavements and only allow pedestrians to cross the road at designated crossing points.</p> <p>I would like to know what actual evidence the SCC has that there is a problem that requires the imposition of a 20mph area as the solution. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many road accidents involving pedestrians have there been in the proposed area in, say, the last 10 years that involved cars travelling in excess of the speed limit? 2. What percentage of those accidents were the fault of the car? 3. Are the number of those accidents increasing? 4. Is there an increase in the number of accidents involving children? 5. How will the imposition of a 20mph speed restriction solve these problems (especially those accidents caused by a pedestrian not looking properly when crossing the road)? 6. What other solutions have been considered? 7. What evidence is there that "some collisions will be avoided altogether"? 8. What evidence is there that "people are more likely to feel safe when walking and cycling"? <p>I would also like to know if SCC carried out any research to see if a majority of people in Fulwood actually want a 20mph zone imposed on them? Who is it in the area calling for this?</p> <p>At a time when SCC's budgets are squeezed, if there is money to spend it could be better spent on other things such as creating better spaces and parks for children to play in, increasing funding to libraries or marking out more dedicated cycle lanes on the roads.</p> <p>From a civil liberties viewpoint I really do object to authorities banning things as a way to change behaviour. A far better way would be to increase education about the benefits of driving slower or incentivising people to cycle rather than drive if this is something SCC felt strongly about. This way people are making a positive choice to change their behaviour rather than an authority simply banning it.</p>
39.	<p>I would like to object to the above proposal.</p> <p>Whilst appreciating that a 20mph speed limit is necessary around the immediate vicinity surrounding schools – this feels somewhat like a targeted restriction on the whole area of Fulwood and without justification.</p> <p>I feel that a 30mph speed is quite sufficient and that this is largely adhered to by all residents. From my experience there is little evidence of speeding/motoring accidents in the area – especially when compared to some other areas and maybe the emphasis should be on the areas with the highest incident levels.</p>

40.	<p>I would like to object to the proposed 20 mph zone in Fulwood.</p> <p>It is a fact that car emissions would increase as cars are most efficient at 55- 60 mph. There would be more delays to travel time and congestion with a negative economic impact.</p> <p>Reducing speed limits from 30mph to 20mph has "little impact" on road safety, according to a study from Queen's University Belfast, Edinburgh University and the University of Cambridge.</p> <p>It seems unlikely that in a hilly area like Sheffield there would be much more uptake in walking and cycling. In addition if there were more people cycling, road traffic accidents would increase as cycling in built up areas, complete with our hazardous tram tracks, is statistically more dangerous than travelling by car.</p> <p>Most car drivers will probably ignore the speed limits anyway as driving at 30 mph is tedious and unnecessary in most areas unless there is a school or old people's home. In those areas I would support a 20 mph speed limit.</p> <p>This move seems part of a grand plan for Sheffield, not just for Fulwood and the decision to make sweeping changes to the speed limit across the city is once again the work of the Council and Highways Department that was responsible for removing a vast stock of healthy trees from the city because a few individuals had made their mind up that this was what they wanted and wouldn't listen to common sense or members of the public. I am not therefore wholly convinced that any objections would affect the outcome of the so-called consultation.</p>
41.	Please register my objection to the proposed 20mph speed limit area in Fulwood.
42.	Please register my objection to the proposed 20mph speed limit area in Fulwood.
43.	<p>While I strongly agree with a 20mph speed limit outside schools I have several reservations about a blanket 20 mph limit for Fulwood.</p> <p>Firstly, because of the gearing for cars being optimised around a 30 mph limit in urban areas a move to 20mph means that you need to drive in a lower gear. This is especially true in an area with many hills such as Fulwood. Driving in a lower gear increases petrol consumption and hence pollution. Not a very green option.</p> <p>This was also mentioned in letters to the Daily Telegraph on 5th and 8th November, showing that I am not the only person to think this way. I have attached a copy of the 2nd letter.</p> <p>Secondly, it is extremely difficult to keep your speed down to 20mph without constantly looking at your speedometer rather than concentrating on the road. Keeping to 20mph is hard because at low revs and in a low gear a slight movement of the accelerator or change in gradient alters the speed dramatically. Again Fulwood has many steep roads so exacerbating the problem.</p> <p>Thirdly, when driving at 20mph in a 20mph area. some other drivers ignore this and drive inches behind you to 'urge you on' or make dangerous overtaking manoeuvres.</p> <p>Finally, according to a leading lawyer, at 20mph drivers are tempted to look at their mobiles and check emails at lower speeds as they perceive there is less</p>

	<p>risk. See: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2023/04/07/risks-of-20mph-speed-limit/</p> <p>My daughter lives in Surbiton which has a blanket 20mph limit so I have a lot of experience of all three of the above. Surbiton is flat, not hilly like Fulwood, so all these issues will be very much magnified here in Sheffield. It would in my personal opinion be dangerous and un-green.</p>
44.	<p>OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED 20mph SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>The current 30 mph regulation on urban speed has been in place for more than 80 years.</p> <p>To modify this on a timescale of 8 weeks is not the action of a reasonable council who wish to take into consideration the democratic wishes of the electorate.</p> <p>Four weeks to register objections without any commitment to respond within this period and then to implement this after a further four weeks is not a consultation, it is a declaration of intent which brushes aside objections</p> <p>The information issued to define the proposal is of poor quality. The map is indistinct and even under a 20 times magnification the few street names are illegible. The offer of a better map and more information on the website is obviously not available to anyone without both a computer and internet access. This leaves a significant proportion of the electorate inadequately informed.</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is that there will be a reduction in the number and severity of accidents. No numerical information is provided to support this statement. Opinion should not take precedence over factual information. To support this major change data should be provided on the total number of accidents in the affected area and the number which may result from both the effective enforcement of the current speed limit and the reduction expected from a reduced limit.</p> <p>Schools and the safety of children are important. The plan illogically does not restrict any traffic outside Nethergreen School or St Marie's School. This allows both buses and heavy vehicles to be unaffected in what must be the most vulnerable section whilst restricting all vehicles in far less critical areas. The council must regard the safety of children as less important than the impact of these changes on the bus companies.</p> <p>We are consistently told by the council is they do not have funds to provide the essential social services needed in Sheffield. This proposal is to spend public money paying outside contractors on changes that the majority of the public do not support.</p> <p>This situation has similarities to the debacle when the council paid Amey to cut down perfectly healthy trees when the people of Sheffield expressed this was not what they wanted. Again this was after inadequate consultation with the people it affected.</p>
45.	<p>I wish to register my objection to the 20mph proposal for the Fulwood area:</p> <p>(1) we have not been told any statistics of accidents near the schools which are being used as justification for this proposal</p> <p>(2) It is not helpful to include roads such as Slayleigh Lane and Hallamshire Road for inclusion in the 20 mph zone</p> <p>(3) You cannot legislate to cover every aspect of people's behaviour. At some point you have to give people responsibility to behave sensibly.</p>
46.	<p>I would like to object to the proposal.</p>

	<p>The justifications given doesn't satisfy me.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People already feel safe walking and cycling. This adds little or no value to the area. It's a safe area without adding more burdensome restrictions on drivers. You're adding more travel time to work and school journeys. - If we stopped driving all together it will reduce some collisions as well- so makes no sense. - Lowering severity of injuries for people involved in collisions: I think this maybe better targeted at higher speeds. <p>If anything it probably reduces focus on the road when driving at 20mph.</p>
47.	<p>I wish to register my objection to the Fulwood proposed 20mph Speed limit Area.</p> <p>There has been no evidence presented that tells us there have been accidents caused by speeding near the schools.</p>
48.	<p>Whilst I am generally in favour of lowering the speed limits on quieter residential roads in Fulwood, I do not think that the blanket approach of including all the roads in the area is the correct one to take. There are a number of "arterial" roads that run through the area which people use to enter and exit the neighbourhood and where I do not consider 20mph would be appropriate. Having lived in the Fulwood area for 11 years, I have marked on the plan the roads which are used as "main routes" in and out of the area, which I consider should be carved out of the 20mph zone and remain at 30mph. These include the roads which link up to Quiet Lane (which is a main route into the city from the Peak District), Brooklands Avenue (which is the main link into the city from the Mayfield Valley) and the roads which go up to Redmires Road (which is the main northerly route into the city). I have marked these roads in green on the attached plan. Whilst I appreciate there may be areas of these green roads around the shops in Fulwood or nearer Hallam school which smaller 20mph section may be appropriate, this should be considered on a more discrete basis. I think reducing the speed limit on these roads is likely to have a detrimental effect on the economy and inhibit people commuting into the city.</p> <p>There are also some roads which have not been included in the 20mph zone, which I think should be included. Such as Moorcroft Drive, Moorcroft Avenue, Moorcroft Close, which I have marked in red on the plan. They are residential cul-de-sacs and there is no reason why drivers should go from a 20mph zone into a 30mph zone, which may make drivers speed up rather than slow down, and therefore these roads more dangerous than before.</p> <p>I would invite you to come and walk/survey the roads in the area to see how they are used by traffic on an every day basis before taking such a generic "blanket" approach. And also consider the profile of some of the roads outside the black line as whether they should be included or not.</p>
49.	<p>As a long term resident of Fulwood I am somewhat surprised at what seems a virtual blanket 20 mph speed limit within this residential suburb, Whilst I would support a 20 mph speed limit outside schools during term time only & for the hours of say 8.15am to 9.00am, over lunch time & 2.45pm to 3.45pm, I can see little or no justification for the limit being proposed 24/7 365 days of the year.</p> <p>Your "STATEMENT OF REASONS" says - "The proposed 20mph speed limit is required to control vehicle speeds in the residential streets of the Fulwood area". Why not let road users use their own judgment?</p>

	<p>What are your detailed justifications that vehicle speeds need controlling in Fulwood.</p> <p>I would make the following comments about the proposed limit:</p> <p>1) In the past decade, how many vehicle crashes have there been within the proposed Fulwood 20 mph zone, how many pedestrians/cyclists have been injured and how many fatalities within Fulwood?</p> <p>2) What is the cost to the residents of Sheffield by instigating the 20 mph limit including letters delivered to every resident, new 20 mph signs, lighting for the signs & road markings.</p> <p>3) Why has Fulwood been selected for a 20 mph limit. Have the residents of Fulwood lobbied Sheffield Council to instigate the limit?</p> <p>4) Do the local councillors who reside in Fulwood support the 20 mph speed limit?</p> <p>5) How will you monitor motorists & enforce the speed limit?</p> <p>6) According to a study from Queen's University Belfast, Edinburgh University & the University of Cambridge reducing speed limits from 30 mph to 20 mph has "little impact" on road safety. A three year research project by Queen's University Belfast claims 20 mph speed limits across the city have made little difference to safety but reduced the volumes of traffic. Analysis of the data revealed that when compared with areas that retained their previous speed limits, the new 20 mph limits led to minimal change in the short or long term outcomes for road traffic collisions, casualties or speeding. These findings are echoed in an article in the BMJ whose headline is "20 mph speed limits have little impact on crashes, casualties & driver speed".</p> <p>7) Is it the Council's intention to cover the entire city with 20 mph speed limits?</p> <p>8) Where is the Council's in-depth report on traffic in Fulwood that justifies the 20 mph limit on virtually every road along with detailed costs for implementing the scheme?</p> <p>I do not support this blanket 20 mph speed limit imposition.</p>
50.	<p>I received via post the 20mph proposal for Nethergreen and Fulwood and am extremely disappointed to see that Fulwood Road is not included in the proposed 20mph zone.</p> <p>Given the number of schools and nurseries that are on or in close proximity, I feel that for the safety of children and pedestrians, Fulwood Road should be made a 20mph zone during school drop off / pick up times.</p>
51.	<p>I agree that if the speed limit in some areas round school between certain times get to 20mph. I think it will not help in lots of areas. I object to 20mph in most areas including Fulwood area.</p>
52.	<p>I write to object to the proposal to introduce 20mph zone in Fulwood. I cannot see the sense in placing restrictions over such a large area. In my opinion it is not warranted.</p> <p>There may be some sense in making Stumperlowe Park Road (Nether Green Infants), Hallam Grange Crescent (Hallam Primary) and Fulwood Road only in the immediate area of Nether Green Junior School, but certainly not the entirety of the area shown on the plan. I do not believe it is merited and is not needed.</p> <p>I therefore object to the proposal.</p>

53.	<p>I object to the proposal to introduce a 20mph zone in Fulwood.</p> <p>There appears to be little logic to this and it is not needed, in my opinion.</p> <p>I therefore object to the proposal.</p>
54.	<p>I'd like to object to the proposal to introduce a 20 MPH zone in Fulwood. My reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your proposal makes no mention of green issues. Reducing the speed limit from 30 MPH to 20 MPH will add 50% to the duration of each journey within the area. A journey across the area which would have taken 4 minutes will now take 6 minutes. Vehicle engines will therefore be running for longer within the area, at a speed which is less efficient for many engines. I am therefore concerned that your proposal will therefore substantially increase emissions within the area. • Your proposal will lead to more unsafe driving. Instead of watching the road for potential hazards as they drive, drivers will now be watching their speedometers in order to keep to this low speed, and will become less aware of their surroundings. • I see there is no mention of statistics in your proposal. I would be interested to know how many incidents of the type that you wish to avoid occur each year SPECIFICALLY in the Fulwood area. I believe that the number of incidents in the Fulwood area may well be already extremely low. The perceived safety benefit which you are promoting is likely to be minimal, especially when measured against the damage to the environment which your proposal will cause. • I support any proposal to reduce speed limits at relevant times near sensitive areas, especially schools.
55.	<p>I am registering my NO to the proposal. You have listed an expression of wishes without evidence to verify anything re accidents etc from this experiment in other areas with a 20 mph enforcement.</p> <p>Some collisions avoided altogether sounds vague and not statistical in any way and more likely to feel safe, have you completed a survey to verify this statement.</p> <p>With any changes in planning, surveys are conducted to back up opinions even contested.</p> <p>We have better built cars, better brakes and far superior tyres for breaking distances, so it would be good to see evidence of fewer accidents already</p> <p>We have better safety lights on bikes to be seen better education on road safety already</p> <p>So its a NO from me</p>
56.	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed 20mph zone in Fulwood. I am fully aware that this objection goes against the narrative that 20mph zones automatically equate to greater safety.</p> <p>First of all the letter sent to us is not entirely fair in presenting the idea of a 20mph zone. No facts are given. No evidence of the number of accidents that have occurred in the Fulwood area resulting from travelling at speeds greater than 20.</p>

	<p>No costs are presented to us regarding any accidents and the cost of all the new signage that will be needed is not mentioned either. Have there been before and after assessments of reductions in accidents? How can anybody make a judgement on this proposal without facts?</p> <p>Travelling across Fulwood going at 20mph rather than 30mph will increase travel time by 50 percent and increase the amount of fuel consumed by a measurable amount. Both more time and a more inefficient speed will result in more fumes and more danger to health. Has the cost to general health been weighed against increasing safety at all?</p> <p>This whole proposal flies in the face of the green agenda and reducing emissions. How do lower speeds make the environment more pleasant? Surely asking all to switch off engines when stopped for any reason will improve the environment far more radically and immediately than spending all our tax money on yet more signs.</p>
57.	<p>I object to the latest 20mph proposal for expanded Fulwood Area. I have no objection to targeted Areas eg Roads around schools.</p> <p>However blanket scheme will lead to either widespread disregard unless area enforcement is provided and if so will lead to Drivers concentrating on speed limit rather than road. 20mph is not a natural speed for a modern vehicle and will require diving in lower gears with resulting increase in pollution.</p> <p>The statement in your letter that every driver who slows down makes area safer may not proof correct if concentration is on speedometer as opposed to road. Taking this to a logical outcome we could revert to the original nineteen Century rule of every car requiring a man with a red flag walking in front!!</p> <p>Seriously, in my opinion a targeted scheme on areas of danger predominantly schools properly enforced would provide better results than a blanket scheme.</p>
58.	<p>I wish to object at the 20mph speed enforcement that is being planned for the Fulwood/ Lodge Moor area, I feel the current speed limits are perfectly adequate for the area and making them 20mph is only going to cause unnecessary problems on the roads, they have been this speed for numerous years and I believe that even making the roads 20mph isn't going to stop the accidents happening, yes I have seen a couple of bad accidents happen at the far end of redmires road by the golf course, but I can't see it stopping people overtaking on the road only making people wanting to overtake more.</p>
59.	<p>I have received notification of the proposed 20mph speed limit area for the Fulwood and Lodge Moor area and I write to lodge my deep objection to the proposal.</p> <p>I have lived in Sheffield S10 for fifty years, and in Lodge Moor for the last 25 years, and I do not perceive the need for any such restriction. Your reasoning is set out below, and I comment as follows.</p> <p>(i) <i>'Lower speeds will help make neighbourhoods safer, more pleasant for all, particularly our children'</i>. Please explain how such a proposal will make our neighbourhood more pleasant. We are considering the passing of vehicles in this proposal and that will remain a fact of life whether vehicles will be travelling at 20 or 30mph. Please explain how our children will perceive this to be more pleasant than adults? Is your statement meant to indicate that it is better to be</p>

	<p>hit by a vehicle moving at 20mph than 30mph – I personally would prefer to not be hit by any vehicle, and am not of the opinion that I will feel happier and feel safer to be hit by any vehicle travelling at 20mph. I have walked and driven the area over the years without, personally, feeling that it would be a helpful move to reduce the speed limit. Over the years my experience of traffic accidents is that they are normally associated with cars travelling illegally at considerably excessive speed (for example the collision at the junction of Redmires Road and Hallam Grange Road a few years ago, where the persons speeding almost ended up in the quarry which forms the 17th hole on Hallamshire Golf Club – and Redmires Road is not within the proposed zone) or due to a person being confused and pressing the accelerator inadvertently resulting in them crashing into a structure – as happened twice recently at the Lodge Moor shops.</p> <p>(ii) <i>‘Lower speeds reduce the severity of injuries for anyone involved in a collision’.</i> The number of accidents and fatalities in Fulwood and Lodge Moor is not an issue that has any sort of priority in my mind. I am not saying that such incidents have not taken place (I cannot recall one at present relating to any cars travelling at 30mph and obeying the law), but locations of repeated accidents are known and efforts to make those areas safer is a much more sensible approach, which I would support.</p> <p>(iii) <i>‘Some collisions will be avoided all together’.</i> Whilst this statement might have some merit, road safety in Fulwood and Lodge Moor is not, I believe, an issue in locals minds. I do not recall ever having a discussion with somebody concerned about traffic moving at the current speed limits and driving within the law. My experience tells me that generally road traffic incidents occur for other reasons.</p> <p>(iv) <i>‘People are more likely to feel safe when walking and cycling’.</i> You are suggesting that by reducing the speed limit from 30 to 20mph people will go from feeling ‘unsafe’ to feeling ‘safe’. Frankly that is nonsense as there will still be vehicular movement and individuals will still have to be aware and take measures to ensure their safety when out and moving around the locality.</p> <p>As far as I am concerned this will be a waste of Council Officer’s time, energy and our resources, and the same would be better employed in addressing more pressing problems in Sheffield than trying to make the residents of Fulwood and Lodge Moor feel ‘safe’ when I do not believe there is any significant call within the community for such action.</p> <p>I am a Chartered Civil and Structural Engineer and over the years I have worked on many schemes where road safety was an important feature, and this proposal does not chime with my experience and knowledge.</p>
60.	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed 20mph zone for Fulwood and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>I do not believe it is necessary to implement this in an area where there are very rarely any issues with speeding. The decreased speed would only add to congestion at busy periods and around school hours, which can already add up to 10 minutes to a short journey.</p> <p>I think it would be appropriate to implement 20mph zones around schools but ONLY around schools.</p>

	<p>There is also no logic in keeping Crimicar Lane as 30mph and changing Brooklands Avenue (a steep hill) to 20mph. This lower speed would make most cars struggle up and almost certainly increase pollution.</p> <p>Please reconsider the proposed plans to implement 20mph zones around Fulwood as it really does not make any sense.</p>
61.	<p>I would like to object to the proposed 20 mile speed limit for Fulwood.</p> <p>Studies have suggested that 20 mile speed limits tend to increase pollution. A safe driver has time to react to events that take place on the road when travelling at 30 miles an hour. Whereas an unsafe driver will probably ignore a 20 mile speed limit.</p> <p>In your letter you state that one of the aims of the 20 mile speed limit is to encourage cycling. I think that is unlikely to happen because of the hills. I used my cycle a lot when I lived in London even commuting to Waterloo but I find the hills too much to cycle around Fulwood.</p> <p>My last point is about avoiding accidents. Could you please send me the figures about road accidents in the Fulwood area? How many are there & how much of a reduction in road traffic accidents are you expecting?</p>
62.	<p>I am writing to object to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Fulwood.</p> <p>I am not aware of a single death or injury that this would have prevented in my lifetime.</p> <p>Please spend the money on the education or social care budget instead? Surely the money spent on this initiative would save more lives if spent on homelessness in the city rather than road signs....</p>
63.	<p>I write to formally object to the proposed introduction of a 20mph limit in Fulwood.</p> <p>Your letter dated 2nd November 2023 asserts, without evidence, that "lower speeds will help make neighbourhoods safer".</p> <p>It seems to me that there are already very few accidents in Fulwood and that the large majority of people drive sensibly.</p> <p>It therefore seems likely that accidents are already near a minimum level, and that introducing this slow speed zone will inconvenience residents with minimal benefits.</p> <p>A 20mph zone will either not be enforced, or will lead to safe drivers being penalised for no good reason.</p> <p>If it is intended to make areas near school safer, I suggest introducing 20mph areas within 100 yards of school entrances and exits, accompanied by speed bumps in the road, which are self-enforcing and proven to work.</p>
64. Recei ved twice	<p>I would like to object to the proposed 20pmh speed limit across the Fulwood area. I live and drive within this area and consider this to be a totally unnecessary proposal. In my experience there is no issue of cars driving unsafely at the current limits. With regard to the schools highlighted Hallam school is in an exceptionally quiet area and both Nethergreen schools have pedestrian crossings so high speed traffic is not an issue.</p>

	<p>I would be interested to know how many accidents have been identified in this area due to a vehicle travelling between 20 - 30mph.</p> <p>Spending council tax money on schemes like this is very wasteful and unnecessary especially in the current economic climate and the state of some of the road surfaces. The council has refused to put a pedestrian crossing on Hangingwater Road allowing children walking up to High Storrs School to cross the road safely when the pavement ends and I would strongly suggest that resources are directed to this rather than speed reduction initiative.</p>
65.	<p>I write to formally object to the proposed introduction of a 20mph limit in Fulwood.</p> <p>Your letter dated 2nd November 2023 asserts that "lower speeds will help make neighbourhoods safer".</p> <p>I have not been made aware of, or witnessed, any accidents due to speed in Fulwood.</p> <p>It seems to me that there are already very few accidents in Fulwood and that the vast majority of people drive very sensibly.</p> <p>It seems likely that accidents are already near a minimum level, and that introducing this slow speed zone will inconvenience residents with minimal benefits but may lead to increased frustration for drivers who drive safely at the current speed limit - 30mph.</p> <p>A 20mph zone will either not be enforced, or will lead to safe drivers being penalised for no good reason.</p> <p>If it is intended to make areas near Nethergreen junior school safer, I suggest introducing 20mph areas within 100 metres of school entrances and exits, accompanied by speed bumps in the road, which are self-enforcing and proven to work. There are already pelican crossings for both infant and junior schools which significantly enhances child/parent safety.</p>
66.	<p>This e-mail/letter is to register my <u>strong objection</u> to the proposed 20mph Speed Limited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 20mph limit will inevitably increase journey times and frustration for drivers and in consequence the likelihood of accidents will be increased. • Responsible and competent drivers will be will be reducing speed to 20mph or less where appropriate. • Those drivers not competent or responsible will not reduce their speed to 20mph because of small signs (possibly difficult to see) amongst the plethora of signs which drivers already face.
67.	<p>I want to openly object to the general change of all speed limits in Fulwood area to 20mph, this is a needless change and there is no evidence base to support the implementation - especially when you look at accident and fatality data from the area - we do not need this reduction in speed across the whole area.</p> <p>Why don't you use that money to speed restricting items such as speed humps near the schools where the risk to pedestrians is always greatest.</p> <p>So just to reiterate - please do not implement the 20mph speed limit in Fulwood, it is a waste of money and just not needed!</p>

68.	My wife and I live on Stumperlowe Hall Road and both of us strongly object to the proposed 20 mph limits
69.	<p>I have today received a letter about the proposed 20mph zone in Fulwood. Other than a generic line about 'making the roads safer' you have failed to build a robust case for the change.</p> <p>Why haven't you mentioned the number of accidents in this area? The number of injuries or even fatalities? If you can back up what you say with data then you might just get people on side. Or does the data not exist and you are trying to fix a problem that doesn't need fixing? It's not clear.</p> <p>In fact, it's lazy to just throw some generic safety lines out there hoping everyone just buys it. You should know people are resistant to change and therefore you've got to build a clear picture on the problem in order to deliver your proposal as a solution. You haven't built a robust case and therefore how do you expect people to get behind?</p>
70.	<p>As a resident in Fulwood, I object to the proposal.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons given by Sheffield City Council is completely unjustified and provides no evidence whatsoever as to why this is necessary. This appears to be unnecessary spending by Sheffield City Council on signage which will have no effect. Who exactly is going to enforce the new speed limit?</p> <p>I would much rather see specific traffic calming measures in targeted areas such as those in Crosspool around Lydgate Junior School and the reduced speed limit through the shopping areas (Nether Green/Fulwood/Lodge Moor shops) than a blanket reduction.</p>
71.	<p>I have received your letter about the proposed 20mph speed limit to be introduced in Fulwood. I am writing to object to this proposal. I think it is better to target specific areas if a reduction in speed is needed for safety, such as near to schools and hospitals.</p> <p>My objections to a blanket introduction are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In an area as hilly as Sheffield it is difficult to maintain a speed of 20mph without frequent gear changes and revving up the car engine. This results in more petrol usage, emissions and pollution. 2. It is inefficient for people who drive for a living because it will increase the time it takes for them to complete their work and hence less income or longer hours. I am thinking of van drivers, taxis and other essential workers such as carers who are visiting the sick and elderly. 3. It is an unnecessary expense to install the signage at a time when councils are short of funding for essential services. This is not a good use of tax payers money. 4. Finally, and most important, the evidence to show significant improvement in safety is not clear. A report by the RAC from 3 studies carried out at Queens University, Belfast, Edinburgh University and Cambridge University found that reducing the speed limit from 30 to 20mph had 'little impact' on road safety. <p>To conclude, I hope council will NOT go ahead with this proposal</p>
72.	I'm writing to oppose the introduction of blanket 20mph speed limits in Fulwood and elsewhere.
73.	I refer to your letter dated Nov 2 nd 2023, together with the accompanying plan.

	<p>Whilst I am generally supportive of reduced speed limits in residential areas and particularly near to schools, I do not agree with the inclusion of those roads which are bus routes which are usually wider and reasonably safe.</p> <p>I therefore object to Hallamshire Road, Hallam Grange Road, Barncliffe Road, Moorcroft Road and Brooklands Avenue being included in the proposal.</p> <p>I am assuming that Redmires Road, Crimicar Lane and Fulwood Road are not included in the proposal, but, if they are, my objection would also apply to them.</p>
74.	<p>Though I have nothing against making my residential area as safe as possible, I would like to see the evidence that would demonstrate that such a blanket speed restriction is justified.</p> <p>How many serious collisions or road traffic injuries have occurred in the Fulwood area in recent years?</p> <p>I fully support the 20 mph restrictions near to schools especially when these operate when children are travelling to and from school. These have always seemed a very effective way of slowing down traffic during those important time periods.</p> <p>I feel that a blanket restriction would be much less effective as people would just become complacent and even ambivalent towards it. The very use of the word 'less expensive' makes me feel that this is just a 'tick boxing' exercise rather than a genuine desire to improve people's quality of life. I feel a 'blanket' application will be largely ignored and rather than making the whole area safer will make the areas where there is a real need for speed control less safe. I strongly feel any such changes should not be about cheapness but rather effectiveness. 20 mph areas should be restricted and properly highlighted in school areas during school hours and areas with high pedestrian numbers. If the council has evidence from the Fulwood area re road traffic accidents, they should be publicised and speed control applied to those areas!! In summary I disagree with the proposal to introduce a blanket speed limit in the Fulwood area.</p> <p>It is fundamentally wrong to make blanket decisions without being in full possession of the facts!</p>
75.	<p>To whom it may concern;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst I appreciate the safety reasons and the desire to make our neighbourhoods safer, I am concerned that this is really just a tick-box exercise. "The signs are up...we have done our job." Without enforcement the speed limit signs are meaningless. Given that no-one even enforces the current 30mph limit along the wider roads (Slayleigh Lane, Hallam Grange Road, Barncliffe, Hallamshire Road) wouldn't enforcement have to be a part of the plan? If not, why bother with expensive signage? Virtue signalling by the council? • I live on Hallam Grange Road and it really is a miracle that no child has been killed by parents dropping their own children off/collecting them at the end of the day. Parents double park, park across pavements and driveways and seem oblivious to the fact that this is also a bus route. This is by far the most dangerous time of day.....and a 20mph limit would make not a scrap of difference to any of these problems. If you are serious about road safety and children this would be a better starting point. • A further pavement safety issue is the encroaching vegetation which forces parents, the disabled and vulnerable people onto the road edge. Number 87 at the junction of Hallam Grange Road/Redmires Road makes

	<p>no effort to cut back their hedges. This is a popular walking route for parents with pushchairs and is within 10 metres of a busy bus stop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to this the proliferation of builders' vans which park at the top of Hallam Grange Road (working on the huge Redmires "Moorcrest Mews" development for the past three years) and others which also park on pavements along Hallam Grange Rise and Hallam Grange Road...local people with pushchairs and mobility scooters are forced to cross the road to have access to a safe pavement. <p>I would love to see safer streets, I would hate to see someone killed by speeding traffic and, overall, would support a 20mph speed restriction. However I am rather sceptical about its efficacy and think that some enforcement of existing traffic regulations about parking, pavement space and vegetation would make more of a difference without wasting money on signage.</p>
76.	I strongly object to the proposal to change the speed limit in Fulwood to 20mph.
77.	I understand the reasoning, but the proposed area for 20mph is vast. It is only likely to increase rash driving and dangerous overtaking by some drivers. I object to this proposal.
78.	<p>I object to this proposal,.</p> <p>Like most traffic restrictions it simply slows commerce, adds to congestion and pollutes more as journeys take longer.</p> <p>The bland statement "lower speeds will make the area safer" is not backed up by any studies and should take into account the wider disadvantages.</p>
79.	I object to the 20mph speed limit in Fulwood. I feel that there should only be a 20mph speed limit on roads with schools on.
80.	<p>Following the receipt of the notification of the 20mph limit in Fulwood, I would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>The objectives of this exercise are subjective and from the research I've done, any supporting evidence is at best woolly and inconclusive. The majority of drivers in Fulwood drive respecting the conditions. The drivers who create problems under the current 30mph limits will, in my opinion be the same ones who would create concerns at 20mph. It would be impossible to police effectively.</p> <p>20mph zones create frustration for the drivers going about their normal business, travelling to and from work etc. This frustration, in itself increases the risks of accidents according to a police driving instructor with whom I attended a driving skills course.</p> <p>The question regarding increased emissions at 20mph vs 30mph remains inconclusive according to the research I have read. It appears that one can choose the science that best supports the answer you want. (I was scientifically educated and a chartered engineer so have a reasonable grasp of the arguments). My car, a Euro 6 compliant petrol car, automatic, chooses its own gears according to speed and incline. Typically, it's in 2nd or 3rd gear at 20mph (roughly flat roads) and 3rd or 4th gear at 30mph. The rpm changes accordingly. Doing a proper study in Sheffield would be extremely difficult as flat roads are rare and only real conditions are relevant to the argument</p> <p>I'm sure that there will be a cost:benefit equation but if the apparent benefits are not measurable, it's not relevant and without doubt, the costs throughout Sheffield will be substantial when we continue to suffer major road quality issues.</p>

	<p>On a positive note, I would support the imposition of 20mph zones within the areas of infant and junior schools during the periods of school travel times - say 8-9.30 and 3-4.30. Distance, say a radius of 500m or 1000m (this would include my home) where the young children are walking to and from school with several roads to cross .</p>
81.	<p>I live in the S10 post code.</p> <p>I write to OBJECT to the proposed 20mph speed limit for several reasons.</p> <p>I don't believe the evidence presented suggesting reduced risk of accidents. Frustrated drivers are more likely to flaunt speed limit rules and therefore this negates the perceived lower risk of accidents.</p> <p>Deliveries, travel times will all take longer leading to financial consequences for businesses that rely on travel - this has already come through very clearly as a significant factor from the Wales experiment.</p> <p>Please register this as an objection from the 3 of us living in the S10 area.</p>
82.	<p>I would like to OBJECT to the plans to have 20mph limit around Fulwood. I have lived in the area for a number of years and have taught my child the correct road safety awareness and have never considered that there needs to be a reduction in general the people do not exceed the limit within the area. I feel it is completely unnecessary to change to 20mph.</p>
83.	<p>I would like to object to the proposal for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are roads within the zone that are safe to travel at 30mph - considerate drivers already drive at appropriate and safe speeds - introducing a 20mph zone will not affect the behaviour of those drivers who drive without due care - the 20mph limit will be impossible to police - the considerable additional cost of introducing the scheme <p>I live within the scheme zone and hope that you will take my views into consideration.</p>
84.	<p>I would like to formally register my objection to the proposed 20mph zone.</p> <p>The zone is unnecessarily large, covering large proportions of roads that are nowhere near the three schools highlighted.</p> <p>The majority of main roads highlighted are wide, with large pavements where it is clear to see pedestrians and completely safe to travel at 30mph.</p> <p>Moreover, with the elderly population in the area often driving significantly under the speed limit currently, with a 20mph max limit, this would further increase congestion and the risk of accidents due to them focussing more on the new low limit than the road.</p> <p>I think a 20mph limit would be appropriate for the roads immediately surrounding the three schools but not further than this is appropriate.</p>
85.	<p>As a resident of Fulwood in the proposed area, we are writing to fully support the introduction of 20mph limit. We hope you will be in a position to introduce this in most residential areas.</p>
86.	<p>I have received details of your mooted new 20mph zones in and around Fulwood. Whilst quite clearly agreeing with your objectives of safety for all, and possible</p>

	<p>pollution issues (although not mentioned in your letter), I can NOT support the blanket introduction of 20mph across most of S10 Fulwood.</p> <p>* Having a 20mph zone is very valid where it is needed - and clearly that is outside schools at appropriate times of the day. Such zones would be respected, assuming they are identified with flashing lights, suitable signage etc, and these are the areas that DO need protection. Blanket coverage of Fulwood simply diminishes the focus on the areas which do matter!</p> <p>* Areas outside schools should also be far better 'policed' as invariably cars are parked far too close to school gates, causing traffic queues and frustration. I appreciate the use of manpower to keep traffic away and into safer pick up areas is not easy, but cameras to record and pursue offenders of double yellow lines, hazard marked areas etc would ease frustration amongst both 'child pick' cars and other passing traffic.</p> <p>* On some roads it is very difficult to limit speed to 20mph, especially when clearly there is no justification for it or any risks in the vicinity - and therefore the limit will be ignored (deliberately or inadvertently). The absence of anything 'special' around schools will mean that limiting speed to 20mph in critical areas is also far less achievable.</p> <p>* The area plan which you sent out shows 3 schools in the suggested areas, please focus your efforts on the immediate area around these schools and you will get far better results..... blanket / carpet bombing never works!</p>
87.	I strongly object to the proposed 20mph limit you want to impose in Fulwood.
88.	<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to the proposed 20 mph in Fulwood.</p> <p>This seems to be taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut. I can understand reducing speed in areas around a school but you are proposing a huge amount of area to be covered by this restriction.</p> <p>I have lived in this area for 40 years and have not experienced vehicle collisions, walkers and cyclists feeling unsafe, in fact this is a quiet residential area where we are not subjected to joy riders or dangerous anti social behaviour. I can only remember a couple of minor vehicle bumps in all that time. Do you have evidence to the contrary?? I doubt it.</p> <p>I would ask that this plan be reduced in size to match the areas around the schools.</p>
89.	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed 20mph speed limit in the Fulwood area.</p> <p>Having been a resident of Fulwood for 30 years, I am sceptical about the effectiveness of this measure. Given the area's high population density, it's common for households to park their second cars on the streets due to limited driveway space. Consequently, it is nearly impossible to drive fast, even with the existing 30mph limit. Investing in 20mph signs and designated zones seems like an unnecessary allocation of funds, time, and resources.</p> <p>Instead, I urge the council to redirect this expenditure towards repairing the roads and pavements, providing the area with the essential care it deserves.</p>

	<p>Furthermore, considering the stretched resources of the South Yorkshire Police department, it would be more prudent to focus their efforts on addressing pressing issues such as tracking down stolen vehicles in our community, rather than enforcing a 20mph speed limit.</p>
90.	<p>I have the following objections against the wide area this proposal is to cover.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you intend to enforce the speed restriction when it is not now policed under the 30mph legislation? 2. At what cost to the council at a time when the council keeps saying that they need to save money. 3. You state that some collisions will be avoided. Is there a crystal ball showing how many there will be? 4. How many collisions have occurred in this area over the last 2 years? 5. On a more practical solution I certainly would be in favour of a 20mph near or around the schools.
91.	<p>Having read the letter and information available on the website, I would like to formally <u>object</u> this proposal on the following grounds.</p> <p>Rationale You have listed reasoning to justify the rationale for introducing a lower speed limit, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Lower speeds reduce the severity of injuries for anyone involved in a collision.”</i> • <i>“Some collisions will be avoided all together.”</i> • <i>“People are more likely to feel safe when walking and cycling.”</i> <p>However, no information has been provided to support these statements. You state on the website you decide where to implement the 20mph scheme based on “local accident reports”, but these reports have not been signposted or made easily available to see. Therefore, I question whether these local accident reports firmly provide the rationale for this proposal. I would also question whether local accidents are purely as a result of ‘speeding’ to warrant this proposal. It would be helpful to see this information to understand the City Council’s rationale.</p> <p>Evaluation of Existing 20mph areas The website lists 27 places in Sheffield where the 20mph speed limit has been adopted. What the website doesn’t state is what the impact has been since the implementation in all of these places, either positive or negative. If local accident reports are the main evidence provided to justify the proposal, then I would have expected to see some supportive evidence detailing how the change of speed limit in these locations has been a direct cause of a decrease in local accidents. The absence of this information suggests to me there is no data on this, or no data Sheffield City Council can use to justify implementation.</p> <p>The Plan for Drivers The Government have stated their plans to protect drivers from “over-zealous” traffic enforcement, as outlined in “The Plan for Drivers” policy on GOV.UK. The policy states <i>“We will make it clear that 20mph speed limits in England must be used appropriately where people want them – not as unwarranted blanket measures.”</i> The information in the letter, or on the website, makes no reference to this policy. Therefore, I would question whether any consideration to this policy with regards to progressing with the proposed 20mph speed limits in Sheffield has been made. My assumption is this is not the case, as there is no information to suggest otherwise. With the two other proposals in Batemoor and Waterthorpe, along with the established speed limit in the other 27 areas, it comes across as</p>

	<p>the Council's attempt to make Sheffield a 20mph city ahead of any government policy implementation, which could block this in future.</p> <p>Streets Ahead Roads Development Programme On the basis there has been no clear evidence to justify the implementation of the 20mph speed limit in Fulwood, it would be appropriate for the Streets Ahead Roads Development Programme to focus the spending of tax payers' money on more pressing issues, such as the quality of Sheffield's road surfaces which are in a terrible state. Resurfacing activity has occurred near Fulwood, but only touches on the wider issue affecting Sheffield's roads. I would equally question whether local accidents are as a result of the poor quality of Sheffield's roads, and not directly related to speeding. Furthermore, I would like to see the cost impact of implementing these changes in totality (across the current 27 areas in Sheffield) and how this equates to more pressing road issues in Sheffield. I.e., is tax payers' money being spent on the right areas. If there is no clear evidenced impact a lower speed is having, then I would question why tax payers' money is being spent on this when there are other, more pressing, issues.</p> <p>Emissions In addition to this, with the Government's aim of setting out their path to zero emission vehicles by 2035, surely the road development programme should focus on more electric charging points than lower speed limits to make electric cars more appealing in Sheffield. Currently, electric charging provision in Sheffield is a luxury and not accessible for electric car owners. Furthermore, with the introduction of Sheffield's "Clean Air Zone" across the city, I would like to understand whether this initiative, along with the 20mph proposals are ways to punish local drivers. Initiatives like these will discourage people into the city, and with the high street in the sorry state it is, we will soon see more vacant outlets and less footfall across the city.</p> <p>In summary, I do object to the introduction of the 20mph zone in Fulwood based on the areas I have outlined above.</p>
92.	<p>I object to the widespread introduction of 20mph zones within Fulwood. I agree in principle to certain estate roads and those around schools being 20mph, this makes sense and improves safety for children and pedestrians in general. I also think that around Hallam School there should be absolutely no parking or traffic, other than residents, at school times. This would improve safety for children and be far safer than a 20mph limit. My objection is with main routes, mainly bus routes and where the road is wide and there is full visibility of what is happening on the pavements. If you can provide evidence of the increased deaths or serious accidents causing serious injury to individuals then this may go some way to persuade me but having lived in Fulwood for at least 40 years I know of very few serious collisions. Most of those I am aware of are involving cars on Crimicar Lane which isn't included, that I am aware of, on the 20mph limit. Crimicar Lane from Fulwood shops to the junction of Hallamshire Road should be 20mph as its virtually impossible to go above 20-25 mph owing to parked cars and busses. I totally agree that roads such as Winchester Avenue which is a double cul de sac should be 20 and even 15 mph on the corners the same with Westminster Estate. I also think speed bumps would be more beneficial on some of the roads as opposed to 20 mph but appreciate this is a costly exercise for the council but it's the most effective way to force a reduction in speed.</p>
93.	<p>I am writing to object to your proposal to extend the 20mph maximum speed limit in the Fulwood area.</p>

94.	I don't agree to making Redmires road to 20 mph fair enough side streets but Redmires road is a main road through from Crosspool to lodge moor which at the moment part of it is 40 mph that's a big drop in speed and with it been a long straight road nobody's going to do 20 mph it's just ridiculous.
95.	I wish to object to the proposed 20mph speed limit in Fulwood. I don't personally feel like this is required in the whole area & may actually result in an increase in "road rage" as parents attempt to travel to work after dropping their children off at school. Possibly if you just put the limit near the schools this would
96.	<p>I'd like to express my strong objection to the proposed 20mph Speed limit area in Fulwood.</p> <p>Looking at the plan, it's clear that there are only 3 existing schools in the area, so why not introduce a 20mph speed limit around them, why extend this limit to the entire neighbourhood?</p> <p>Yes surely lower speeds lead to less collisions, but in my opinion this measure is extreme and completely unnecessary. What is the point of driving if soon walking will be comparable in terms of speed. The existing 30mph limit is already protecting the public from the 'street racers' and there's no need to torment the law-abiding drivers any further.</p> <p>As for more formal reasons, slower driving with constant stops at speed bumps causes more pollution which doesn't benefit the community.</p> <p>The proposal states that "People are more likely to feel safe when walking and cycling". Well that is not achieved by banning drivers from driving at a reasonable speed, it's achieved in many other countries by giving pedestrians the overall priority while crossing the smaller roads - something that UK traffic rules seem to lack.</p> <p>I really hope the department will be able to provide a different more sensible proposal.</p>
97.	I would like to register my objection to the proposed blanket 20mph speed limit in Fulwood, whilst I agree with reducing limits near schools to introduce a blanket limit of 20mph as shown on the drawing provided is completely unnecessary & a complete waste of taxpayers money.
98.	<p>I would like to object in the strongest possible terms to the 20mph speed limit which you propose to impose on Fulwood. My objections are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is unnecessary – Fulwood is not an area with a high rate of traffic accidents, nor with a large number of pedestrians. I do not therefore believe the imposition of a 20mph limit will have any impact on road safety whatsoever; ▪ The police do not have the resources to enforce the limit in any case; any sporadic enforcement that does ensue will be designed only to raise money by persecuting motorists rather than as a genuine but futile attempt to improve road safety; ▪ The money it would cost to implement this scheme would be much better deployed in improving pedestrian safety by regularly clearing roads and gullies of leaves. Outside my own home, for instance, you have only just managed to remove last autumn's leaves despite numerous calls from residents. I believe your attentions would be better focused on doing what needs to be done within the council's existing powers (and responsibilities) than on addressing a non-existent problem by

	<p>aggregating further powers to yourselves to interfere unnecessarily with residents' lives.</p> <p>Frankly I have no faith whatsoever that you will listen to what any of the residents of Fulwood think; I believe instead that, driven by your anti-car dogma, you will impose your will on us irrespective of what we think, just as you tried to do when you set out to cut down the city's trees. You are no more right in this proposal than you were then. As a believer in local democracy, however, I would be remiss if I did not set out my objection to your proposal, however, which I do hereby.</p> <p>I would be delighted to contribute to this debate further, but since I believe this consultation is a box-ticking exercise rather than a genuine attempt to canvass residents' opinions, I do not have any expectation that objectors like myself will be listened to. I would, of course, be delighted to be proved wrong.</p>
99.	<p>After reading your letter and viewing the map regarding 20mph speed limits, I do agree that around school etc, should be 20 mph.</p> <p>I was wondering if anybody has been out in person, looking at all the roads you propose to make 20mph, or is it just someone looking at a map , sat at a desk.</p> <p>I walk around the roads of Carsick Hill Crescent, Stratford Road with my neighbour's dog everyday. I very rarely see any person or any vehicle. It is a very low traffic area. Yet you feel the need to make it a 20mph area. Which in my opinion is totally unnecessary.</p> <p>Tom Lane on the other hand is a high traffic area and does require some measures to slow traffic down.</p> <p>Therefore I feel that some of it is not necessary and a waste of money. But the council are good at wasting money. So therefore I wish to register my opposition to some of the 20mph areas.</p>
100.	<p>Having studied the attached map provided with the notification I wish to object on the grounds that the proposal is too expansive. There are in my opinion areas which do not have a 20mph speed limit and need one, ie the junction of Hallam Grange Road and Hallam Grange Crescent which leads to Hallam Grange School. I suggest that a more targeted restriction be imposed around schools etc not a blanket speed restriction over the whole area.</p>
101.	<p>Objection to the proposed implementation of a 20mph zone in the "Fulwood" area of Sheffield.</p> <p>My current objection to the proposal is based on the following points...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that a, the proposal contains no data to justify the need / benefits. - that b, there is no explanation for the boundaries of the proposed zone. - that c, there are better alternatives to address speed related safety in the area. <p>Point a...</p> <p>Changes such as this need to be based on hard data. It's not appropriate to cite the vague statement that "speed kills" as on this basis, every road in the country should be no more than 20mph. Measures need to be targeted and demonstrate a benefit to a proven issue.</p> <p>The council need to publish figures for the number of injuries /fatalities in the proposed zone, where excessive vehicle speed was the cause or a contributing factor.</p>

	<p>Point b... The zoned area outlined on the proposal is provided without explanation. For example, why are the few remaining roads to the west of the proposed zone omitted, and/or why does the boundary to the east stop where it does?</p> <p>Point c... Alternative measures... The proposal negates to address the real traffic issues that afflict the west half of the S10 (approx.) area, examples of which include....</p> <p>Redmires Road... Shortly after the bus terminus (beyond the Lodge Moor Hospital estate), Redmires Road reverts to the national speed limit (60mph), despite not actually leading to anywhere and being heavily used by cyclists, walkers and horse riders.</p> <p>A proactive step, would be to reduce the limit on this and other road bounded by Manchester Road (to the north) and Ringinglow Road (to the south) to 40 (or 30).</p> <p>Ringinglow Road... Despite there being a number of proven speed related incidents (including fatalities) on Ringinglow Road, heavily used by cyclists, I don't currently see any proposals to amend the speed limit there. Is there any good reason why the current 50 / 60mph sections shouldn't be reduced to 40mph, with added enforcement measures to stop vehicles using it as a race track?</p> <p>Hallamshire Road / Fulwood Road... Both Hallamshire Road and Fulwood Road, which either have on them or are major routes to local schools, suffer from vehicles well in excess of the current 30mph limit many times daily. Measures to better enforce the existing 30mph limit on these roads would be welcomed.</p> <p>These simple measures are examples of safety improvements that could be implemented with minimal cost, minimal objections and for most people, minimal impact to their daily lives.</p> <p>Where the benefits of a proposed change can be suitable demonstrated / justified, I would provide my support, but at present there is nothing to suggest this proposed 20mph zone has been correctly designed on the back of hard data, consultation or research.</p> <p>Given the council's historically problematic approach to local measures, the recent findings from that and the resulting ramifications to council members, I find it astounding that despite promises to change, this proposal (in its current form) shows no evidence of that happening.</p>
102.	<p>I'm objecting to the proposed 20 mph limit in Fulwood area, I don't think will make a blind bit of difference as drivers have to slow down near schools anyway due to the sheer amount of cars doing drop off and pick up.</p> <p>Money would be better spent with traffic enforcement officers around schools at drop off and pick up as some parents park so inconsiderately, this hinders traffic flow and builds pollution.</p>
103.	<p>I wish to OBJECT to the proposed 20 mph speed limit because you have failed to consider two important points:</p>

	<p>(1) A car emits more pollution when it is travelling at 20mph than when it is travelling at 30 mph.</p> <p>(2) A speed limit of 20 mph is too low in some areas and this will cause drivers to become angry and frustrated, which is likely to lead to accidents. This is particularly true when the road conditions are good and 30 mph is a safe limit.</p>
104.	We object to the proposed 20mph limit in Fulwood.
105.	<p>I was thrilled to receive the letter informing us of the proposed 20mph zone for our area this morning, until I studied the map and saw that Fulwood Road is not included. Not even the areas where schools are!!</p> <p>Having been a Fulwood Road resident for the past 23 years, we have seen an extremely worrying increase in the speed that traffic passes both up and down the road. There is no concern from drivers in respect to the schools, shops, bus stops, pedestrians and cyclists. It is alarming how fast traffic passes when you're simply trying to cross the road or get in your car and moving away either from our driveway or from the road. Visibility when crossing from the north side of Fulwood road to the south side (Tesco express) is very difficult due to the bend in the road and the parked cars. Nethergreen school is only about 20 metres from our house. At school drop off and pick up times there are a lot of pedestrians including children who will not be visible to drivers due to parked vehicles, yet they still drive at speed. Some parents do cycle with their children but I can understand why more don't. It must be terrifying for them.</p> <p>We also have a big problem with speeding traffic outside of school drop/pick up times with not only boy racers but all demographics of people driving dangerously fast. Noise is also a big issue for us residents, with revving engines especially driving up the road towards Fulwood both day and night.</p> <p>Engine idling is another problem. This is usually parents waiting for their children to come out of school, work men in their vans eating their lunch, taxi drivers, delivery drivers or simply people wanting to either keep themselves comfortably warm or cool in their vehicles with no concern for air quality or using unnecessary fuel. Plenty of areas around schools display "no engine idling" signs. Surely this should be across the whole city.</p> <p>I would suggest, to avoid any more accidents or near misses, a 20mph limit should cover the area from just before Stumperlowe Lane to just past Graham Road. It would also be very much appreciated if the area could be monitored or patrolled in some way so this huge issue is seen first hand and that measures are taken to help resolve it.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me regarding this situation.</p>
106.	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 2.11.2023. Having examined the map I see the proposed 20mph limit is expansive and wonder how this has been matched to accident statistics in the area. Sadly that evidence is not included. Whilst I fully understand the desire for 20mph near schools I do not agree with the wider area proposed on the included map. This will just lead to frustration and criminalisation of otherwise lawful members of the public.</p> <p>If a 20mph limit is to be commissioned it should be local to the three schools listed on the map and should relate to school hours - certain times of day - even 6am - 6pm but not during the evening or night.</p>

	<p>There will be a cost/benefit to the proposal and I would have thought it incumbent on the council to repair roads prudently rather than spending on a wider 20mph.</p> <p>I am a cyclist and cycle to work. I feel vulnerable to deep ruts in Slayleigh Lane and Rustlings Road (where I have to go on the opposite side of the road to miss highly dangerous imperfections in the road surface)</p> <p>It is a personal view – but one I can evidence – unlike the letter sent out by yourselves.</p>
107.	<p>I object to the proposed 20mph speed limit restriction planned for Fulwood for a number of reasons (not in any order of significance, yet all important).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The cost of implementing such a scheme. 2. The fact that the 20mph restriction will still be enforced at quiet times of the 24 hour period, when there are less schoolchildren/pedestrians/cyclists about, and overall less traffic e.g. after rush hour, over night, during school holidays, etc. 3. I have lived in Fulwood for 30 years and not heard of any fatal collision in the area. Where are your statistics about local collisions? 4. Would it not be better spending our money improving the abysmal local bus services? More frequent buses would potentially mean less cars on the road. 5. Sticking to a 20mph speed limit necessitates constantly looking at one's speedometer, which means the driver is not fully concentrating on what's happening on the road - causing a risk of an increase in collisions rather than a reduction. 6. There are other ways of traffic calming which wouldn't inflame local residents so much. 7. Presumably there would be another increase in council tax? Please don't waste our money like the council has done in the past. <p>Please listen to the local residents.</p>
108.	<p>I write to oppose the plans proposed for a 20mph zone which blanket covers the entire Fulwood and Lodge Moor area in Sheffield, which was put forward by your letter of 2 November 2023 (received 28th October 23).</p> <p>I have no issue with a 20mph limit being imposed on the specific roads directly outside the 3 schools in this area, but to seek to impose a blanket 20mph limit across the entire suburb is absurd.</p> <p>Fulwood and Lodge Moor is one of the hilliest areas in Sheffield up above the snow line. To try and travel at 20mph only around this entire area is very difficult and requires a low gear with a high rev. To drive like this up steep hills burns considerably more petrol which not only is awful for the environment but substantially increased the money being spent on petrol by residents in the height of a cost of living crisis.</p> <p>Redmires Road is included within your proposed limit area, this is a 40mph limit currently, it is a long straight and wide road with very large grass verges between the road and the pavement and the golf course on the other side. There is absolutely no need for this to become a 20mph.</p> <p>If, as appears to be the aim of Sheffield City Council, this is another plan aimed at making driving cars more difficult around sheffield, I would question the impact of this plan on bus services in the area. A 20mph zone across the whole suburb will of course significantly impact the bus services to the area, bus timetables will need to be changed accordingly and they will struggle up the larger hills such as Crimicar Lane.</p>

	<p>Having lived in the area for most of my life, and based on the information widely available online, Fulwood and Lodge Moor has an extremely low car accident rate. So to claim this is required for safety does not make sense, this is not an area known for car accidents which requires action to be taken to lower the incidents. There are little to no issues in the area which require any action.</p> <p>For the reasons above, I object entirely to this proposed 20mph zone. If you wish to impose 20mph zones directly outside the schools in the area then that I would consider acceptable, but to seek to impose a full 20mph zone across a whole suburb is just plain lazy.</p> <p>In light of the above, please consider this a formal request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 for the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide the road accident information for this area over the last few years which must have been compiled to consider this plan, including the statistics for road accidents. 2. Please provide the environmental research undertaken by yourselves or consultations were undertaken in considering this proposal and the likely impact of vehicles driving in lower gears at higher revs in order to travel up the steep hills at a lower speed. 3. What the basis for a full 20mph zone as opposed to only imposing a zone directly around the schools 4. What consultation was undertaken with the bus services as to the impact these plans will have on bus services to the area <p>I look forward to hearing from you as regards DH above and my FOI request within the next 20 working days.</p>
109.	<p>I would like to register my strong opposition to the proposed 20mph speed limit area in Fulwood. I have lived in Fulwood for 29 years and object to the extent of these plans.</p> <p>Apart from the cost of implementation there is no research pointing to the need for these changes. Unnatural speed limits such as these cause too much speedometer watching leading to more danger. Also, is it really necessary to drive at 20 mph on these streets at, say, 2 am? Research has shown that many driver's will ignore unrealistic speed limits. The research about extra pollution caused by this and injury statistics are both far from clear. I disagree with your assertion that these changes would make Fulwood either safer or more pleasant.</p> <p>PLEASE LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE.</p>
110.	<p>I wish to object to your proposed 20 mph speed limit in the Fulwood area. I already feel safe travelling in my local area and do not see any future benefit arising from your proposal.</p> <p>- Where speeding is a problem it is due to drivers breaking the existing limits and steps could be taken to enforce the current limits.</p> <p>The only recent accident that I recall involved a school child. It took place on a known blackspot and after your inquiries you failed to take action to improve the crossing point or improve visibility for pedestrians and drivers. I refer to</p>

	<p>Hangingwater Rd. and I would support spending money to reduce the danger here and at other known blackspots.</p> <p>Many of my local friends and neighbours are walkers and cyclists, but their journeys to shops, to work etc are simply not feasible using a bike or walking. I doubt that that 20mph speed limit would do anything to change this.</p> <p>I note that you provide no facts or figures to support your proposal. I am, therefore, not convinced that a 20 mph speed limit will achieve any reduction in accidents or increase in walking or cycling, so I cannot support the proposal and must object.</p>
111.	<p>I STRONGLY OBJECT.</p> <p>I think this is a complete waste of time and money. The council should be considering more important things.</p>
112.	<p>We object to the proposed Fulwood 20mph traffic speed limit Area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is a hilly area and to limit speed to 20mph will require either braking continually (brake pad wear) or changing to a lower gear which would increase engine revolutions and increase pollution. 2. What evidence have you that imposing a 20mph limit in this type of terrain would reduce accidents or pollution? 3. What evidence have you that people will feel safer when walking or cycling 4. How do you define pleasant when cars could be producing higher emissions.
113.	<p>I'm a resident and fully support the idea that areas in the immediate vicinity of primary schools should be 20mph HOWEVER the extent of the proposed area covers huge swathes of Fulwood that have no reason to be made 20mph. It will cause unnecessarily slow moving traffic in areas with wide roads and very few pedestrians. Please take this as my wholehearted objection to the proposal.</p>
114.	<p>I would like to register my objection to the 20 mph proposal for the Fulwood area. I have seen this in operation in Wales and do not think it is a sensible proposal.</p>
115.	<p>As a resident of Fulwood I would like to strongly protest the idea of 20mph zones.</p> <p>The current map of the planned zones is expansive and would cause a lot of traffic in an area which already gets busy during peak times. The reduced speed and use of lower gears would increase CO2 and noise pollution in a residential area.</p> <p>This is a residential area and in all the years I have lived here everyone respects the areas around schools and drives slower when there are children around. There is no need to formalise a 20mph zone and waste taxpayer money on the creation of the zone and the ongoing enforcement of the 20mph restriction.</p> <p>The council should not put this into place without consulting the residents of the area in which they plan to put the zone in.</p>
116.	<p>Further to your letter of 2/11/23, I would like to register my wholehearted support for the proposed 20mph speed limit in Fulwood</p>
117.	<p>I would like to register my objections to this ridiculous proposal.</p> <p>The area affected is far too big and most of the problems are caused by inconsiderate parents dropping off and collecting their children-they park in dangerous places and cause children to have to step out from behind cars. Focus</p>

	<p>on these rather than other drivers who are by a vast majority abiding by the speed limits and are vigilant near schools. I'm unaware of any incidents that have occurred in the Fulwood area!</p> <p>Children should be encouraged to cross at pedestrian crossings rather than suddenly stepping out in front of vehicles-this particularly happens around secondary schools.</p> <p>As for cyclists, they are the worst perpetrators of road safety- they weave in and out of traffic with total disregard.</p> <p>I would urge the council to think again!</p>
118.	<p>I received today a letter outlining your proposal to change the speed limit to 20mph for the Fulwood area. After using a magnifying glass to understand further the roads involved as it was virtually impossible to read it with the naked eye it, I do not understand why it has to stretch out and have an impact on so many roads.</p> <p>I understand that the exercise is to reduce accidents and serious accidents causing serious injuries and death which we would agree to but there are pockets where a 20mph makes more sense rather than costing and using manpower for painting roads and putting up signs. Fulwood Village, around schools and possibly around the Westminster estate, Barncliffe shops and Lodge Moor shops are the best examples perhaps. How much further is the council proposing to take the 20mph zones out. The fumes from cars and the frustration of drivers braking constantly downhill has not been mentioned. I just wonder about the sanity of it all and will we ever know whether our health has improved because of these measures in 5 years' time by which time no doubt this clean air zone may well have included cars.</p> <p>In a perfect world we could all afford electric cars and be fit and healthy to cycle, but we can't and we are not.</p>
119.	<p>I am writing this email to formally object to the proposal of reducing all roads speed limits to 20mph. I do not feel this is necessary for all roads, only roads with schools on.</p> <p>Also I feel Hallam Grange Crescent could easily be made safer by making it a one way system. This will reduce congestion on the road as currently there are a lot of issues with cars unable to pass each other and it means cars will only be coming in one direction when crossing.</p>
120.	<p>As ever I don't agree with a Council barmy decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes around schools and known accident areas please let me know:- the number of accidents to Fulwood residents in a school zone and why not just have school zones? The average number of accidents in a non school in the current 30 mile zone. Have you counted them? 2. You are making it safe for residents who cycle and walk in Fulwood not many do it's too hilly and with kids and shopping and health and age impractical. That doesn't leave many residents left in this at risk bike and pedestrian category. 3. Cars running slowly are very uneconomical and an emit more exhaust fumes. Did you know this? I would rather care for the environment that supports life than a rare and random accident to a cyclist / pedestrian within the 'Zone'. 4. Once you are outside the zone you become at risk again? - so the sense would be to have 20 mph everywhere or nowhere. Half way makes no sense. <p>When is this Council going to make a trip around this city an enjoyable experience? I went into the city centre recently and it was not a nice welcoming</p>

	<p>experience at all. You are building on all the car parks the shopping centre is a disgrace and there are still people begging? Stop sending out useless maps that you can't read without a magnifying glass and spend the money on making this city a nice place to live please.</p> <p>No I don't agree with your 20mph zone and I will never be persuaded that it is a good idea to use public money for this. And btw as for you putting plant pots in the middle of the public highway - its against the law to obstruct the public highway?! Did you know this?</p> <p>This Council is a laughing stock are you aware? Perhaps maps in the city centre would be good idea - for both residents and visitors. I heard you were digging up the expensive cobblestones laid in Fargate - why? Because they were a safety hazard which everyone knew from the beginning. The Council has a very long list of wasting money ideas. Student Games? have I paid for the yet</p> <p>Sorry but you did ask for comment.</p>
121.	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed 20mph limit area for Fulwood, where I live specifically or any other area in the city for that matter.</p> <p>I do not think that the proposed change will make any difference to statistics for injuries and It will also increase pollution. 30MPH is already a satisfactory limit and 20 is far too slow. In many of the areas where the limit is proposed, you would only do 20-25 anyway and criminalising people who exceed this is not acceptable. It would seem, like the city centre zone more about raising more revenue from citizens who already pay too much for the running of the city.</p> <p>I do not accept any of my council tax going towards this.</p>
122.	<p>Just received your letter proposing a 20mph zone in Fulwood.</p> <p>Another idiotic meddling idea from Sheffield City Council. Presumably your next step will be to dump planters in the middle of streets as you have done on Crookes to further annoy everyone.</p> <p>Lived in the area for many years and never seen an accident involving a vehicle and a pedestrian, let alone a child. So, this is a completely unnecessary measure showing how completely out of touch you are with reality.</p> <p>I object most strongly to this waste of time and money.</p>
123.	<p>I have received your letter dated 2nd November regarding proposed changes to the speed limit in Fulwood.</p> <p>Firstly, I received a letter dated 2nd November last week, on Thursday or Friday 26th or 27th nearly a week before the date on the letter.</p> <p>Secondly, the font size on the map is far too small for anyone to actual understand what roads are affected. No one in my family can make out any of the road names.</p> <p>Finally, has anyone on the project visited the area in a car. Had anyone tried to drive down Crimicar Lane or Brooklands Avenue at 20 mph. Without excessive braking it is impossible. I would be grateful if a project team member could accept my challenge and try to drive along Hallamshire Road and Fulwood Road and the other roads I have mentioned without breaking the speed limit.</p>

	<p>Whilst I am fully supportive of reduced speed limits around schools, to make a whole area a 20 mph limit is ill thought through. I would be happy to support a reduced limit on roads immediately surrounding a school but the key cause of danger is poor and dangerous parking by parents collecting their children.</p>
124.	<p>Please enforce 20mph speed limits around schools and nurseries 🙏. It doesn't need to be 20mph everywhere else</p>
125.	<p>Whilst the 20mph zone would be safer in Fulwood, I do believe the proposed area is too large and it will not be adhered to.</p> <p>It needs to be focused on the roads which are narrow, used as short cuts, vehicles drive too quickly along them or there is a history of collisions rather than targeting the whole area.</p> <p>The signs will be ignored whereas if it was a concentrated area or areas then it is more likely to be impactful.</p> <p>I therefore do not support the current proposal.</p>
126.	<p>I object to the proposed order. I have attached a mark-up of the plan showing through roads that should be retained at 30mph.</p> <p>The letter informing me of the scheme and dated 2nd November 2023 was not delivered to my house until 30th November 2023 (yesterday). According to the Order, on the website (the website stated on the letter), objections must be sent in writing by 30th November. Insufficient time has been allowed to make an objection by the stated date. I therefore ask for confirmation that my objection is not time barred. I also request that you confirm that other residents in Fulwood have been given sufficient time to make their views known in writing before the 30th November.</p>
127.	<p>Dear Sheffield Waste of Space, Waste as much money as possible on anything other than what is really needed and matters council.</p> <p>I'm just so let down to again see that this council is looking to waste money on something like 20mph zones. The roads are so poor, congested and built up that to do over 20mph in these areas is already pretty difficult. But to now see that instead of allowing drivers to regulate their own speed as to the road and conditions you're going to stick up signs that will do nothing. No one will pay attention to them and you won't be putting in anything that actually enforces drivers to do this speed. Even if you do put in "traffic calming measures" it still won't make a difference and again will just be a waste of money! https://www.gbnews.com/lifestyle/uk-drivers-speeding-20mph-zone-unenforceable</p> <p>It's therefore just a complete waste of money! But why am I surprised, that's all this council does. Instead of spending the money fixing the mess that Amey has made of our roads, the pot holes, line painting, cleaning drains, road sweeping, better flood defences, spraying for weeds, fixing junctions with filter lanes or improving traffic flow, it will come as no surprise to anyone that you're just out to waste more money!</p> <p>There's been calls for a crossing on Hangingwater Road where it meets Whitley Woods Road for years but no, lets stick up signs that drivers can ignore instead! It won't ACTUALLY make the roads safer, "but it looks like we're doing</p>

	<p>our jobs in attempting to make roads safer oh and we get to waste some money as well!"</p> <p>I know that this will fall on the deaf ears of someone that's pushing for this and to waste more of the taxes I pay you for even less and less each year but it's made me feel a little bit better to send to you.</p> <p>Please don't reply, I'm not interested in the lip service that you're going to pay me while I try to run a small business in an economy where councils could be supporting us by engage small business and using us, instead of nationals and conglomerates with fat cat directors skimming more off the top than they pay the hard working staff at the bottom! All of this while you waste our taxes on schemes of "change" instead of just making what we have work and be right, i.e. the biggest bug bear of everyone in this country POTHOLE!!!</p>
128.	<p>I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to the proposed plan to reduce the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph in the Fulwood area of Sheffield. While I understand the intentions behind this change may be to enhance safety and reduce traffic-related incidents, I believe that this reduction is not the optimal solution for our community and may indeed have unintended negative consequences.</p> <p>The Fulwood area is characterized by its efficient flow of traffic which contributes significantly to the ease of commuting for its residents. The current 30mph speed limit strikes a balanced compromise between safety and traffic fluidity. Reducing the limit to 20mph could lead to increased travel times, potentially causing congestion, especially during peak hours, which in turn may lead to higher levels of pollution due to idling vehicles.</p> <p>Moreover, the 20mph speed reduction may not significantly improve safety in an area where the accident rate is already low. It is crucial to base such changes on concrete data rather than a presumptive safety benefit. The implementation costs for new signage and road markings, along with the enforcement of the new limit, could be substantial. These funds could be more effectively utilized in other areas of road safety improvement that have proven efficacy, such as better street lighting, pedestrian crossings, and road maintenance.</p> <p>I also believe that community education on safe driving and the enhancement of public transportation would be more beneficial long-term solutions for Fulwood. Encouraging residents to abide by safe driving practices and offering robust public transit options could alleviate the need for such stringent speed restrictions.</p> <p>In conclusion, while I support measures that improve the safety and quality of life in Fulwood, I am not convinced that a blanket reduction to a 20mph speed limit is the right approach. I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and look into alternative measures that can deliver the intended benefits without the aforementioned drawbacks.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my perspective on this matter. I look forward to a response that addresses these concerns and outlines how the council plans to proceed.</p>
129.	<p>I would like to register my objection to the 20mph speed limits in the area shown as I don't believe the existing ones in other districts have worked and the money could be better spent on road maintenance</p>

130.	<p>I would like to register my objection for the proposal of a 20 mph speed limit in Fulwood.</p> <p>I would be interested in viewing the statistics to underpin the reasons you have cited to lower the speed limit; that some collisions will be avoided altogether and that people will more likely feel safe when walking and cycling. How is it that you have arrived at that conclusion in particular before you have requested opinions of said reduction in speed limits?</p>
131.	<p>I am all in favour of reducing speed limits from 30 mph to 20 mph on smaller roads with lots of parked cars etc.</p> <p>However I do not believe a blanket 20 mph one size fits all approach is the correct one</p> <p>For example, Redmires road towards Hallamshire Golf Club is never in a million years suitable for 20 mph</p> <p>On the subject of road safety where many bad accidents happen is it not time that small country lanes with ridiculous 60 mph limits were reduced to 40 mph?</p>
132.	<p>I am writing this email to formally object to the proposal of reducing all roads speed limits to 20mph. I do not feel this is necessary for all roads, only roads with schools on.</p> <p>Also I feel Hallam Grange Crescent could easily be made safer by making it a one way system. This will reduce congestion on the road as currently there are a lot of issues with cars unable to pass each other and it means cars will only be coming in one direction when crossing.</p>
133.	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed 20mph limit area for Fulwood, where I live specifically or any other area in the city for that matter.</p> <p>I do not think that the proposed change will make any difference to statistics for injuries and It will also increase pollution. 30MPH is already a satisfactory limit and 20 is far too slow. In many of the areas where the limit is proposed, you would only do 20-25 anyway and criminalising people who exceed this is not acceptable. It would seem, like the city centre zone more about raising more revenue from citizens who already pay too much for the running of the city.</p> <p>I do not accept any of my council tax going towards this.</p>
134.	<p>As a resident of Fulwood, I see this as an ill-conceived, kneejerk proposal.</p> <p>Where it has been introduced, there is clearly no capacity to enforce it and any attempt to observe it produces dangerous tailgating and, in practice, less concentration on the road.</p> <p>By all means have 20 mph limits at peak morning and evening times outside schools if you can acquire the capacity to enforce this speed limit. You certainly don't seem able to enforce parking restrictions and please turn your engine off request outside schools!</p> <p>I certainly most definitely vote against an unenforceable blanket proposal which will generate stress and strife between drivers (see the recent letter in the times on this very subject) and distract from careful and observant driving.</p>
135.	<p>I am writing to object to the proposal to introduce 20mph zones.</p>

	<p>I am in agreement to the roads with a school on them but the most dangerous is Nethergreen Junior School and this isn't included in the zone.</p> <p>Research has shown that cars travelling at low speeds increases pollution.</p> <p>This is just the next step to introducing LTNs in the area. It is part of the council's hatred of cars and part of the plan to completely destroy this once great city.</p>
136.	<p>I would like to register my strongest possible objection to this proposed scheme. There is no basis for carrying this out as even the current 30mph schemes are not properly enforced. Even the 20mph areas that currently exist in the High Storrs area are poorly enforced. I was told by one of the councillors that the basis for putting in a 20mph speed limit is "if you have a 20mph speed limit people will keep below 30mph" which seemed to me to be beyond foolish. If you want people to drive at less than 30mph enforce a 30mph speed limit!</p> <p>I am scrupulous about sticking to speed limits but, when driving through the current 20mph limits, I am often harassed by other vehicles, especially white vans, driving within inches of my rear bumper.</p> <p>I can see the justification for 20mph limits adjacent to schools but then only during the period that children are likely to be present. The solution adopted in Australia of having timed 20mph zones that are operational around school opening and closing hours but not at other times makes much more sense.</p> <p>I would be very surprised if 20mph speed limits are generally supported by the residents of the area and feel that you cannot legitimately go ahead with this unless you have a mandate from those residents. Therefore, I call upon you to put this to the vote with a binding referendum. I appreciate that it would be expensive to carry out such a referendum, however, there is a general election coming up next year and a referendum could be carried out in parallel with that with the plans having been put on hold in the meantime.</p>
137.	<p>I object to the proposal to put 20mph speed limit on the numerous Fulwood roads listed on your website.</p>
138.	<p>I live in Fulwood and do not want this area to become a 20mph area.</p>
139.	<p>The average speed in built up areas is around 18mph – less than the proposed limit. Reducing the limit to 20mph will reduce this further causing frustration to road users. Cars still provide a major form of personal transport especially where distances make cycling and walking impractical. When the public transport system is improved, that would be the time to discourage car use. Reducing personal and especially commercial transport will negatively impact the local economy.</p> <p>A better way of reducing casualties is to ensure proper compliance with and policing of existing laws. As an example, cars at Nethergreen middle school often drop off children whilst parked on double yellow lines or else on the zig-zag lines of the crossing. A simple solution which has been left unattended to for several years.</p>
140.	<p>I totally object to the inclusion of 20mph restrictions.</p> <p>The pollution caused by reducing the speed from 30mph to 20mph by far outweighs the benefits. Children's health will be put at risk by this reduction</p> <p>You, the Sheffield City Council have already put residents health at risk by chopping down trees that produce oxygen to sustain life.</p>

	I totally reject this proposed speed limit
141.	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed 20mph speed limit in the Fulwood area. Whilst I appreciate this would be acceptable for the roads around school the area proposed as it stands in Drawing No. TR-208013 197-TRO-001 incorporates main roads such as Sandygate Road (part of which is currently 40mph), Sleighleigh Lane & Hallamshire Road. A 20mph speed limit on such roads is an unnecessary distraction that will just cause frustration and unlikely to reduce accidents. For the cyclists in this area to feel safer I would suggest they try sticking to the current speed limit which many do not.</p>
142.	<p>I am writing to express my disappointment in Crimicar Lane, particularly the lower half toward Fulwood Rd, not being included in the 20mph zone.</p> <p>Vehicles regularly exceed 40/50/60mph, the road passes a nursery, cars have lost control numerous times, destroying a bus stop directly outside the nursery, and a wall in a private garden in separate incidents. This and other incidents have happened in the three years I've lived on the road and the cars noticeably drive too quickly down the steep road, and there are no speed bumps, speed cameras, traffic calming or speed limit signs in place. I and many others cannot allow my children to play close to the road.</p> <p>The road is often busy with children each morning, and the problem extends onto Brookhouse Hill towards Fulwood Road on the steep bend. The pavements are narrow, hardly space for parent and pram; cars, buses and trucks pass too quickly and very close. It is not safe for a child to walk up.</p> <p>Indeed, Crimicar Lane is one of the few roads where drivers are able to exceed 30mph, so I can't understand why it has been excluded.</p> <p>Walking or cycling to school and around the area should be a pleasant experience, and we should encourage children to exercise. The exclusion of Crimicar Lane and Brookhouse Hill is totally detrimental to this aim.</p>
143.	<p>I strongly object to this ridiculous idea. I live within the proposed area and have children.</p> <p>Your logic is beyond ridiculous – why don't you make it a 5mph or 10mph limit? – it would save even more lives.</p> <p>Do you really think the Ranmoor/Fulwood population wants/supports this? I don't know one person that does. It's as daft as your no parking on Ecclesall Road proposal.</p>
144.	<p>As a resident of carsick hill crescent both my wife and I are APPALLED AT THIS INSANE POLITICALLY CORRECT NONSENSE.</p> <p>This is a waste of public money and the fumes given off from cars driving at artificially low speed speeds will only make pollution worse the money would be better spent removing the speed bumps already in place .</p> <p>My wife and I object to this stupid and unnecessary policy in the strongest possible terms. Just because the brain dead first minister of Wales has adopted the same policy does not mean you have follow him like sheep .</p>
145.	<p>We have received information this morning about the proposed 20mph zoning for Fulwood.</p>

	<p>Firstly the map is impossible to read and the roads completely unclear.</p> <p>To me the project is a complete waste of time effort and money. How many accidents have there been? Motorists can only go at 20mph in most areas of Fulwood and why would children find it a more pleasant place? How can you say some collisions will be avoided?</p> <p>Once again Sheffield Council is against the motorist when most are courteous and careful on the roads.</p> <p>Please think again and use the money for something else.</p>
146.	I object to the proposed 20 mph area in Fulwood.
147.	<p>Objection:</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to the new 20mph speed limit area as detailed in your letter of 2nd November 2023.</p>
148.	I object to the proposal. As a resident I don't see an issue with 30mph, and have no safety concerns. So this proposal is a poor spend of council money. Also a potential stealth tax.
149.	<p>I wish to object to the scale of the proposed 20mph speed limit in the Fulwood area.</p> <p>I agree entirely that there should be a 20mph limit around schools, and that this should include roads in the immediate vicinity of schools where children may be walking. However to introduce the speed limit to the whole area is draconian - trying to maintain 20mph in a petrol car going up some of the steep hills in the area is almost an impossibility and will certainly cause more emissions. Additionally having to watch the speedometer constantly means not watching the road properly and could actually therefore lead to more accidents, not less.</p> <p>Maintaining a 20mph speed leads to less efficient petrol consumption - I am an OAP and the fact that I live in Fulwood does not mean I am a millionaire.</p> <p>I do also feel that the Council could and should spend the money required for all the signage etc required if the proposal was to go ahead for the whole area on more important and pressing issues, potholes and leaf clearance being but two obvious ones.</p> <p>In short I support the proposal around schools but not as an all encompassing speed limit for the whole area.</p>
150.	<p>Thank you for your letter regarding the above proposal. I wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds</p> <p>It is already difficult to sustain 30mph speeds in most of the roads in the area under discussion;</p> <p>The volume of traffic within this area during day time driving already restricts speed to a safe level, especially near schools, where speeds are close to 10 mph when children are entering or exiting the school and being dropped off by parents.</p> <p>It would be expensive, disruptive and non productive to restrict speed to 20mph, given the amount of signage which would need to be changed.</p> <p>On some hills a 20mph limit is impossible, as vehicles climbing these hills will stall, resulting in congestion and some danger of collision. I have seen this for myself in other area of sheffield where 20mph has been introduced.</p>

	<p>In short, it is a daft idea, will achieve nothing, and is unnecessary given the terrain under consideration. I do not support 20 mph zones because:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think you are paying lip service to appease the green lobby and creating such zones will have little or no effect. 2. Do you have any substantiated evidence in support of your claims? 3. How would you intend policing the new limit and can you confirm how many prosecutions there have been in respect of breaches of this limit in other areas of Sheffield? <p>It will be of interest if you can publish detailed answers to the above so that members of the public can be fully informed before you proceed and if you will also publish details of the implementation of your proposal.</p>
151.	<p>Thank you for your recent letter (dated 2nd November 2023! In advance) about the proposed 20mph Speed Limit Area for Fulwood. I am a local resident of the area and am accepting your offer to register my objection.</p> <p>My objection is because, possibly unlike some other areas, the general traffic in Fulwood usually travels at a reasonably slow speed in spite of your proposal. However, a reduction of the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph would in my opinion actually make the traffic flow less safe owing to it causing a large increase in disgruntled drivers caused by more slow cars in front of them, and their thereby resorting to dangerous manoeuvres where hardly any exist at present in this quiet area. In particular this would be true for traffic which crosses the Mayfield Valley and through Fulwood village during rush hours as the cars cross town.</p> <p>I therefore register a most strong objection to the proposal as in practice it would be deeply counter-productive to present slow and considerate traffic habits in Fulwood.</p> <p>Whilst writing, could I mention that your no parking or loading restrictions at the bottom of Crimicar Lane in Fulwood village are very regularly ignored by Co-Op lorries delivering supplies to the Co-Op store there. However this corner is on the regular main 120 bus route and the buses and other traffic have great difficulty turning this sharp corner when the delivery lorries are parked there (illegally). This is a constant and regular traffic hazard which appears much more dangerous than, for example, traffic driving too fast in the area as per your proposal, and yet your own parking restrictions appear never enforced by the Council. Could you resolve this regular situation?</p>
152.	<p>I would like to oppose the proposed 20mph speed limit in Fulwood. I think the areas around the schools that are 20mph zones are quite sufficient and it is not necessary to expand these areas to the limits you propose.</p>
153.	<p>Please take this email as my objection to the proposal of speed limit of 20mph in the Fulwood area as this would not serve much purpose to an already busy stretch.</p>
154.	<p>A 20mph policy fails to act in the public's best interest in any way. The Highway Code has worked well for 100 years.</p> <p>The proposal fails to provide any evidence for the so-called 'benefits' of lower speeds; using vague, unsubstantiated claims.</p>

	<p>Far more people are lost each year due to poor NHS management including ambulance delays than could be lost from a 10mph speed differential, although perhaps you could provide some actual data. As an Environmental Scientist, I can confirm there is no data to support your claims.</p> <p>It fails to provide any cost-benefit analysis. How much taxpayer money would be spent on signage etc to implement this project?</p> <p>The proposal conjures up ideas which conceal your true aims of controlling individual car use and implementing stealth taxes. The road to hell is paved with Agenda 30 SDGs which have never received public approval.</p> <p>Please remember, as public servants, you serve us, not the other way around.</p> <p>In areas of the UK which have already implemented such a project, opposition has been rapidly increasing and is now overwhelmingly against such an undemocratic and anti-people strategy.</p> <p>I object to this.</p>
155.	<p>Whilst the principle of limiting speed in localised areas in which the added restriction would be beneficial at specific times and days is a sensible measure to reduce risk on the highway, a blanket cover for all hours and days is neither enforceable nor desirable. Many vehicles will exceed the limit not due to driver intent but because modern smaller vehicles do not operate well at such a low speed and for IC engines the necessary use of low gears will increase exhaust pollution, the same way that stop/start traffic is more polluting than continuous speed driving at 30-50mph. Furthermore, drivers aiming to observe the new limit could spend time eyeing the speedometer, not looking for hazards.</p> <p>If the aim is to make the area safer and more encouraging for pedestrian travel, then rather than spend money erecting signs, painting the road and introducing enforcement devices, spend effort and money on making the pedestrian causeway more accessible. Within the area of the proposed 20mph zone many landowners whose boundary abuts the public highway allow plant growth to overtop or otherwise encroach upon the causeway, obliging pedestrians to duck or walk in the roadway. Is it not possible to distribute notices legally forcing landowners to not obstruct the causeway, or for Streets Ahead to cut the vegetation and then issue an enforceable invoice for the work? Also - the pavement, gutters and drains in the area along the whole length of Fulwood Road from Broomhill to Fulwood shops and the surrounding residential streets are not cleared of silt, leaf and items ejected from vehicles resulting in injury from slipping, splashing from blocked drains and in some locations the ponding of run-off water - all avoidable by regular maintenance.</p> <p>So - YES to limited places of 20mph enforcement, NO to a blanket area and YES to significant effort to clean the public causeway and free it from restricting undergrowth.</p>
156.	<p>I strongly disagree with suggestions of this ridiculously slow speed!! Granted, this would be useful in certain areas of high accident potential. But definitely not in all of Fulwood.</p>
157	<p>We would like to <u>register our objection</u> to the proposal and state <u>what would be required for us to support an evidence based variant</u>.</p>

We object because speed limits take a one sided approach to traffic safety which ignores the remorseless increase in the tonnage of cars and other vehicles, individually and collectively.

The 'killing speed' of a small car weighting 1000 kg or less is around 40mph; whereas the killing speed of a very large SUV, weighing 4000 kg or more is 10mph.

This is because killing speed, where the large majority of pedestrian victims are likely to be killed, is related to the momentum of the vehicle, which is the product of a vehicle's velocity and its mass.

So, Momentum = mass x velocity.

Double the mass, halve the velocity; halve the mass etc.

In recent years, this has become an urgent matter because battery driven cars are double the weight of their petrol equivalents. Why the difference in weight? At least four reasons. First, batteries with long endurance and power are extremely heavy. Secondly, they require counterweights at front or back to stop the car upending and to remain stable on the road. Thirdly, batteries are voluminous and require a bigger frame hence more weight. Fourthly, batteries are very expensive and those who can afford the technology generally prefer bigger cars for their money.

In this regard, we note a change of stance of the motoring organisations and motoring lobby. They now support speed restrictions. We believe this is to distract attention from the other aspect of 'killing speed' ie the mass of the vehicle, the mass of the SUV, the mass of the battery driven vehicle, tie he supposed future of private transport. In recent years, the improvement in road fatalities has stalled. This is due to the increased mass of vehicles and the reduced killing speed that results. There were pedestrian survivors from 30mph and 40mph accidents when most cars were small and light, much fewer when many cars are SUVs, even less as we move towards battery powered cars being the norm. A quick reduction in speeds might avoid an embarrassing increase in road deaths, which might even challenge the growth in battery powered private transport amid calls for a rethink. This does happen eg false - and corrupt - data on diesel emissions was successfully exposed.

Other aspects of battery technology are also being glossed. The Luton Airport car park fire was blamed on diesel fuelled vehicles. This was a foolish gloss as diesel is notoriously dsifficult to burn and filming by the public demonstrated the ferocity and speed of the fire, reminiscent of recent footage of electrical bicycles fires. This indicates the presence of metals used in powerful batteries, such as lithium in either initiating or stoking that fire. Similarly, a couple of years ago, the scientific press were highlighting how toxic to ecosystems was the mining and on site processing related to powerful batteries. Almost all of the 40,000 new mines globally are related to this technology and the majority of the world's ecosystems are within 50 kilometres of such a mine, leaving them exposed to air and water carried toxicity. The specialist press have recently gone quiet about a danger that grows every day.

Have you considered differential speed limits for different weight vehicles or imposing weight bans on some roads? This would sit closer to the science than your current proposals. Please note that mayors of some French cities, such as Paris and Lyon, have begun to impose bans on SUVs, mainly to relieve congestion.

Your current plan imposes a blanket 20mph to the whole ward except Fulwood Road. The map is misleading because on the Eastern boundary of the ward, four more schools are either on Fulwood Road or immediately adjacent to it. No North-South Road will retain a 30mph limit. This will inconvenience those making

journeys to Crookes and Crosspool or seeking to travel North or South by avoiding the City Centre. Has congestion been modelled?

We assume Nether Green Road etc will retain a 30mph limit. This will mean that Pendeen Road will have a 20mph sign. This will mislead and encourage dangerous driving. It is obvious that this exceedingly narrow cul de sac with hidden gates etc is not suitable for speeds up to 30mph, it is less obvious that 20mph is almost as dangerous. Yet it is. Anything much above 5 mph is dangerous. If you don't believe us, come and do some filmed testing of the road. For the science and evidence based reasons above, we oppose the proposal.
We might support a proposal which provided the following:

- * more than one 30mph route through the ward, in different directions;
- * use of 5mph and 10mph signage for very narrow streets or for play streets;
- * a Sheffield City Council statement challenging the sudden change of stance by the motoring lobby. on road safety. Why the sudden and vocal rush to reduce speed limits alongside the profound silence about the steady increase in vehicle weights - especially for cars. Might this be related to face saving and pre-emptive action to mitigate embarrassing new evidence in the debit column for a growth industry and potential bonanza - battery driven transport. The City Council should call for new powers to ban abnormally large and heavy vehicles within a vehicle class (eg SUVs within the class of cars) with suitable consumer warnings (eg 3 years notice) attached.

Finally, you might ask, what are the alternatives to battery driven vehicles. The alternatives are already emerging ie: clean mains electricity; universal and free mains driven public transport (trams, trolleys and electric trains); safer and more conducive conditions for cycling and walking; working from home; zoom meetings; bans on supermarket and out of town development as in pre-Modi India; encouragement of local, non chain small shops as in some cities in Italy such as Bologna.