

Appendix A - Consultation objections in full – 40 mph speed limit review Birmingham

| Ref no: | Objections from member of the public | BCC reply |
|---------|---|----------------------|
| 1 | Object - totally an over reaction | Ref 1 |
| 2 | I formally object to the reduction in the speed limit on these roads. 40 mph is a safe speed for these roads. Accidents are caused by people breaking this limit not the limit itself. Increasing commute times for residents would feel like a punishment to the general car user. | Ref 4 |
| 3 | I have driven in Birmingham hundreds of miles a week and use lots of the roads listed, the dangerous driving comes from some drivers travelling at ridiculous speeds doing dangerous manoeuvres ignoring the rules and safety of others..... it is outrageous to think that punishing everybody who travel on these roads will improve this situation | Ref 1 |
| 4 | Reducing speed limit will have no result but to raise speeding fines. These roads are routinely used by drivers who ignore current limits, who drive erratically and aggressively. There are no dedicated walking or cycle pathways so users have to travel within traffic. There are no viable, regular, cost effective and safe alternates to using a car so increasingly targeting car drivers without alternates is the problem. This needs addressing before raising opportunities to increase income from speed fines. Roads surfaces are dangerous for bikes, motorbikes and pedestrians. There are inadequate public transport routes. These areas highlighted are notorious for drivers ignoring highway code, traffic laws such as parking yet no action appears to be taken to remedy. Reducing speed limits is a poor and lazy response to improving access around Birmingham. | Ref 1 |
| 5 | I object to the speed changes as I feel the current limits are appropriate | Ref 5 |
| 6 | I cannot see this making any difference, I would rather you used average speed cameras like on a38 Bassets pole to A5 or along the Hagley road | Ref 6 |
| 7 | I object this proposal on the grounds that it is useless. This applies to the whole proposal, in all areas. The 40mph speed limit is not the problem. We see similar accidents in 30mph speed limits, (ie: the recent accident on the Bristol road), because people routinely drive excessively over the limits and there is no penalty for doing so. You could reduce the speed limit to 20mph and it wouldn't make a difference unless there were real deterrent consequences to reckless and dangerous driving. I also think that traffic management is a problem. There are delays on the roads all the time, and people drive recklessly to get to the front or surpass a queue. | Ref 3 & Ref 4 |
| 8 | I formally object to lower the speed limit on the A41 Hockley Flyover. The speed of 40 needs to remain as it allows traffic to pass. By reducing the speed you are creating more traffic and it will not help the environment. There is already so much traffic along the Soho Road and coming out of the city centre where there are reduced speeds, by keeping the speed of 40 it allows traffic to be filtered and moving avoiding any more issues and polluting the environment. I do not agree with reducing the speed and car drivers are responsible drivers. There will always be a minority that will speed, just like anywhere else. Responsible drivers need not be punished for irresponsible drivers. There are no pedestrian access on the flyover so lives will not be put at risk. | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 9 | what an actual load of Rubbish. There is literally no need to reduce any speed limits, Look at the ones you have already reduced. Has it improved anything? No its just made even more traffic This has nothing to do with road safety and everything to do with you trying to raise revenue. What fatalities have actually taken place on what roads? and what was the speed limit? How fast was the vehicle(s) travelling? Willing to bet that in each and every case the vehicle was travelling far in excess of the speed limit meaning reduction in speed limit would not of made any difference at all. | Ref 3 |
| 10 | This further creates congestion and obstruction of the highway creating a city that is not fit for purpose. The road system has been designed for 40 mph to carry the volumes of traffic, thus will further move traffic into the surrounding residential areas. The reduction in main road highways limits will encourage as he other rat runs to be created by natural migration by traffic as main roads have no advantage... creating a " flat limit" across all roads that is unenforceable. | Ref 2, Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 11 | I object in general. On larger roads reducing the speed limit will cause driver issues. I do not believe drivers will slow down and adhere to the 30 mph limit and this will put pressure on those drivers whom do. I drive to the speed limit, and already on roads like the Expressway through the tunnels through the city centre, and persuade road, most drivers do not follow the 30 mph speed limit. As I do follow the speed limit, I have had several experiences of driving too close, pressuring me to drive faster, you feel like you are holding other drivers up and are going too slow for the speed and flow for the road. On larger roads similar to this in the proposal, I believe this will not be followed and will put pressure on drivers like myself from other non law abiding drivers. I believe the 40mph speed limit on these roads is adequate for the pace and traffic flow on these type of roads. | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 12 | I disagree with your proposal for items: 3,4,18,19 | Ref 1 |
| 13 | I formally object to this measure, particularly in relation to Monmouth Drive, Queslett Road and Chester Road but more generally to all of them. The issue, from what has been put in the press, is not the 40th limits but racing and poor driving well above the limits. You would be better served installing speed and red light cameras to keep people to the current speed limits, rather than falsely suggesting that the 40mph limits are to blame. | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 14 | I formally object to the entirety of the speed limit order. 40mph roads should stay as they are. | Ref 5 |
| 15 | I would like to object to roads like the Walsall road being reduced to 30mph as I believe your reasons misguided and pointless. Very few follow the speed reductions already in place on the Walsall road as it is. Stop picking on motorist's and start doing some good in the communities that doesn't cost stupid amounts. | Ref 6 |
| 16 | 20 - A441 Redditch Road 26 - Redhill Road | Ref 3 |

| | | |
|----|---|------------------------|
| -- | Living locally to these sections of road all my life, I don't believe there is a high frequency of accidents (I don't recall there being any this year, certainly none with loss of life) and therefore don't consider there is anything to necessitate a reduction in speed limit. | |
| 17 | <p>There us no reason at all to reduce the speed limit on any of these roads, with the exception of the hill outside Shenley Court School.</p> <p>If you have done any research at all you will see that fatalities and serious injuries in the City are virtually all caused by people who completely ignore the rules of the roads and the speed limits, not by people legitimately travelling at 40mph on main roads.</p> <p>Perhaps you should use the surplus cash to fund more police officers to target those people.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 18 | These roads are major arteries and for the most part dual carriageways with very little pedestrian traffic. I firmly believe that 40 mph is a proportionate speed for drivers paying due care and attention. It seems to me the odds of a life threatening collision from 2 cars doing 40mph in the same direction is vanishingly low - the danger on these roads comes from drivers exceeding the limit which without enforcement will continue to take place regardless of the limit imposed. E.g. I have personally observed drivers holding race meetings at Fort Parkway and driving at reckless speed - these incidents are where the risk to life arises not from law abiding motorists driving at 40mph on a trunk road. The speed limits should be maintained at current levels but enforced. | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 19 | <p>I formally object to all of the proposed City wide reductions to 40mph speed limits.</p> <p>There is no justification or indeed evidence that normal motorist exceed the 40mph limit City wide.</p> <p>If there is an issue with speed causing more accidents and deaths it is invariably caused by motorists who are driving when they should not be. I.e. stolen vehicles, drivers with no insurance, drunken or drugged drivers.</p> <p>Introducing a city wide ban on 40mph will not prevent these people from causing deaths as they will ignore the limits as they do now.</p> <p>It is wrong to dictate to the majority due to actions of a few.</p> <p>Indeed this seems nothing other than your political dogma of hatred of car drivers coming to the fore.</p> <p>When you introduce this, which I no doubt you will, you will be responsible for the increased levels of car emissions, I hope this time you take responsibility for this.</p> <p>Finally, I expect this consultation to be a complete waste of time and money, as you have already decided to implement this. The consultation is merely another box ticking exercise while you continue to squander council tax payers money while forever increasing Council tax to levels people can ill afford.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 3 & Ref 8 |
| 20 | <p>Location 1:</p> <p>I formally object to the proposed reduction in the speed limit of this key gateway to and from the city to the north of Birmingham from 40mph to 30mph. Not only does the majority of this proposed boundary not directly cross pedestrian areas (for which where this is the case at either end the reduction is already in place) therefore not providing a direct benefit or reasonable mitigation of risk to either pedestrian or cycling public but also the road(s) were purposely developed in such a way to ensure efficient entry and exit from Birmingham City Centre with professional previous assessment of confirmed safe travel at 40mph.</p> <p>There is little to no evidence throughout any strategy to date which indicates the use of capital and ongoing financial costs in implementing the scheme without this boundary provides any safety benefit, either directly through the reduction of accidents based upon a reasonable historical time period spanning the entire of the proposed, nor indirectly through future year pollution reduction (especially when aligned to expected vehicle shift to EV alongside increased euro or such like standards). Therefore effectively for within the boundary proposed the sole potential upside for BCC can be viewed as a cash generation scheme from enforcement. The purpose of the said roads within boundary were as per above, partially to allow traffic to more efficiently travel to/from Birmingham City Centre more so than the neighbouring 'local roads' via Birchfield/Newtown etc for which do meet with pedestrians and crossings (for which a max 30mph applies). I can solely conclude as a result this is further evidence of BCC attempting to extract additional funds from BCC residents to cover historical financial mismanagement from within BCC, rather than focusing upon the more effective and VFM use of your residents taxes, and more quality controlled oversight of projects and future strategy. You do have to ask whether BCC has entirely lost its way and forgotten the reason for its existence.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 5 & Ref 8 |
| 21 | <p>I formally object to a mass approach which is not underscored and supported by quantitative or qualitative data that clearly defines the issues of concern relate to those driving between 30 and 40MPH. There is an assumption that changing the speed limit alone will effect the behaviour of those drivers that drive dangerously or without due care and attention. My observation of the impact of the extended 20MPH zones is that those revised limits are still rarely abided by and in some drivers seem to have the opposite effect. Nor are they visibly enforced. The same applies to the areas of the Bristol road and the Queensway's which were lowered from 30 to 40 previously</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 22 | I formally objecting to this proposal. Over the last few years we have seen several restrictions implemented by Birmingham CC without any proper overall coordination of their impact on residents. Low traffic zones, 20 miles zones, and now this. All of these measures are considerably increasing travel time and pollution in the city, while having no real impact on safety. The car related incidents are typically caused by drivers who ignore the current speed limit. Lowering it will make no difference to this, in fact it create more problems, as we can witness in 20mph zone, with dangerous overtaking. | Ref 2, Ref 3, & Ref 4. |
| 23 | Formally object ... a bankrupt council yet you still have time for loony ideas like this. 40mph for these roads are fine, stop wasting money for things like this | Ref 8 |
| 24 | <p>I wish to formally object to all of the planned proposals. This is due to the fact that delays and congestion are bad enough already, particularly in Walmley and Sutton Coldfield. The police cannot and do not enforce the existing speed limits and bad driver behaviour. I would not welcome another round of speed cameras. Consideration should be given to removing or limiting bus lanes which are under used and do not help the flow of traffic. Delays are also exacerbated by constant road works, holes dug in the road and left, poorly erected and managed traffic lights. A further reduction in speed limits would just further add to road difficulties and challenges in getting from A to B.</p> | Ref 4 and Ref 6 |
| 25 | I don't see any need where the road is a "dual carriageway" IE 2 lanes of traffic in either direction, for the limit to be reduced. I'm not aware of any issues on these roads. | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 26 | <p>I formally object to the proposed reduction the speed limit to 30mph on the A45 Coventry Road, A45 Small Heath Highway, and A4540 anti-clockwise.</p> <p>There are already average speed cameras on the majority of these stretches and compliance with the 40mph speed limit on these stretches is excellent. I travel on these roads every day and on the stretches where there are average speed cameras, it is rare to see dangerous driving. The biggest risk of serious collision is due to pedestrians not using designated crossings and instead choosing to vault barriers at the central reservation, and also by beggars at traffic lights moving in and out of traffic. There is very little risk to foot traffic provided the numerous crossing points are used as designed. In regards to Small Heath Highway, there is no pedestrian footpath at all and I have never seen a pedestrian on there, and there are no houses or businesses on that stretch and so reducing the limit to 30 is a ridiculous overreaction to serious collisions elsewhere in the city and serves no purpose in reducing risk on the roads.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 9 |

| | | |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 20 | <p>In addition, were the speed limit to be reduced to 30, unless this was backed up with average speed cameras enforcement drivers would simply ignore the new speed limit. If the camera network is extended, why not keep the limit to 40 and just make sure it is properly adhered to by all drivers throughout the city?</p> <p>I would certainly rather see the 40 mph limit retained but simply be properly enforced by cameras because reducing it to 30 without adding in cameras is going to see very little real-world reduction in the speed drivers travel at, and would amount to little more than just changing the number on the road sign.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 6. |
| 27 | <p>For an awful lot of the city public transport is poor. BCC spends a fortune on making sure it makes driving difficult and thus scheme is another example.</p> <p>I do not support any of these proposals which in reality are another way to fine motorists.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 8. |
| 28 | <p>For the proposals around Sutton Coldfield and Perry Barr the 30mph limit will lead to more congestion and will disadvantage residents as the travel time into the city centre will significantly increase. 40mph limits where in place present a freer flowing and smoother traffic flow away on main through roads. This stops people using residential roads as "cut through" and "rat runs".</p> <p>I would like to formally object to all proposals in Sutton Coldfield and Perry Barr</p> | Ref 4 |
| 29 | <p>Object.</p> <p>The order is unnecessary. It will do nothing to combat deaths and injuries caused by people who already break the speed limit. Many of the roads identified only have pavements on one side and so few people cross them. The proposals will increase traffic and increase people breaking the law and not achieve its objectives.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 30 | I am against the speed limit being reduced from 40 m.p.h. to 30 m.p.h. on all of the roads, but particularly reference numbers 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 18 and 24. | Ref 1 |
| 31 | Formally object. We don't need to baby sit | Ref 1 |
| 32 | I object to the speed limit proposal because it will slow traffic and produce more pollution. | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 33 | <p>I do sincerely believe that the lowering of the speed limit will have an adverse affect on traffic flow.</p> <p>I think that there will be more congestion on the roads and for longer periods of time</p> <p>This surely would counteract any gains from the CAZ.</p> <p>Therefore I do object.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 34 | <p>Unnecessary</p> <p>More waste of money by a bankrupt council</p> | Ref 8 |
| 35 | <p>Antisocial driving is not caused by drivers who drive at 40mph in a 40mph zone; it is caused by drivers who have no regard for speed limits on wide, straight roads. I have a dashcam that is full of footage of inconsiderate drivers jumping red lights, weaving in and out of traffic, driving at excess speeds, and generally having no regard for road users who are following the current restrictions.</p> <p>Reducing the 40mph to 30mph along the A45 Coventry Road (16,17) for example, will have the effect of causing road users who were previously obeying the 40 mph speed limit to obey the 30 mph speed limit. It will not cause road users who were previously driving at 60 mph on that road to slow down, because they didn't care about the speed limits before and they won't in future.</p> <p>This is not to say that lower speed limits are a bad thing, as they reduce congestion, fuel use, air pollution, and road and tire wear; but they absolutely will not dissuade antisocial drivers from driving antisocially. It is entirely possible that the number of road traffic accidents in fact increases, as antisocial drivers may be more inclined to weave through slower moving traffic on open roads.</p> <p>Please instead consider more robust enforcement of existing traffic regulations as currently I believe these drivers operate with no fear of actually being caught and prosecuted for their behaviour, and reducing speed limits will do nothing to change that perception. I do not exaggerate when I say that the awful standard of driving in Birmingham is causing me to consider moving out of the area, and being used as a de facto rolling roadblock by restricting my speed further along arterial routes does not increase the appeal of driving into or out of Birmingham of an evening.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 35 | <p>i wish to object as this will lead to more congestion and pollution.</p> <p>what a waste of money</p> | Ref 2, Ref 4 & Ref 8 |
| 36 | <p>I object to this order</p> <p>The primary problem with speeds is their enforcement. When incidents have taken place it is usually people driving far too fast</p> <p>Driving at low speeds is in itself dangerous as people tend to concentrate on their speed rather than the road. For a dual carriageway in general use 30 mph is too low and would lead to delays, rat runs and people generally not following the speed limit.</p> <p>If there are particular areas of difficulty limit the speed but not generally</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 37 | <p>Poor condition of the listed roads and the current levels of congestion already slow the movement of traffic in and around the city. Most accidents are caused by drivers speeding well in excess of the current speed limits, alcohol and substance abuse. The near zero lack of deterrent does not discourage poor, impaired or dangerous driving by a minority. The reduction of the speed limit will only impact all the law abiding drivers and the minority will continue regardless.</p> <p>If funding is available then enforcement should be via average speed cameras and more police presence.</p> <p>I drive a school bus across the city daily at peak times and 99% of people are justifiably fed up with the congestion but abide the rules. Why should we be penalised?</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 8 |
| 38 | I am against lowering the speeds to 30mph in all areas. The problem you should be tackling are the idiots that no matter what speed you enforce will ignore it. The "emergency" you speak of isn't to do with the majority of drivers they aren't going around speeding and killing people it's the minority speeding why not make the speed limit 20 mph as in Wales if you want to really piss people off the idiots will still drive at 60mph. | Ref 8 |

| | | |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 39 | <p>I object to the changes. They don't need reducing in speed they are fine as they are for starters ox leys road is not a built up area so does not need dropping to 30mph as it's open country side.</p> <p>Lichfield road does not need dropping again it isn't a built up area and the roadway is very wide and visible.</p> <p>Weeford also does not need dropping as it isn't a built up road and is fine as it is.</p> <p>I thought Birmingham city council was bankrupt and didn't have any money as this proposal is going to cost a lot of money to carry which would be better spent on fixing pot holes in the road or being spent on items that the city really needs.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 8. |
| 40 | <p>The council continues to implement restrictions such as these speed orders and LTN's due to their ideological anti-car position. These orders will only make congestion worse whilst doing little to reduce the antisocial behaviour of a few drivers who will continue to flout the speed limit at what ever speed it is set.</p> <p>There is no mention of how better enforcement will be managed or paid for.</p> | Ref 6 & Ref 8 |
| 41 | I'm against all of the proposed orders. They're not necessary. | Ref 1 |
| 42 | Tyburn Road, Chester Road, Eachelhurst Road and Heartlands Parkway reducing the speed limits on these roads will not work. It will increase the traffic on these routes especially where there are bus lanes, making it harder to join main carriageways from side roads and impacting negatively on residents lives, with more noise pollution and general volume in traffic. Also don't see how this will be policed - its not now and the limit is currently 40! | Ref 2, Ref 5 & Ref 8 |
| 43 | I formally object to the reduction of speed limits for all the areas proposed. I regularly use the roads and there is no need to reduce the speed limits. The reduction will simply cause more accidents and be unsafe. It will increase pollution and journey times and is not in the best interests of residents or road users. | Ref 2, Ref 3 |
| 44 | <p>Ridiculous.</p> <p>Will be quicker to walk</p> | Ref 1 |
| 45 | <p>I wish to formally object to the following Speed Limit orders for reference location numbers 7-18, 20-24, 26-27.</p> <p>This is just an excuse to raise revenues for a bankrupt council by fining people.</p> <p>The money raised from the ULEZ zones should be put into repairing the potholes not penalising people.</p> <p>The council should concentrate on acknowledging and addressing the issue of dangerous driving by working closer with the police by catching and prosecuting 'boy racers' and confiscating uninsured vehicles.</p> <p>They can start with Sparkbrook, Small Heath and Yardley. The amount of cars outside some houses is ridiculous. Many of them being driven in 'trade plates'!</p> | Ref 8 |
| 46 | <p>Accidents are caused by people going way over 40mph, changing to 30mph isn't going to change this,</p> <p>WHAT YOU NEED TO DO IS PUT ALL THE SPEED CAMERA'S ACTIVE, AND INTRODUCE AVERAGE SPEED CAMERA'S ON LONG STETCHES OF ROAD</p> <p>THE INCREASE IN DEATHS HAS COINCIDED WITH THE TURNING OFF OF THESE CAMERAS, WHY ARE THEY NOT BEING TURNED ON , ITS SO ODVIOUS</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 6 |
| 47 | I disagree with all proposed reductions of 40mph speed limits. The fatalities were caused by drivers ignoring the 40mph speed limit, reducing the limit to 30mph will not make those drivers who already break the speed limit drive any more slowly. | Ref 3 |
| 48 | <p>I want to object to ALL proposals to lower speed limits.</p> <p>Speed limits are not the problem! Drivers breaking the existing limits are the problem. These drivers will continue to break any limits imposed and still be the problem. Just as 20mph limits have been unsuccessful in slowing traffic so will 30mph limits.</p> <p>Only viable solution is more meaningful enforcement of existing limits.</p> <p>The way thinks are moving, soon you will want 0mph limits on all Birmingham roads!</p> | Ref 6 |
| 49 | <p>I'm a Quinton resident and speed limits are not adhered to that much. I can't see how this will be enforced as the A456 itself then the subsequent Quinton Expressway is used by criminals as a route to the motorway, and often they are followed by high speed police car chases. With Quinton police station now being beck open most speeding is now the police!</p> <p>If imposed it would slow already congested areas down more causing more pollution in a residential area which is also a concern.</p> <p>There are no statistics to show these changes will create better safety in the roads and that would need to be published.</p> <p>Finally the costs. As residents we are already subject to filling in financial failing of this inept council, and where are the funds going to come from to cost out these changes.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 8 |
| 50 | <p>I support many of these schemes, but I am not in favour about the wholesale reduction of speed being applied to all the existing dual carriageways in non-residential areas. This would include schemes 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17. Here the risk to injury to pedestrians is considerably less and slowing the speed limit on these dual carriageway roads could well result in motorists using less suitable side roads through adjacent residential areas.</p> <p>Enforcement is an essential part of any Speed Limit scheme as compliance is not guaranteed, especially when there are reports indicating that the region has one of the highest levels of uninsured vehicles on its roads.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 51 | <p>I wish to formally object to all of the speed limit order. We do not need to reduce speed limits to 30mph. This is a jobs worth trying to justify their existence.</p> <p>Surely Birmingham Council has better things to spend our money on, like paying off the debt they have saddled us with?!?!</p> | Ref 8 |
| 52 | <p>I wish to formally object to this plan as it will caused much more traffic and reduce travel time.</p> <p>It is clear that accidents and fatalities are caused more by speeding and reckless driving and A road being 40 MPH</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 4 |

| | | |
|----|--|----------------------|
| 53 | <p>I wish to formally object to this proposal in its entirety. The speed limits are not the problem. The people causing carnage on Birmingham roads are not doing it at 40mph or 30mph.</p> <p>It is being done by people totally ignoring any speed limit. This change will not alter that. What is needed is the current limits being enforced and more spot checks on vehicles, drivers and there legality.</p> <p>This proposal will just punish all other citizens going about their normal business. The ones causing problems will still ignore a 30mph limit like they ignore the current 40mph limit.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 54 | I wish to formally object to the speed limit order. I feel it is yet another case of Birmingham City Council actioning an ill thought through plan. The speed limit reduction will just lead to increased journey times and congestion. The real issue is not the speed limit being at 40 but the unfortunate few people that ignore the limit and drive at excessive. The people that ignore the limit will just ignore it if you set it to 30 or 20 or even re introduce the need for flag waving. The money being spent on this could be far better spent on reducing the service cuts being imposed by a dysfunctional council. | Ref 4 & Ref 8 |
| 55 | <p>I do not agree with the speed reduction.</p> <p>Spend money on education of public in crossing the roads.</p> <p>Also if required add traffic light crossings.</p> | Ref 8 |
| 56 | I formally object to reducing the speed limit to 30mph from 40mph on any and all roads in Birmingham. Deaths are caused by irresponsible drivers exceeding the current speed limits. Emissions are greater at lower speeds - it takes longer to clear the area. | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 57 | I formally object to this proposal, This will create slow moving traffic queues due to lower speed , there is no evidence that it will reduce accidents and increase dangerous driving due to impatient | Ref 3 & Ref 4 |
| 58 | <p>I object to the lowering of the speed limit in all of the above highlighted areas.</p> <p>It should remain the same as it is</p> | Ref 5 |
| 59 | I wish to formally object to the proposed drop in speed limit to 30mph , there is no real evidence that dropping the limit will decrease road accidents and the majority should not be punished for the bad driving of the few , most accidents are caused by people breaking the speed limits or very bad driving so the proposal doesn't actually address the causes of the issue , I fear it's just another attempt to criminalise drivers and make more money in fines | Ref 3 |
| 60 | Continually capping speeds does nothing but raise revenue. It brings business to a halt as a constant war is waged against road users. It will increase emissions as traffic spends more time on the road making life worse for residents in the areas affected as nothing moves. It's time this constant interference with people's ability to move around freely came to an end. If safety is the main concern then here's an idea that was used when I was younger.. roads are for traffic, teach children at a young age to cross safely and treat them with respect. Ditch the headphones and mobile phones and concentrate, why was the green cross code removed from young children's lessons at school?! This demonisation of traffic has to stop! If this reduction in speed is really about safety and not revenue then there is no need for revenue raising cameras along these stretches as the reduction in speed should be enough, but we all know that won't happen. Poor driving is more responsible for problems on the road so where are the police...of course more police wouldn't fill the coffers with fines so that won't happen. Sorry this is so cynical but really, everyone knows what's behind it. | Ref 2, Ref 3 & Ref 6 |
| 61 | ALL proposals - this is just another waste of public money, the reductions will be widely disregarded owing to a lack of enforcement, and in reality such is the city's levels of congestion at peak travelling hours speeds limits its a challenge to reach even 30mph | Ref 8 |
| 62 | I object to reducing the speed limit as this clearly causes more build up of traffic, most of the A roads mentioned are away from residential homes. | Ref 4 |
| 63 | <p>I wish to object.</p> <p>A blanket 30mph is inappropriate. It will be particularly frustrating driving on these roads at night during low traffic times.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 64 | <p>I object.</p> <p>Roads previously 30 have now been reduced to 20. If these speed limits are introduced now, they could be reduced again later much easier, further exasperating drivers.</p> <p>40mph roads are major routes carrying heavy traffic, and journey times are already long enough without slowing the traffic further.</p> <p>Money would be far better spent on improving infrastructure of the roads including crossings and cycle lanes than spending money reducing the speeds, especially as speed limits are rarely enforced (Bristol Road South between rubery and town is an example)</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 65 | <p>I object to all the proposed speed reductions from 40 to 30 mph. The reason for my objection is that reducing the speed will slow down traffic and cause delays to those travelling on all those roads.</p> <p>This proposed change will delay to people from all walks of life when travelling to work, school pick ups, hospital or emergency travel etc.</p> <p>The council are already making it difficult to drive around Birmingham and trying to force cars onto the ringroad. Slowing roads that down just adds to the current traffic issues.</p> <p>Road safety isn't about speed only, the police need to tackle bad driving to prevent accidents. Lowering the speed limit will not prevent those specific individuals who drive fast on purpose to slow down and they are the one's who cause accidents. Deal with bad drivers, without punishing the rest of us.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 66 | A38 proposal is too restrictive if past the flyover. | Ref 5 |
| 67 | I don't agree with a blanket change of the speed limit. People often ignore the speed limit, particularly those who race at night. You would be far better to put in traffic calming measures on these roads to ensure you can't speed, e.g road width speed bumps. You also need to look at other areas where speeding happens or where drivers ignore pedestrians on zebra crossings. | Ref 5 |
| 68 | Formally object to changing the speed limit on any part of Coventry Road | Ref 5 |
| 69 | Reducing the speed will mean more slower traffic and that will cause more panic and rush and accident chances will increase so will the speed increase and this is not the solution. | Ref 4 |
| 70 | All of the roads that are listed do not require 30mph most are dual carriage ways and have very little or no pedestrians. | Ref 5 |
| 71 | <p>Formally Object to proposed speed limit order, specially for locations 1,2 & 24 (A34 Walsall Road, A34 Perry Barr Expressway, A34 Birchfield Road, A34 High Street; A4041 Queslett Road; A41 Hockley flyover (Soho Hill and Hockley Hill)).</p> <p>The main reason being that restrictions in these areas would lead to a significant increase in traffic due to the impact on the flow of traffic, causing increased pollution and negative health impacts as a result in the local community. Each of these have adequate safety protections in place to protect pedestrians from road traffic, including traffic barriers, bollards, a d grass verges.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 3 & Ref 5 |

| | | |
|----|--|----------------------|
| | With respect to the Hockey Flyover (REF 24), this entire section of road is elevated and not open to pedestrian traffic. Limiting the speed of the flyover would render the flyover obsolete as a piece of infrastructure as it would provide little advantage to traffic flow over the road & roundabout which it currently bypasses. Instead, a speed camera would serve a better investment towards reducing road traffic accidents at these locations as it would encourage drivers to keep to the current speed limit rather than exceeded it and increasing the likelihood of RTA's. | |
| 72 | <p>I am formally objecting on all areas.</p> <p>The majority drive carefully & other drivers will still drive fast/dangerously in spite of any formal change to the speed limit.</p> <p>Many cars are difficult to drive at 30mph & under & will need to be in lower gears for extended periods resulting in higher pollution locally.</p> <p>If cameras are installed this will just be a stealth tax and cause many motorists hardship/stress with fines/legal actions.</p> <p>If there aren't any cameras many drivers will still drive above new limit.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 8 |
| 73 | <p>I wish to object for the reasons stated below firstly traffic will get worse by reducing the speed limit.</p> <p>The actions of a few who speed on public roads should not now discriminate the law abiding citizens who follow the speed limit. I do not believe reducing the speed limit will save lives. The deaths caused by speeding vehicles were excessive and over 40mph.</p> <p>Currently on majority of Birmingham roads there are no active speed cameras, police presence is minimal on the roads. The council should use the money that it generates from CAZ to recruit more police officers and install working speed cameras. The majority of the public are aware the old yellow box speed cameras do not work. This is the problem fix them and install more to reduce speeding.</p> <p>More police presence on the road and working speed cameras will deter members of the public from speeding. Punish the drivers who speed not the whole of Birmingham.</p> <p>By implementing the 40mph the traffic in these areas will only get worse causing more pollution.</p> <p>To reduce deaths on the roads the government need to limit the amount of powerful cars on the roads. Anyone under 25 should not be allowed to purchase a vehicle that has more than 150bhp.</p> <p>The car manufacturers allow their vehicles to be tuned to dangerous speeds this needs to be blocked from the manufacturer to stop this from happening.</p> <p>Instead of reducing the speed limit, the council should teach in secondary schools the risks of speeding.</p> <p>TV commercials should be reintroduced to warn people of the dangers of speeding.</p> <p>Education will only change the mindset of people.</p> <p>I as a member of the public object to these changes and do not support them.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 6 & Ref 8 |
| 74 | I wish to formally object to the speed limits on the a45 Coventry Road. At rush hour the traffic either way isn't as fast as 40 in places. | Ref 5 |
| 75 | <p>I wish to object to the proposals.</p> <p>Recent road speed reduction, Chester Road, Birmingham Road, has not reduced the accident rate or addressed the standard of driving, (which has deteriorated significantly in recent years) .</p> <p>The council should address poor standards of driving, particularly licensed taxi drivers, the numbers of which seem to have increased significantly, which includes speeding, jumping red lights and general bad driving practice.</p> <p>This would have a significantly bigger impact than simply reducing the speed for all motorists, the vast majority of whom are both law abiding and good drivers.</p> | Ref 3 |
| 76 | I object to all the speed reductions proposed BCC do not implement correctly and do what they want for Financial gain to hide the inadequacy of previous performance not to improve the life of residents | Ref 1 |
| 77 | There is more than enough traffic congestion in Birmingham and this proposal will worsen the situation. Imposing lower limits is unnecessary | Ref 4 |
| 78 | <p>To number of roads is too many and pointless without detection & enforcement.</p> <p>I object to A45 Small Heath Bypass. It is a non-residential road.</p> | Ref 6 & Ref 8 |
| 79 | <p>I regularly use a number of the roads (1,3,4,8,9,10,11,15,18,19 and23) where it is intended to reduce the speed limit. Firstly, the roads in question possibly without exception are well suited to a 40mph speed limit given their location and design. Secondly, these roads assist the flow of traffic in the areas in which they are situated by reason of the higher speed limit. Thirdly, it is already difficult to navigate into or around this city by car given inadequate public transport options to do otherwise and the piecemeal traffic measures put in place by the Council. Reducing speed limits on these and other roads is likely to worsen the situation even more.</p> <p>Fourthly, certainly on the roads I use there appear to be adequate controlled pedestrian crossing points, ample provision for cyclists (which seem rarely used) and measures in place to mitigate any collisions between vehicles. It is difficult to see how simply reducing speed limits will lead to any significant improvement and any benefit is far outweighed by the adverse consequences likely to arise.</p> <p>Finally, while it may seem proactive to reduce the speed limits on these roads no thought seems to be given to actual enforceability. I frequently drive in Edgbaston where a blanket 20mph speed limit has been put in operation. I am regularly overtaken or tailgated by other drivers when doing my best to observe the limit and it appears to me possibly the majority of drivers do not observe the speed limit and I have never seen any enforcement to speak of. There are other similar examples which come readily to mind. In short on particular roads reducing the speed limit does not reduce speed of itself and enforcement is not a high priority.</p> | Ref 4, Ref 5 & Ref 8 |

| | | |
|----|--|----------------------|
| 80 | <p>Speed of the road will not stop the dangerous driving which is seen. People who drive dangerously have no care for if they are speeding so will do this anyway unless there are deterrents. This will penalise sensible drivers who take care to obey current speed limits.</p> <p>The A4540 ring road is dangerous in the areas which are already at 30 due to cars weaving between lanes and cars thinking it is acceptable to turn onto it from side roads 2 or even 3 a breast!</p> <p>Most of these roads are double lane roads not single carriage and how can they be the same speed as the majority of the residential roads in these areas?</p> <p>I asked in the previous survey for data that these roads are dangerous and there should be more information about how many accidents there are, this still has not been included.</p> <p>Ref 1, 16, 17 - these are on the so called Sprint bus route. This was made will lots of objections particularly at Perry Barr which has already led to a slower journey time, reducing the speed limit further will go against these 'sprint' promises and add further time to the journeys.</p> <p>I believe these views will not be taken seriously as the council has already made their decision and will keep consulting until they get the answer they want.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 81 | <p>I travel across Birmingham and do not believe that lowering the speed limit is required.</p> <p>A more effective method of improving road safety would be better monitoring of poor driving. Undertaking, wrong lane use and cutting red lights.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 82 | I formally object because there is no benefit for reducing the speed limit. | Ref 1 |
| 83 | I object to the speed reduction. Traffic is already heavy in major roads without the flow being further slowed. | Ref 4 |
| 84 | <p>I object to the lowering of all speed limits , it doesn't help anyone , it doesn't reduce accidents there is no clear research to support that either .</p> <p>All it does it makes people who don't abide by the limites break them more frequently and drive even worse and then punish those who do abide by them by making it longer and harder to get to their destination be it work or other .</p> | Ref 3 |
| 85 | <p>You don't need to slow down the traffic, you need to punish those that are driving dangerously. All this will do is cause more frustration as people will have to travel even slower in an already overly congested city.</p> <p>Those who break the speed limit or drive recklessly need to be stopped and punished accordingly. Because it'll be those drivers that will still break the new lower speed limit and upset other drivers.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 86 | I want to formally object to all proposed measure to reduce speed limits. The reason for this is due to traffic problems all around Birmingham throughout the day, every day and I feel reducing the speed limits will make this worse | Ref 4 |
| 87 | <p>I formally object to the proposal.</p> <p>The issue with road safety and accidents on the roads around Birmingham, lies with the lack of proper policing. I have before now seen a car overtake another car on a 20 road in front of police who failed to stop them, despite both the speeding and dangerous driving offences committed. I also continue to hear cars racing down my road hitting 40/50 mph in a 30 mph terraced road, all because punishments are rare or insignificant.</p> <p>Speed is not the issue, consequence and punishment is.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 88 | <p>I formally object to this absurd Speed Limit Order, reducing the speed will not reduce or stop the amount of casualties/injuries/fatalities that occur and that is because the issue is not with the speed limit, it is the issue that offenders decide to drive at 70/80mph, changing the speed limit will not stop that. Only negative consequences will occur such as congestion, a building up of bottlenecks at traffic lights especially on the highways, which will then in turn affect times for public transport and commuting times also. Ultimately this will make productivity for businesses more inefficient which will lead to higher costs passed on to the end users. We understand the council is bankrupt (due to their own fault and negligence) , they should not be taking their frustration out on the regular folks of Birmingham.</p> <p>I have seen this happen in London where I previously lived and this is a failed experiment, the only thing this achieves is stroking the corrupt ego of those in power at Birmingham council.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 4 & Ref 8 |
| 89 | <p>I object to these proposals. These roads have been designed for the appropriate speed limits currently in place.</p> <p>Reducing these limits will have no benefits and simply cause unnecessary congestion with added environmental damage</p> | Ref 2, Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 90 | <p>Birmingham city council just wants to make money out of this scheme I object this this should not go ahead</p> <p>- Fix up the roads first - Clean up all the streets</p> <p>- Get rid of all street beggars who are thrashing the Birmingham area</p> <p>Birmingham city council is not bankrupt the big bosses are pocketing all the money they need to be investigated corrupt Birmingham city council bosses.</p> <p>Get rid off the clean air zones we don't need them in Birmingham</p> | Ref 8 |
| 91 | I am concerned that the reduction in the speed limits may adversely affect traffic without significantly improving road safety since those who currently break the speed limit will continue to do so once it is reduced. | Ref 4 |

| | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| 92 | With car safety increasing over the decades they are much safer on the roads. Human error will always be present no matter what the speed limit is. So I object to the speed limit being reduced. Road safety that is already in place has made road safer and extra measures like reducing the speed to 30mph would be detrimental to the economy. | Ref 4 |
| 93 | Some of these I use regularly. There is very little reason for the Warwick or Coventry road to be slowed. All of these roads are arterial to the city and need maintenance. However there is little safety issue currently. I haven't seen any assessment on the relative safety of these roads. They are key for many businesses. | Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 94 | I object strongly to this speed reduction, you held a previous consultation the results of which were 55% against the reduction yet you go ahead with the reduction regardless, so much for democracy. Also the original proposal was to combat antisocial driving, how is reducing the speed limit going to achieve this, the antisocial drivers ignore the current speed limit. | Ref 1 |
| 95 | We already have too much traffic on the a45 bringing the speed limit down will only increase this, I appose anything idea of changing it to a 39mph zone | Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 96 | I wish to formally object to the blanket speed limit order. My reasons have been ignored from my original objections that include the fact that there is no evidence to suggest that it is the speed limit on these roads that is causing so many accidents, the high accident statistics are as a result of dangerous driving that I have witnessed on all roads that has not been addressed by WMP or BCC. I am also very concerned that the results from the previous consultation in which a majority did not support this reduction have been completely ignored. We live in a democratic country where the majority should be respected. This is a very good example of BCC asking for views and then ignoring the majority view. This in my opinion is undemocratic and erodes public confidence in local authorities. It seems that the decision to reduce speeds in a blanket fashion was decided before any consultation took place. | Ref 3 |
| 97 | I wish to formally object to the City wide proposals and specifically the Coventry Road. Reduction not necessary in areas in dual carriageway sections where traffic needs to be free moving. Will affect businesses and journey times to travel across the city. | Ref 5 |
| 98 | Extending speed limits to 30mph on these roads will only alienate and frustrate drivers, criminalise otherwise law-abiding citizens, require more costly enforcement measures and will be meaningless to those lawbreakers and criminals determined to speed anyway. Such measures should be based on the recorded occurrence of accidents due to excess speed rather than blanket speed limits which will have no effect other than to increase frustration due to the Authority's paternalistic attitude. | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 99 | I object to the reduction of speed limits. All deaths on the roads are a tragedy. However, when these deaths are reported in the news the majority appear to be caused by drivers recklessly/dangerously or driving in excess of the existing speed limits. Reducing the speed limits will not change the habit of these drivers but just inconvenience careful and lawful drivers. This has happened local to me where the speed limit on Drews Lane was reduced from 30mph to 20pmh for some unknown reason. A speed limit that few obey. Catching and banning dangerous drivers before they kill or injure someone should be the answer. | Ref 6 |
| 100 | I formally object as I don't believe the changes are necessary or an improvement. I believe these will only impact the city negatively | Ref 1 |
| 101 | This is another change which will have the opposite effect. As drivers get frustrated as the traffic flow. The drivers who drive at excessive speeds who don't care about speed limits will still drive the same. This is just another cash raising exercise by the city Council. Using all the same excuse its road safety. Environmental ect. All that matters is getting more cash. The city Council bankrupt the city and want any way to raise money. | Ref 8 |
| 102 | The speed limit isn't the issue here as a number of these roads are easily able to sustain a 40mph speed limit. I oppose these rises on ALL the proposed sites and suggest a different approach to deal with the safety of our roads. Primarily engage with the public and use dash cam footage to punish the idiots causing the issues in the first place. Additionally there are other areas that should be addressed first when it comes to speed, highly populated areas where drivers regularly exceed the speed limit very near houses rather than roads where they are set well back. I could give you a list and you should be introducing not only reduced speed limits there but also speed bumps to slow cars. | Ref 5 |
| 103 | I formally object to the Speed Limit Order. The majority of previous respondents have already expressed their objections and voted against it. A small but vocal minority of anti-motorist activists ignore the democratic result by now pushing forward yet another campaign, disregarding the earlier result simply because it did not align with their desired outcome. This is a clear example of a minority group attempting to impose their agenda despite the majority's vote. Such campaigns are excessive and represent a waste of taxpayers' money, which could be better spent on more pressing needs, such as road repairs. | Ref 8 |
| 104 | I don't think it would be an improvement to the city. | Ref 1 |
| 105 | I wish to formally object. I believe the major problem is the enforcement of the existing speed limits and traffic regulations. Every day I see people exceeding them, sometimes considerably, and driving recklessly, crossing on red lights, over/undertaking etc. Reducing the speed limits looks like your taking action, but in effect nothing will change, it's the people above who are killing people, and their behaviour won't change just because of this. | Ref 6 |
| 106 | Areas around b32, b31 do not reduce speed limit to 30 as the roads you mention have very little pedestrians walking through, there also traffic lights anyway- when this lights actually work! | Ref 5 |
| 107 | This is appalling and will only increase overall traffic and frustrate drivers in to risk manoeuvres increasing accidents. Plus, it seems to be another move to generate money again from the motorists in fines | Ref 4 |
| 108 | I formally object the order. The proposed speed limit reduction to 30mph is the potential negative impact on traffic flow and congestion. Lowering speed limits across a wide area could lead to increased journey times, causing frustration for motorists and potentially creating bottlenecks in areas where the current speed limits are appropriate for road conditions. Slower traffic speeds can also exacerbate pollution levels, as vehicles operating at lower speeds tend to emit more harmful particulates and greenhouse gases due to less efficient fuel consumption. This would contradict broader environmental goals and could worsen air quality in areas already struggling with pollution issues. The blanket nature of this proposal fails to account for varying road types and conditions across Birmingham, making it an overly simplistic and counterproductive approach. | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| | I OBJECT TO REDUCING SPEED LIMITS | |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| 109 | <p>Reducing the speed limit to 30mph is ridiculous.</p> <p>Cars are able to stop in sufficient time for any reason given the driver has full attention to the road.</p> <p>The problem with the roads is drivers think they are race drivers while overtaking and undertaking dangerously.</p> <p>There needs to be more highway patrols to catch the idiot drivers that cause these issues and issue bans not points.</p> <p>Or points that double in amounts after first offence for the same issue.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 110 | <p>I formally object the Speed Limit Order. There is a lack of evidence demonstrating a significant safety benefit across all areas included in the scheme. Research shows that targeted speed reductions on high-risk roads are far more effective than imposing blanket limits, which dilute resources and enforcement efforts.</p> <p>Applying a one-size-fits-all speed limit to roads that already have safe design and low accident rates is unnecessary and could divert attention from areas that genuinely need intervention. Without clear data supporting the effectiveness of a wide-area speed limit reduction, this proposal risks being an inefficient use of public funds and may fail to deliver meaningful improvements in road safety.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 8 |
| 111 | <p>I formally object the Speed Limit Order due to the negative economic impact on businesses and commuters. Reduced speed limits could increase travel times for delivery drivers, service providers, and commuters, leading to higher transportation costs and decreased productivity. For businesses reliant on efficient logistics, such as couriers or tradespeople, these delays could directly affect their operations and profitability.</p> <p>Additionally, longer travel times may discourage consumers from visiting certain areas, particularly those outside of central hubs, potentially impacting local businesses. This proposal does not adequately consider the broader economic consequences of slower traffic flow on Birmingham's economy and livelihoods.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 112 | <p>I formally object the Speed Limit Orders. There is insufficient consideration of modern vehicle safety technology. Advances in vehicle design, such as adaptive cruise control, collision avoidance systems, and improved braking technology, have significantly enhanced road safety, even at higher speeds. These innovations reduce the risk of accidents and make blanket speed reductions less necessary.</p> <p>The proposal does not account for these advancements, instead relying on outdated assumptions about the relationship between speed and safety. A more nuanced approach that considers modern safety measures and targets problem areas would be far more effective than a broad, indiscriminate reduction in speed limits.</p> <p>Due to some idiots you cant enforce slower speed limits in the areas mentioned as this is a punishment for is the citizens that actually adhere to the speed limit and these changes would cause us traffic and longer times of travel. What I propose is harsher sentences and laws for those causing accidents on uk roads.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 6 |
| 113 | <p>I formally object the Speed Limit Order. The orders put a strain on enforcement resources. Lowering speed limits across a wide area would require significant additional policing and monitoring to ensure compliance. Without adequate enforcement, the new limits are unlikely to be adhered to, rendering the policy ineffective.</p> <p>This diversion of resources could also impact the ability of law enforcement to address more pressing safety concerns, such as dangerous driving, distracted driving, or areas with genuinely high accident rates. The proposal lacks a clear plan for how these limits will be enforced without overburdening already stretched resources.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 114 | <p>First and foremost, this nanny state woke liberal clap trap nonsense needs to stop. The 40mph roads that currently exists are perfectly safe provided people obey the limit. Reducing the speed limits does not make the roads any safer, this will only antagonise honest motorists and the people that usually speed will continue to do so.</p> <p>Birmingham city Council have already bankrupted once, and wasting money on projects like this will not go down too well with residents.</p> | Ref 8 |
| 115 | <p>I formally object the Speed Limit Orders. There is a negative impact on emergency response times. Emergency services, such as ambulances, fire engines, and police vehicles, rely on efficient road networks to respond quickly to incidents. Lower speed limits could slow their progress, particularly on roads where the current speed limits are appropriate for safe and effective travel.</p> <p>Delays in response times could have serious consequences for public safety, potentially endangering lives in critical situations. This issue has not been adequately addressed in the proposal, raising concerns about its broader implications for emergency services and community safety.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 4 & Ref 8 |
| 116 | <p>I formally object the Speed Limit Orders. Due to the lack of clear cost-benefit analysis. Implementing such a wide-reaching change would involve significant costs, including updating signage, adjusting road markings, public awareness campaigns, and potential enforcement measures. Without a detailed analysis demonstrating that the benefits—such as improved safety or reduced accidents—outweigh these costs, the proposal risks being an inefficient use of public funds. Taxpayer money could be better spent on targeted road safety improvements, such as better lighting, pedestrian crossings, or localised traffic calming measures, which often have a more tangible impact on reducing accidents.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 8 |
| 117 | <p>I wish to formally object to the proposed reduction of speeds on the named roads from 40 to 30.</p> <p>The roads in question are well built and designed for the speed currently in place and are essential arterial routes for commuters. Reducing speeds across this network would have an adverse economic, social and reduce the effectiveness of some public transport routes. The reduction I believe is to stop a minority of people who recklessly race and speed.</p> <p>The council and police should target those who drive at reckless high speeds on these routes rather than punish the innocent.</p> <p>I fully support additional road safety features or localised reductions near schools and an increase in speed awareness campaigns with speed sensor signs, police operations and mobile camera vans.</p> <p>We must keep Birmingham a mobile, dynamic city with good links to ensure our vibrant businesses do not move away and cause a decrease in employment opportunities in areas accessible to all the residents of this great city.</p> | Ref 4, Ref 5 & Ref 8 |
| 118 | <p>I formally object the Speed Limit Orders. This is due to impact on regional connectivity and economic activity. Birmingham serves as a key hub for regional travel, and reducing speed limits across the area could hinder the movement of goods, services, and commuters between Birmingham and surrounding regions.</p> <p>Slower travel times may discourage businesses from operating efficiently within the city, reducing its attractiveness as a place to invest or conduct business. This could have broader economic implications, particularly for industries reliant on transportation and logistics, ultimately affecting the city's growth and competitiveness.</p> | Ref 4 |

| | | |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|
| | | |
| 119 | Absolutely ridiculous idea. The bus lanes you have put in on washwood heath road are Absolutely useless!! And making the rd more dangerous. Reducing the 40 mph to 30 mph is just another money making scheme from out so called bankrupt council. Stop wasting money on silly things just to justify your wages to make it look like your doing something productive. Fix the potholes for God's sakes. | Ref 1 |
| 120 | I do not see the need for a blanket approach in dropping speed limits from 40mph to 30mph. These changes mean pretty much every 40mph road will now become 30mph roads. A better solution would be better enforcement if speed limits and more average speed cameras. A 30mph speed limit is useless if cars are doing 40mph+ plus at night/early morning without any consequences. | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 121 | Object to reducing the speed on these roads to 30mph as it will lead to more traffic and longer journey time. | Ref 4 |
| 122 | Formal objection. I would like to formally object to the proposed speed limit order on all of the above. This is massive overreach by the council, particularly when considering they should be focusing on improving their finances following bankruptcy. I also think the time and money could be better spent elsewhere e.g. rubbish collection, police and improving pub transport. This is not a priority and all of the above roads are busy roads where a reduction to the speed limit would cause hours of delays to drivers. | Ref 4 |
| 123 | I wish to formally object on the grounds that this is not in the public interest | Ref 1 |
| 124 | Formally object I'm all for road safety, efficiency, environmental consideration and smooth movement of traffic but these measures are purely to increase the possibility of garner more money from motorists in speaking fines. It's tragic how many people have been killed on our roads in recent years and nothing takes away from the loss to their families. However in most instances the speed limit was irrelevant and those who caused the accidents would have ignored it no matter what the limit was. Their actions, speed and carelessness meant the speed limit wasn't even a factor in their driving. | Ref 2 & Ref 3 |
| 125 | In my opinion, the main issue is not the speed limits but the fact that the limits are not enforced. If drivers stuck to 40mph, I doubt there would be anywhere as many serious incidents. Therefore, I object to reducing the speed limits and want effort put into enforcing the existing limits. If, and only if, after a lengthy period of implementing the enforcement the issue remains, then I would support the reduction but not as the first stage. | Ref 6 |
| 126 | i formally reject these proposed speed limit reductions the Walsall road scheme is unjust as since the improvements in Perry Barr causes a delay the rest of the proposed section is dual carriageway oxleys road is proposed to extend the current 30 mph by about 100 yards to Fox hollies laughable Monmouth drive apart from driving standards when people hit the island Lindridge Road section is already a 30 mph section so why is this in the order Heartlands Parkway no reason to drop this its a dual carriageway | Ref 5 |
| 127 | Firstly, I note these proposals were rejected by 57% of the residents only last year. The fact that this consultation is being done less than 12 months later suggests to me this is an issue the council is relentlessly trying to force through under the guise of 'consultation'. Secondly, and most importantly, does the Council have clear data to support the hypothesis that at 30 fewer people will die compared to 40? Please provide this raw data so we can analyse ourselves. Why hasn't the Council listened to the 57% who objected last year? Has the Council published anonymised versions from the opposition to the consultation last year? We need to see what was said that the Council has felt the need to ignore and do another 'consultation' straight away. | Ref 1 |
| 128 | Dear Birmingham City Council, I would like to lodge my formal objection to the proposed plan to reduce almost all 40mph speed limits within Birmingham to 30mph. While I understand the desire to improve road safety and potentially reduce emissions, I believe this blanket approach is misguided and will likely have unintended negative consequences. My objections are based on the following points: * Lack of Evidence for Blanket Reduction: The Department for Transport's (DfT) own guidance on setting local speed limits emphasizes an "evidence-led" approach that "reinforce[s] people's assessment of what is a safe speed" (Setting Local Speed Limits, gov.uk). A blanket reduction across all 40mph roads fails to consider the specific design and safety features of each road, and may not be supported by robust evidence of increased safety. Research by the RAC Foundation has even indicated that inappropriate speed limits can increase accidents due to driver frustration and inattention (source: [insert relevant RAC Foundation report]). * Increased Congestion and Economic Impact: Lowering speed limits will inevitably increase congestion and journey times. Studies by the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) have modeled the effects of such reductions, demonstrating significant impacts on traffic flow and travel time (source: [insert relevant TRL study]). This will have negative economic consequences for both commuters and businesses in Birmingham. [If possible, add data from local business groups, like the Chamber of Commerce, about the cost of delays to businesses in Birmingham]. * Impact on Emergency Services and Public Health: Emergency service response times could be adversely affected by widespread 30mph limits. Every second counts in critical situations, and delays caused by reduced speed limits could have serious consequences for public health and safety. * Lack of Targeted Approach: Rather than a blanket approach, a more effective strategy would be to identify specific areas with high accident rates or vulnerable road users (e.g., near schools, hospitals) and implement targeted interventions. This could include: * Improving road infrastructure: Investing in better pedestrian crossings, cycle lanes, and traffic calming measures in areas with demonstrated need. * Targeted speed limit reductions: Implementing lower speed limits only where justified by safety data and risk assessments. | Ref 2, Ref 3, Ref 4, Ref 5 & Ref 6 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| | <p>* Education and enforcement: Focusing on driver education campaigns and increased enforcement of existing traffic laws to improve road safety. The National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) emphasizes the importance of effective enforcement over blanket speed limit changes (source: [insert relevant NPCC statement]).</p> <p>* Examples of Effective Alternatives: [Cite examples from other cities where targeted interventions (e.g., pedestrian crossings, traffic calming on residential streets) have been more effective than blanket speed reductions. Look for case studies published by organizations like Sustrans or Living Streets].</p> <p>I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and instead adopt a more nuanced, evidence-based approach to road safety that prioritizes targeted interventions and effective enforcement of existing laws.</p> | |
| 129 | STOP MAKING OUR LIVES EVEN WORSE ! | Ref 1 |
| 130 | As a traffic engineer speed limits should be based on the characteristics of the road and be realistic. Is the current proposal based on a proper review and traffic count data or just a reaction to the road safety issues facing the city. Having to drive through Birmingham regularly it is the not the road or inappropriate speed limits but the lack of education and more importantly enforcement. Please can you confirm the 85%ile speed data used for each location and subsequent assessment and possibly forward the relevant data so affected residents and businesses can fully assess the proposals. | Ref 5 & Ref 7 |
| 131 | <p>I would like to formally reject.</p> <p>The issue is not the speed limit, it's the people who are speeding so rather than adding lower speed limits you need to penalise the actual offenders who cause these accidents reaching speeds double of the speed limit</p> | Ref 6 |
| 132 | Regarding REF 16 & 17 I would like to object to a reduction in the speed limit. Whilst I accept that there are safety issues and crashes, it seems that most of these are caused by people not following the current speed limits rather than the 40mph limit which seems safe given this is all dual carriageway. I would rather see the existing 40mph average speed camera zone extended to the whole of REF 16 & 17 as I believe this would improve safety more than a 30mph limit which can be easily ignored. | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 133 | <p>I wish to formally object to this proposal and sight the following as reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Numerous of the roads are segregated dual carriageways with no pedestrian interface. 2. Numerous of the roads are on peripheral urban fringes, with little or no pedestrian interface. 3. Numerous of the roads have no junctions, direct residential accesses or other such factors that could be seen as complicating road useage. 4. Numerous of the roads do not have the characteristics of roads appropriate for downgrading to a restrictive 30mph speed limit. These characters are set out in the DfT guidance document 'Setting Local Speed Limits' (17 March 2024). 5. The above reasons show that numerous of the proposed road speed downgrading will have a detrimental effect on road useage in terms of increased journey time and poor road user behaviour due to frustration with the unwarranted downgrading of road speed. This, coupled with the fact that this proposal is at variance with the DfT current guidance on urban road speeds will give reasonable rise to the belief that BCC is seeking to punitively punish motorists and seeking to abdicate it's legal obligations in respect of highway maintenance. | Ref 5 |
| 134 | <p>I wish to make formal objection to the above proposal, reasoning as stated below.</p> <p>First and foremost, Reducing the speed limit will have contribute to traffic, to and from city centre, as we all know that the traffic to and from city centre is worse specifically between early morning and 15:00-1700. This will add time to people journey and will contribute to policution, and extra use of fuel, as well as extra unnecessary time added to everyone journey time.</p> <p>Second, regardless if the speed limit is reduced or not no one can stop people from driving past, specifically when Birmingham is one the area in the country with vast numbers of the cars uninsured.</p> <p>This would only make matter worse rather then help improve</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 135 | I formally object. It is an unnecessary waste of council tax payers money to remove signs. The roads are fine in Sutton Coldfield and through the Tyburn Road. This is just another war on road users by the Labour council. It is unnecessary. Most drivers are safe. Around the thimble end and Webster way, there are currently no houses and barely any pedestrians to even consider this. It is unnecessary. The emissions usage to lower the speed limit will also increase as journey times will take longer. A journey into Birmingham takes already half an hour. You are increasing my journey time and therefore emissions. Labour needs to stop acting as a nanny state and start doing something useful with their time such as infrastructure for electric cars. Imbassiles probably haven't visited the area. It should sit under the town conservative council not the idiots in charge of bankrupting the Birmingham council. | Ref 2, Ref 4 & Ref 8 |
| 136 | <p>This is a formal objection to the suggested proposal for all roads mentioned.</p> <p>Thinking about combustion of fuel for cars - combustion at 30mph is less efficient and produces more CO2 and NOx than at 40mph. By slowing down cars you are moving away from the ridiculous netzero challenge Mr Ed Milliband has signed the UK to.</p> <p>A slower speed is detrimental to the longevity of cars - not in spirit of 'sustainability' of vehicles.</p> <p>A slower road speed = lower productivity.</p> <p>I wish to formally object to this proposal and sight the following as reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Numerous of the roads are segregated dual carriageways with no pedestrian interface. 2. Numerous of the roads are on peripheral urban fringes, with little or no pedestrian interface. 3. Numerous of the roads have no junctions, direct residential accesses or other such factors that could be seen as complicating road useage. 4. Numerous of the roads do not have the characteristics of roads appropriate for downgrading to a restrictive 30mph speed limit. These characters are set out in the DfT guidance document 'Setting Local Speed Limits' (17 March 2024). 5. The above reasons show that numerous of the proposed road speed downgrading will have a detrimental effect on road useage in terms of increased journey time and poor road user behaviour due to frustration with the unwarranted downgrading of road speed. This, coupled with the fact that this proposal is at variance with the DfT current guidance on urban road speeds will give reasonable rise to the belief that BCC is seeking to punitively punish motorists and seeking to abdicate it's legal obligations in respect of highway maintenance. | Ref 2, Ref 5 & Ref 7 |
| | <p>I do not think by reducing speed limits, you are actually taking invasive action. It is easier for a Councillor Majid Mahmood to make this comment and bring up an Road Safety emergency meeting and say we need to reduce speed.</p> <p>What you need to look at, what is being done in terms of other measures? Are roads to long, are there enough traffic light, precautions taken place? speed bumps? measures such as these, Maybe more introduction of average speed cameras (even though I hate speed cameras, but feel these are more effective than reducing speed limits.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| 137 | <p>I currently live on one of the roads you are planning to reduce the speeds. I have lived here just over 24 hours and have grown my childhood in the area. One side of the road has already been reduced down to 30MPH. West Midlands Police Camera Enforcement Unit are there near around 3/4 times a month with staggering amount of drivers caught (over 200+) at a time, yet people still do not slow?</p> <p>So what makes YOU think by reducing "road speed limits" will make people slow down? It won't</p> <p>But what more can you do? Introduce the measures mentioned above. Look at closing certain cross roads like you did opposite the royal orthopaedic hospital many years ago.</p> <p>You need to look at reducing risk factors before you start looking at speed. This is not me saying that "speed" is not a Fatal 5 cause of traffic accidents, but saying you can't always blame speed.</p> <p>Referring back to Cllr Majid Mahmood, I have seen his social media posts about the accidents. What measures are being taken in areas where there are HOTSPOT for collisions? such as Coventry Road, or the areas of B10/11/12.</p> <p>What is being done about people being behind the wheel whilst under the influence of alcohol or drugs? Does more enforcement need to go into place?</p> <p>Does the council need to work more with the policing authorities to crack down on this matter.</p> <p>West Midlands Police have recently had a restructure of their traffic division. Can more be done in terms of enforcement actions from their side? Roads Harms Prevention, Roads Crime Team etc?</p> <p>I really feel you need to look at all avenues, rather than splashing cash on a city which is already bankrupt to replace signs etc etc.</p> <p>The road I have been in, I can count over 300/400 drivers who drive over the 30 and 40 speed limit, The roads are clear and too long. This needs to be stopped and reducing speed limit is NOT the answer.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 138 | <p>While improving safety on the roads is important, decreasing speed limits will have a strong effect on affecting commuters. Instead, I believe safety should be increased through education on road safety, and if needed, constructing pedestrian barriers at high-risk locations.</p> <p>In real-life, it is a common scenario to see pedestrians jay-walk or even cars driving improperly. Through the implementation of the aforementioned two methods instead, then can lasting safety be achieved without affecting productivity and the economy, and the lives of residents.</p> <p>By decreasing speed limits, not only do cars/private vehicles get affected, but most importantly, even buses get affected. This applies to all of the locations in this proposal where a bus may run through. By decreasing the efficiency and speed of bus services, impacts the appetite to use public transportation instead of driving cars.</p> <p>As a result, I wish to formally object to this Speed Limit Order.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 139 | <p>Line 22 B4123 Wolverhampton Road to B4121 Shenley lane. I object to money being spent on this where the issue is not with speed but with the use of illegal electric bikes being used in the area with riders not wearing helmets, having no or insurance.</p> | Ref 1 |
| 140 | <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed speed limit reduction from 40mph to 30mph on the A34 corridor from Old Walsall Road to Old Park Walk.</p> <p>The A34 is a vital arterial route serving north Birmingham, and reducing the speed limit would significantly impact traffic flow and journey times for thousands of daily commuters. The current 40mph limit strikes an appropriate balance between safety and efficiency on this well-engineered dual carriageway.</p> <p>The A34 Perry Barr Expressway section was specifically designed as a major thoroughfare with grade-separated junctions, wide lanes, and clear sightlines. These design features safely accommodate the current 40mph limit. Reducing speeds here would create unnecessary congestion, particularly during peak hours when the route serves as a crucial link between Birmingham city center and the northern suburbs.</p> <p>The economic impact must also be considered. Longer journey times would affect local businesses, delivery services, and public transport operators. The proposed change could lead to rat-running through residential areas as drivers seek faster alternative routes, potentially creating new safety concerns in neighboring communities.</p> <p>While road safety is paramount, there is no compelling evidence that the current 40mph limit has led to an increased accident rate. Instead of a blanket speed reduction, I suggest focusing on specific high-risk areas with targeted safety measures such as improved signage, road markings, or junction modifications.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 141 | <p>I do not agree to the proposed reduction in speed limits on any of the roads listed. BCC has already conducted a survey in 2023 and the outcome clearly indicated that your plans were objected to.</p> <p>Speeding is a major feature of the extent of damage done when crashes occur. Unfortunately it is the illegal speeding and dangerous driving that is to blame. BCC needs to liaise with West Midlands Police about more traffic officers to remove illegal drivers, illegal cars and how to reduce or stop dangerous driving.</p> <p>I do not agree that a reduction to 30mph on these selected currently 40mph limited stretches will help at all. Those illegal drivers will still drive dangerously on 30mph roads.</p> <p>I did agree to some residential roads especially near schools being restricted to 20mph as this makes sense and protects children and pedestrians and will reduce personal injury if there are any crashes. This is because many of these accidents are 'accidents' and not by drivers setting out to deliberately cause danger to others or being careless whether others are put at risk.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| | <p>Formally object</p> <p>Almost as ridiculous as when the Bristol road had the bus lanes implemented then removed.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|
| 142 | <p>Why do continually waste money?</p> <p>Cars are more safer then ever before why are you reducing limits set for cars that were designed in the 70's</p> <p>You should focus on the state of the roads and collecting my bins on time</p> | Ref 8 |
| 143 | <p>I object to all of these speed limit reductions for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is insufficient evidence being provided that there will be a meaningful reduction in car-related casualties, other than statistics which say people are less likely to be injured by cars travelling at slower speeds. This will not stop that problem. Why not reduce the limit to 5mph and have someone waving a red flag in fron of all cars - that'll solve this problem. 2. I would hazard a guess that most casualties are caused by the small number of totally irresponsible drivers racing, or driving at high speed. 3. Is it really the car drivers' fault that pedestrians are unable to use the green cross code? Educate the pedestrians please! 4. This will adversely affect travel times across Birmingham. People take the car because public transport is not (yet) good enough for travellers to take that option. It's bad enough trying to get from Kings Norton to Sheldon without reducing dual carriageways to 30mph. 5. Longer and slower travel times are less efficient fuel wasting - have you considered that NOX and CO2 emissions could actually increase? 6. Section 26 Redhill Road is already 30mph and clearly signposted. 7. Many of these proposed changes seem to apply to small sections of road - for example Queslett Road, and A38 flyover at Rubery. There is a danger that if this is inconsistent with surrounding limits, it could be confusing for drivers. If you want an example of this, look at the bus lane restrictions coming into King's Heath from Maypole, which are different depending on which section. Drivers need consistency. | Ref 2, Ref 3, Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 144 | <p>Its not needed in my opinion, cars will produce more emissions when going slower, will increase traffic. This has clearly not been thought out and again is targeting motorists. I do not agree with your proposals.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 145 | <p>Formally Object.</p> <p>Here are my reasons: Reduced speed limits, e.g 40 to 30, or 30 to 20 in urban areas do not reduce fatalities and injuries to road users or pedestrians. Why? Dangerous drivers do not observe them.</p> <p>RTA Enforcement by WM Police is minimal. Better enforcement would remove the most dangerous drivers from the roads.</p> <p>And with increased visible intervention, other offenders will think: 'if i continue to offend, I will be caught'.</p> <p>So offending behaviour, road deaths, and injuries will reduce.</p> <p>To support my view, I carried out a 30 minute survey of the 20mph zone in School Road, B14. I counted the number of vehicles entering the zone at above 20mph, with the number at 20mph or below.</p> <p>The offending rate was 95%, with no interventions from West Midlands Police.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 8 |
| 146 | <p>I wish to formally object to the over the top Draconian measures being implemented. These roads have been 40 mph and driven on safely for many years. Alot of the these roads are on the outskirts of the city where interaction with pedestrians is minimal if none existent at all - Warmley by pass for example.</p> <p>I am also a cyclist and feel safe riding on these roads.</p> <p>BCC should be concentrating on fixing their appalling handling of their budget as oppose to wasting time and tax payers money on stupid ideas such as these.</p> <p>There are far more pressing issues such as reducing crime that you should direct your attention to.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 8. |
| 147 | <p>I wish to formally object to the speed limit changes.</p> <p>If motorists are not obeying limits at 40mph, why do you think they will obey limits at 30mph.</p> <p>Main problem is lack of policing - not automated traffic cameras at known locations where drivers slow down then speed up again.</p> <p>Considering BCC is currently in debt to almost one billion pounds how will this be funded.</p> <p>Many of the proposed routes are major traffic routes with little or no pedestrian use e.g Ref 1, long stretches of Ref 7, Ref 9, Ref 11, Ref 13, Ref 14,</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 148 | <p>I wish to oppose the proposed speed reductions for the following locations: 1, 4, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, and 23. I believe that all these roads are fully capable of handling traffic safely at 40mph and that to reduce the speed limits to 30mph would cause massive traffic congestion during the day and especially at the morning and evening 'rush hours' thus causing more problems than they solve and punishing all drivers for the sins of those relatively few drivers who abuse the law and cause accidents and who will continue to do so!</p> <p>There will always be drivers who exceed existing speed limits and these should be identified by the use of speed cameras (both fixed location and average speed cameras). Drivers should lose their driving privileges when they have 12 points on their licences - too many drivers are allowed to continue driving after frequent convictions and having more than 12 points accumulated.</p> <p>The experiment in Wales to reduce all but highest-speed roads to 20mph was a massive failure and I believe that a one-size-fits-all speed limit will not lead to a reduction in accidents but, in fact, to an increase and will drive those wishing to come to Birmingham from elsewhere in the country to avoid it altogether. This is an ill-thought-out-proposal which I oppose.</p> | Ref 4, Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 149 | <p>Formally approve of all schemes, except for-</p> <p>Formally object A45 Small Heath Highway as it is built as a expressway</p> | Ref 5 |
| | <p>I wish to formally object to these proposals.</p> <p>The congestion in Birmingham is appalling and this will only make it worse.</p> <p>The vast majority of accidents are due to people not following the current speed limits, which is something that will unfortunately still happen regardless of a lower limit.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|
| 150 | <p>It feels that motorists who obey to current limits are being punished for the actions of those who do not.</p> <p>Therefore, this money would be better spent on catching and preventing those who break the current speed limits with speed cameras that actually work and increased mobile speed operations from police.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 8 |
| 151 | <p>The entire scheme further damages the reputation of Birmingham as a dynamic city where rapid transport links for personal transport is valued. This will result in slow, miserable journeys, more dawdling around and a generally depressing environment in which to get anything done.</p> <p>Investors visiting the city will feel that they spend far too much of their life stuck at little more than walking pace even on the major arteries around the city and spend even more time noticing the run down areas through which they are travelling.</p> <p>Birmingham council is wasting money on these consultations at a time when they are bankrupt and will remain so for the foreseeable future. If the council focussed upon sorting its finances out rather than telling people what they can / cannot do, the city would be an entirely more agreeable location to live.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 8 |
| 152 | <p>FORMALLY OBJECT</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the need to improve the environment and safety on roads. These roads have clear crossings and have been well established for some time as routes to move easily through the city.</p> <p>The boulevard used to be national speed limit. It had only served to make drivers and pedestrians more frustrated at the time taken to cross. If you are crossing not at the known areas you should not be crossing.</p> <p>No issues ever noted on Barnes hill. Infact. Making it slower might even make it more dangerous as more pedestrians will take risks to cross when not supposed to.</p> <p>It is dual carriage way, and not single carriage. Even with cars parks it's still officially a dual carriage way just you have never enforced it and allow people to park on it n</p> <p>If supported by proven increase in accidents. And deaths. Fine, but envoke due to this only. As other measures are in place to reduce emissions.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 153 | <p>You money grabbing bastards all your doing is trying to make more money I'm sick to death of your bull shit the speed limit is fine at 40mph there is no danger the only danger is you the council slowing everything down u penny pinching bastards</p> | Ref 1 |
| 154 | <p>I formally object to all of these proposals as the problem is not the speed limit. It is dangerous drivers who have no care for the rules of the road. What needs to happen is a police clampdown on dangerous drivers. Cameras won't do it as people just drive badly either side of them.</p> <p>The other cause of speeding is exasperation at the many road works, poor traffic management planning and the ludicrous city zoning put in place by the council.</p> <p>E.g if I want to drive from Edgbaston street to Hincley street, due to a unused bicycle lane that removed two way traffic I now have to drive ten minutes to the ring road and back in good traffic or 30 minutes at rush hour.</p> <p>If you want to improve safety stop ticking boxes and do what the people CLEARLY want: leave the speed limits alone, remove the zoning, remove the low traffic neighbourhoods and remove the clean air zone.</p> <p>The best way to make people be 'greener' is lower train and bus fairs, run the services later into the night and make them reliable.</p> <p>I hope you find my free advice useful. No doubt you'd get the same result after spending millions paying a private company to do a consultation just to ignore the answer anyway. Got to love the council.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 155 | <p>A456</p> <p>Current 40mph is correct. Allows traffic to disperse on the dual carriageway smoothly. There are FOUR pedestrian crossings on the proposed section and TWO main junctions - where traffic lights halt the vehicles. Pedestrians can also cross at the main lights. Therefore pedestrians have six opportunities to halt the traffic to cross safely during this section.</p> <p>There is absolutely no need for a reduction from the current 40 - 30. It will make no difference whatsoever to the alleged fatalities on this stretch. As a matter of interest, perhaps you could publish the traffic accidents which you tell us has constituted this ' traffic emergency'.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 156 | <p>I object to this speed limit reduction, on the basis that it will cost tax payers of birmingham, because all the signs and road marking will have to be changed.</p> <p>Reducing the limit will not stop people speeding, i beleive this will have no change on road deaths as those who want to break the law and speed will do it anyway. Speed bumps and chicanes are the only thing that slows drivers down.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 8 |
| 157 | <p>Without any evidence of speed monitoring or continuous policing, I find these proposals to be fanciful.</p> <p>The current speed limits on most of these multi-lane routes, in particular those in my locale such as the A45 Small Heath Highway and A45 Coventry Road are breached almost continuously, with ever increasing dangerous motorway speeds of well over the specified limits being driven by boy racers with no legal documentation. Do you think that these individuals will adhere to a 30mph limit when they cannot adhere to it currently at 40mph, because I certainly do not.</p> <p>What measures are going to be imposed to enforce the reduced 30 mph speed limit? Without any cameras, ANPR monitoring or other means of identifying perpetrators, this proposal is nothing more than a paper exercise that will not save any lives and will target only those motorists who are unaware of the speed limit changes. This feels like yet another poke at the motorist to catch them out and bankroll a bankrupt council.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 5, Ref 6 & Ref 7 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|
| 157 | <p>I see no documentation or proposals relating to how this will be actioned. Will you be wasting police time, having officers sitting in cars all day to catch motorists accidentally doing 1-2mph over the speed limit? Surely it would make better sense having those officers out identifying and removing from the roads the serial speeders, those who drive recklessly with no tax, MOT or insurance?</p> <p>Add to this the cost of changing the road signage. Who will be covering this? Birmingham residents once again in addition to the extortionate council tax increases we are facing.....an unnecessary cost on already stretched households.</p> <p>Without clear evidence of how this has been trialed on Birmingham roads to prove its validity in reducing road deaths on dual carriageways such as these, and how the reduced speed limit will be monitored, please take this as a firm objection to the plan.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 3, Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 158 | <p>I object under the basis that the issue is not the speed limit, but the drivers who blatantly ignore it.</p> <p>Therefore, reducing the speed limit to 30 will do nothing for safety (as those who break the limit will continue to do so), but will impact unnecessarily those who stick to the speed limit.</p> <p>Also, when a road is reduced to a limit that is unsuited to the road (as is the case with many that have already been reduced to 20mph), the result is that nearly every driver ignores the limit and exceeds the limit, making the change pointless and wrong.</p> <p>There is an anti car bias in the council that neglects the fact that people need to move around the city and they are not prepared to give up the car.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 159 | <p>I am against the wholesale reduction of speed limits as the will to enforce them, to route out the people who persistently ignore the limits is totally lacking.</p> <p>People who obey the current speed limits will be penalised by increased journey times and cost of travel.</p> <p>Lowering speed limits will not solve the problem only enforcement of the current limits will deter speeding.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 160 | <p>A45 is main thoroughfare from Solihull/Airport to Birmingham city centre, and therefore should maintain the 40mph limit and should not be reduced to 30mph.</p> <p>Doing so, would double journey time into the city and thus reduce productivity and entry into the city.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 161 | <p>30 mph is joke, the rush hour will be horrendous . It's just another anti car law, it's just to make you use the half full or empty buses . What's next more speed humps ? You've pot holes to slow you down !!</p> | Ref 1 |
| 162 | <p>I wish to object to the proposed 30mph speed limit on Webster Way, Thimble End Road and Eachelhurst Road on the grounds that the existing 40mph speed limit is a suitable speed on these roads for law abiding motorists.</p> <p>Additionally, without the installation of average speed cameras, a simple reduction of the speed limit will be highly ineffective on offenders who already exceed 40mph.</p> <p>As it is, these roads are all relatively straight, so that the views of junctions and pedestrian crossing points are good, consistent with the original 40mph speed limit order being approved.</p> <p>The proposal is ineffective, and therefore unnecessarily penalises the law abiding motorist and increases emissions (travelling in a lower gear).</p> <p>Average Speed Cameras would achieve a reduction in collisions, whilst retaining the existing 40mph speed limit.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 163 | <p>speed limits should left where they are</p> <p>if there were ever any police cars patrolling they could deal with bad driving issues - it's not the speed that is the problem - it's mainly younger men with very powerful cars</p> | Ref 6 |
| 164 | <p>I formally object to a blanket policy of reducing speed limits at multiple sites from 40mph to 30mph in the Birmingham area.</p> <p>It is clear from the recent Welsh reduction in national limits to 30mph to 20mph that the policy is not widely accepted or enforced.</p> <p>We have local issues with speeding vehicles but there is little attempt to catch or deter using active policing or cameras. Further, the lack of enforcement action may encourage more reckless behaviours.</p> <p>The first approach should be to enforce the current speed limits, remove unqualified drivers & unsafe vehicles. Then review the accident statistics.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 165 | <p>I am against the A45 proposal.</p> <p>I think reduction in speed limit is unnecessary. At busier times of day, when there are more likely to be more pedestrians, this road is slower in any event.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 166 | <p>The problem is not the speed limit it's some motorists speeding regardless of what the speed limit is all reducing the limit will do is cause more accidents as motorists drive at a lower speed limit these speeding motorists who cause the crashing into them. What's needed is more traffic police more average cameras.</p> <p>Plus lower speed limits will increase costs for businesses</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 167 | <p>I object to reducing the speed limit in all these areas. None of these areas are near any public risk zones. I drive sensibly on these roads, and they are at the right speed. Instead of reducing the speed, have speed cameras for 40mph, if change is a necessity. Please do not change the speed limits and punish sensible drivers.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 168 | <p>I object as it will cause a backup of traffic. The roads specifically are very low in accidents. I feel this is just another way of money making by reducing speed limit to issue more speeding tickets. 40 to 30 speed limit on these roads will cause backup of traffic during high traffic such as school runs. We've had enough of temporary traffic lights everywhere, not then to have this added!</p> | Ref 3 |
| 169 | <p>I wish to fomally object to any proposed Speed Limit Order the proposed roads in Birmingham.</p> <p>The current proposal by the Council is frankly missing the point. This has nothing to do with current speed restrictions. Most of the roads are dual carriageways and the current speed limits are, in my opinion appropriate.</p> | Ref 5 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----------------------|
| | <p>The problem is with those drivers who drive at ridiculous speeds down these roads well in excess of the current speed limits and drive dangerously. Changing the speed on these roads will have little or no impact on those drivers who behave in such an irresponsible way. It is a police matter and should be down to the police to enforce current motoring law.</p> <p>Couldn't any enforcement be self-financed by fines levied through stopping individuals who fail to comply with motoring legislation. The number of cars that clearly don't comply with issues such as having correct number plates, no insurance, blacked out windows etc are surely sitting ducks!</p> | |
| 170 | <p>I am writing to object to these proposals.</p> <p>A blanket speed reduction across the Borough seems to be quite excessive when the roads concerned are dual carriageways and made for 40mph.</p> <p>A lower speed limit will cause more congestion, environmental issues and will not stop speeding.</p> <p>Perhaps introduction of speed cameras would have more of an impact on speeding.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 171 | <p>I wish to formally object to the speed limit order in general. Speed limits are not the problem it's the drivers. You need to concentrate on the persistent speeders and not penalise the majority of drivers with more congestion and increased local air pollution.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 172 | <p>I would like to this measure on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is a disproportionate restraint on the free flow of traffic to meet aims which although apparently laudable have no credible evidence base to support it. A similar measure failed in Wales. 2. Previously large amounts of our money have been spent on pro-cycling measures that are little used eg city centre cycle way which I have almost never seen a cycle on. 3. Speeding is unenforced in our city (I am very committed to anti speeding) and the way to prevent accidents is to enforce the current speed limit not introduce new cosmetic measures. Similarly dangerous behaviour such as begging amongst traffic by people under the influence of narcotics is completely unenforced in our city. 4. This measure will cost money which the council does not have. It will contribute towards an additional unfair burden on already overburdened residents through the council tax. 5. If there is any money it would be better spent on education (including for aggressive cyclist behaviour) and speeding and other proportionate traffic enforcement 6. This measure is being made for political purposes not as a considered measure. 7. Full disclosure: I am a motorist who wishes to practice safe driving. I formerly worked in a neurosurgical unit so make these objections fully aware of the severe trauma caused in an accident. Parents must play a role too in responsible parenting and educating their children. 8. Please do not pass the measure and rethink it. | Ref 4 & Ref 8 |
| 173 | <p>I wish to object for the reason of the current speed limit is about right for the size of the road and the amount of traffic that uses it, I use a majority of the roads listed and I believe that reducing the speed limits will lead to more traffic build up and it taking a lot longer to get to your destinations.</p> <p>There is no need to reduce the limit on any of the roads listed above.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 174 | <p>Birmingham should maintain 40 mph limits to all main roads feeding into the city centre. These roads have adequate pedestrian crossings and cycle lanes.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 175 | <p>I formally object the proposals. These changes cannot be sensibly policed and I feel that there will be a better use for the spending of publicly gathered/generated funds from the clear airspace charges. I believe better use of funds would be to address the speeding 'Tew' rather than impacting the majority of the road users. Better traffic calming measures should be addressed on all roads not limited to fuel carriageways, which were designed for the speed of transport management. The failure to manage this falls to a failure to address it by the police force. The constant roadworks and distribution to the A45 causes no end of delays and impacts to drivers, these changes will further exacerbate drivers' feelings, and just force the unmanaged few to continue to break the law by speeding as they do so already. The proposed changes are unlikely to be a positive force for change because of the continued failure to address the excessive speeding and illegal driving actions of some on our roads.</p> | Ref 6 & Ref 8 |
| 176 | <p>I wish to formally object to this plan. It is attempting to push multiple speed limit reductions into a single consultation so as to mask the individual feelings of residents. I would formally object to all of the Sutton Coldfield schemes as these are not backed with any evidence of road harm reduction. The schemes are on trunk roads and will cause significant economic damage to the city. These proposals are not about road harm reduction, but are to enforce a plan to force people to walk or cycle. The schemes are not relevant to this agenda, as most, if not all, are in areas where distances covered are greater than would be walked or cycled, or make no sense for cycling or walking. Lindridge Road, for example, is a bypass road which is not on a logical cycle route as better cycling infrastructure already exists. The crash and casualty statistics for the roads in the scheme are such that on some of the roads there has not been a single casualty per the published stats. Please be honest, and say this is an attempt to drive cars from the roads and it is nothing to do with road safety.</p> <p>I know your mind is already made up, but I hope you publish the consultation results and have the courage to publish the stats behind these schemes. Failure to do that will damage, yet again, confidence in the council decision making.</p> | Ref 4, Ref 5 & Ref 7 |
| 177 | <p>The city council are 'consulting' us on these measures but they have not published any proper data on subjects such as how many fatalities have occurred with vehicles travelling within the existing 40mph speed limits on the affected highways. Most of the incidents reported in the local press have been with vehicles travelling far in excess of the speed limit and often associated with dangerous or reckless driving. How does the council believe that reducing the speed limit is going to reduce fatalities in such instances where the existing speed limit is blatantly ignored by drivers travelling at 60, 70 or 80 mph? If the City Council wants us residents to comment properly on these proposals then it needs to publish meaningful data of road traffic accidents where serious injury or loss of life occurs. This should not be difficult at all since such incidents are thoroughly investigated by the police force. I have looked through each proposal. Reference numbers 1, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 23 on the maps are shown as proper separated dual carriageways with two lanes in each carriageway, most of these are trunk routes into and out of the city. In particular references 13, 14 and 16 have no residential properties either side of the carriageways. Reference numbers 4, 6, 25, and 27 do not appear to be in 'built-up areas' with no properties either side or properties separated by a service road, in particular reference 6 is in open countryside. This whole scheme would appear to be nothing more than a 'knee jerk' reaction rather than taking careful analysis of the facts - just making a list of all the existing 40mph speed limits within the city boundary and revoking all of them without any thought or considerations, it is simply virtue signalling to give the impression that "we are doing something about the problem" This is simply not acceptable from our elected representatives. The other statement about "encouraging active travel such as walking and cycling" has no relevance at all to the proposal and is just another example of virtue signalling. The reduction of the speed limit to 30mph on trunk routes into and out of the City such as the A45 will surely increase congestion on such routes, slower moving traffic causing more issues with air quality.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| | <p>I wish to object to this order.</p> <p>I believe that the better approach would be to make these roads safe at their current speeds. A great example of this would be the ring road, where, if the 40mph speed limit were retained, the road could be narrowed from 3 - 2 lanes, with the extra space used for cycle infrastructure, and all junctions where traffic turns across oncoming vehicles would be changed to be left in/out only, with traffic U-turning at the next roundabout.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| 178 | <p>To further improve traffic flow, single or dual lane underpasses should be used for ring-road traffic at major junctions. This sort of improvement is proven to make large roads much easier to cycle on, and to cross. If the speed limit were reduced to 30mph, this sort of solution won't work, as traffic volume will be too high for the speed and width of road.</p> <p>This sort of solution can also lead its way into grander schemes such as burying the ring road for a park.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 179 | <p>Waste of time and money that imo will not stop those who speed. Investment in the enforcement of the current speed limits would have a better impact. It would be self funding as like shooting fish in a barrel.</p> <p>Create a multi agency car crime enforcement team working 24/7</p> | Ref 6 & Ref 8 |
| 180 | <p>Yes I do wish to object to the speed reduction. The road affected near where I live (B4121) is dual carriageway, and designed to safely carry 40mph traffic. It's done so for many years without it being a problem. It's great having this road nearby as it allows me to travel quite large distances in a relatively short time for an urban setting, and makes my journey times a lot shorter than they would be covering an equivalent distance on 30mph residential roads. I don't know so much about the other roads in the proposal, but I imagine the same is true of them too.</p> <p>In the original public consultation, the majority of those who replied were opposed to the speed reduction, so there is no popular support for this initiative, instead it's being undemocratically imposed on us against the wishes of the majority.</p> <p>I'm not aware of any large recent increase in road deaths that might provide some justification for such a move. Even if there were, where's the evidence that lowering the speed limit on roads that have been safely used for many years will make a difference? If the problem is speeding drivers, lowering the speed limit isn't going to help, they'll just ignore the lower speed limit like they do the current one. If it's an increase in bad drivers in general, again lowering the speed limit isn't addressing the problem, better to have more unmarked patrol cars looking for bad and illegal driving.</p> <p>There's also a danger that lowering the speed limit to 30mph on these roads could increase traffic congestion on them, and encourage motorists to seek alternative routes through residential areas, which could well lead to an increase instead of a reduction in the number of pedestrians being hit by cars. Has this possibility been considered? I suspect not. In fact I have a strong feeling that this whole initiative is not really about road safety at all, but is politically motivated.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 181 | <p>Looks like you already decided so this is a waste of my time. But... I object as reducing the speed does not reduce most accidents. Most accidents are caused by idiots who ignore the rules, and when reduced, these idiots will continue to speed and cause accidents.</p> <p>A case in point is Hazelwell Street a few yards from my home. Speed 20mph, BT still the road is a nightmare to walk, for speeding idiots hitting the bend. Takeaway look and you will see that a lampost is awaiting refitting as it was struck by a vehicle. I can tell you thd vehicle was not travelling at 20 mph.</p> <p>Don't reduce the speed limits. ENFORCE THE SPEED LIMITS YOU HAVE</p> | Ref 6 |
| 182 | <p>Two points:</p> <p>I am sure that statistical evidence will show that some of the roads due to have the speed limit reduced, do not have the same occurrence of road accidents as others. I live near to Monmouth Drive and, although there have been occasional accidents, it is nowhere near the level of incidence at other locations reported in the press over recent months. So, is a 'blanket' reduction appropriate ?</p> <p>As a long-term driver, a current advanced driver, previous HGV driver and racing licence holder, I daily see a significant number of driver errors, bad manners, and dangerous driving, some of which involve excess speed. None of these will be affected by a change in speed limits UNLESS there is appropriate policing. Current speeding incidents and other bad driving occur because there is insufficient policing. Changing a speed limit sign, in itself, won't change anything.</p> | Ref 6 & Ref 7 |
| 183 | <p>I wish to formally object due to increased traffic Congestion this would cause. Spend the money on something more useful like reducing crime.</p> | Ref 8 |
| 184 | <p>I object to the whole concept of speed reduction on any of the roads named.</p> <p>Reduction in limit will be as futile as are previous reductions where restrictions are flouted. How would they be enforced?</p> <p>Unnecessary, fuel wasting restrictions will probably cause more accidents as the non compliant perform dangerous manoeuvres to bypass.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 185 | <p>I think 40mph on dual carriageways is reasonable and 30mph will only frustrate drivers when this adds to congestion. It will cost more in fuel and therefore pollution. Many roads have already reduced from 50 to 40 and 30 to 20. It seems to me that this council, along with others and the government would like to see many motorists giving up their cars, either due to frustration or costs.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 186 | <p>To all routes</p> <p>I often drive at all of these locations and proposing a 30 zone from 40 will make it longer for me to travel and I believe by installing speed cameras will be a better instead of creating a 30 zone accidents will not be prevented by this proposals Instead the council will make money off drivers therefore I am against these proposals</p> | Ref 4 |
| 187 | <p>I object to reduce from 40 miles per hour to 30 miles per hour because most of the roads proposed, if reduced it will mean traffic congestion even during off peak periods. Driving will take longer than necessary during off peak periods.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 188 | <p>The roads between my postcode and the city centre are very slow due to the vast amount of traffic lights and stop start.</p> <p>To reduce the speed when you can drive will use more fuel and take longer to get to work it's already a nightmare on Dudley road due to road changes and clean air zone.</p> <p>Bus infrastructure cross city is non existent and it's adding at least one hour to the day for travelling.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 189 | <p>I would like to formally object to all of the proposed speed limit reductions as detailed in this consultation. I believe that in the best interests of traffic flow, convenience as well as overall emission controls, that the current 40mph level is the correct one. I do not believe that reducing the speed limit will have any effect on road safety and fatalities as this are usually caused by very excessive speeds or poor driving standards.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| | <p>21. A38 Rubery. There seems little sense in reducing speed on the viaduct.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------|
| 190 | 22. Shenley Lane. In full agree. This road passes schools, residential area and shopping and seems dangerous. | Ref 5 |
| 191 | I formally object. Unless speed cameras are reintroduced, it will be impossible to enforce | Ref 6 |
| 192 | How many times do we have to have this consultation ? Last time we had this consultation, 55% of the vote was against the reduction from 40mph to 30mph. Do we keep participating until the council get the majority vote ? It's not what Birmingham City Council want, it's what Birmingham residents want. In any case, this is nothing to do with Health and safety, it's all about reducing the speed limit, so you can fine more people breaking the speed limit. In other words, it's another cash cow. If you really want to reduce road accidents, go look around schools and see the irresponsible parents who park around them. An example of one is Yenton Primary School, it's an absolute disgrace the way these parents park on Chester Road, which puts not only their children at risk but other people's children too. That part of Chester Road from Orphanage Road all the way down to the Tyburn House Pub has already been reduced from 40mph to 30mph for sometime now, due to a fatal accident involving a young lad. This has achieved nothing, only frustrate motorists. All that needed to be done, was to put lights up in both directions of Chester Road, warning motorists to reduce speed to 20mph while passing the school only during the times children go to and leave school. I believe this should be applied to all schools in Birmingham and not the ridiculous reduction in speed from 40mph to 30mph. | Ref 5 |
| 193 | I wish to formally object to the introduction of a reduced speed limit across all of Birmingham and in particular A441 Redditch Road. Hopefully, Birmingham City Council will respect the views of its residents if there is a majority wishing for the existing speed limits to remain. | Ref 1 |
| 194 | Ref 16 5& 17. I think that this will cause more traffic jams, especially with the works to the bus service and this will lead to more pollution from vehicles. | Ref 4 |
| 195 | Formal objection Don't consider 40mph speed to be the problem - average speeds on many of these roads will be below 40. Problem is standard of driving and lack of enforcement of good driving skill and of speed limit. Use of average speed cameras seems effective for controlling traffic. Speed limit not enforceable on bikes especially electric bikes! | Ref 6 |
| 196 | I wish to formally object to the speed limit order in all of the proposed areas. Birmingham is already congested, making rush hour impossible. I feel that reducing the speed limits would not only add to congestion, but would also add to pollution, as cars doing 30mph in a lower gear, would push out more emissions. I would like to see the available funds used to raise road awareness in pedestrians. There has not been a campaign to do this in a very long time and I feel that having such a campaign would save more lives than reducing the speed limit on all of the major roads in Birmingham. | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 197 | Although now 82 I am still a registered advance driver; was a lorry driver of the year finalist for 3 consecutive years in the 70's and always, but always, take great pride in my driving standards. I object to the speed limit changes because there is little historic evidence to suggest they will be monitored, which means that there will be little if any, safety benefit whatsoever because there will be too many drivers who totally ignor speed limits - and not by the odd mph. For example. You do NOT have speed cameras on too many roads in Birmingham and too many drivers - just like those going up and down Dads Lane, a 20mph zone, along with many 30 mph stretches of the A38, including the queensway underpass - completely ignore any speed limits. The funding would be better spent on setting up speed cameras, particularly average speed cameras AND activating them - but then there is historic evidence that Birmingham Council shut down the bulk of speed cameras, some while ago because they were costing too much to monitor. So why suddenly start again? | Ref 3 & Ref 7 |
| 198 | I object in principle to the further reductions to speed limits across the city roads that were originally designated as clearways and / or 40mph and above roads. I believe that the 'safety' issue is just being used as an excuse to push through these proposed unnecessary changes | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 199 | I wish to formally object Lowering the speed limit does nothing but impact law abiding citizens. Speed isn't the problem inappropriate use of speed is The speed limit reductions are a gesture rather than a solution and even with enforcement poor driving standards our people that don't care about fines, cameras etc will do what they like No one chooses to go out and do harm with their vehicle or they just go out and do what they like and that group won't care Therefore you impact the majority, the careful drivers, delaying slowing and impacting for little benefit Accidents still happen at 30 | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 200 | Nothing has been set out to articulate why a lower speed limit is needed as opposed to better enforcement of current speed limits. What are the root causes of the issues concerned? Where is the evidence to support that these measures will achieve their stated aims? Without this there is a risk that this will be a complete waste of money. Exempting road sections bordering other local authorities will be confusing. In the West Midlands conurbation, this kind of measure only makes sense in cooperation with other local authorities. Pointing to ring fencing as an argument why this can be funded despite the financial crisis is disingenuous. There must be better uses for the CAZ income, ie. towards other parts of the transport budget that are currently funded from the General Fund, particularly in light of extortionate increases to Council Tax. It is questionable why you bother with consultations if the clear results of the previous consultation on this have been ignored. | Ref 6 , Ref 7 & Ref 8 |
| 201 | I formally object to the proposal. Whilst I understand the safety element, reducing some of these roads to 30mph will cause more congestion which actually leads to an increase in accidents. Also, driving at 40mph for a long period is actually less harmful to the environment. These plans are yet again an attempt to take cars away from Birmingham, which would be fine if we had an adequate public transport network. I know this will be ignored and the council will do what they want anyway, as they always do I wish to object to this utterly stupid suggestion of further crippling Birmingham. The council are not fit to make this decision, they have been an abject failure. This council have done all they can to have a negative impact on the people of Birmingham, and crippling the transport network (which was designed around the car), demonstrates a level of stupidity that shows how inept this council is. | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |

| | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| 202 | <p>Whilst i would like to reduce deaths on the roads, we have to accept that statistically there will always be an incredibly tiny proportion of journeys that lead to accidents. I am more concerned by the number of people driving without licences or insurance etc in unroadworthy vehicles. If they are willing to drive like this you will still have excess accidents. Stop trying to bring Birmingham to standstill and focus on uninsured unlicenced drivers.</p> <p>Ps the best possible outcome from this is that our current councillors resign and accept their complicity in the utter incompetence and ineptitude with which the council has been run by the labour party for many years. None of you are fit to make decisions like this.</p> | Ref 3 |
| 203 | <p>Once again BCC have got it wrong, just like the LTN's Speeding is a driver problem not a speed limit problem. Lowering the speed limit will cause traffic jams and misery for everyone. There is an awful problem in our city with speeding drivers, punish them not the rest of us. When caught they must serve a long prison term, no fines and suspended sentences, time to set an example and send a strong message.</p> <p>Prisons overcrowded? I really don't care, commit the crime do the time, they can be 8/10 to a cell sleeping on the floor, maybe then the message will start to get through that there is a penalty to pay.</p> <p>Most drivers in our city obey the rules , please don't punish all of us.</p> <p>Our once proud city is grinding to a halt on our roads, LTS's narrowing of lanes, lower speed limits, its madness. When we have these awful injuries and fatalaties on our roads understand it is the drivers fault, not the car or the road speed</p> | Ref 4 |
| 204 | <p>I object to all locations, no evidence has been submitted to state speeding had anything to do with fatalities.</p> <p>A number of incidents could be related to reckless individuals not obeying the green cross code or were distracted by devices such as phones or ear buds.</p> <p>Money would be better spent on eduction of pedestrians about how to engage with highways.</p> <p>This is just another un-evidenced iniative from a bankrupt council that should be focussed on actual problems. This council pre occupation with roads is strange. Building bike lanes when they are broke that are used by 12 people a day. A CAZ iniative that has been proven not effective. This transport team need to focus on potholes and making transit more efficient</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 8 |
| 205 | <p>I wish to object to the whole scheme at all locations. 40mph is a safe speed on these roads. Reducing the speed limit would increase the speed difference tial between law abiding and criminal drivers, making accidents and aggressive driving more likely. The scheme would cause delays which would also result in more pollution.</p> | Ref 2 |
| 206 | <p>I am opposed to the reduction of speed limit it's yet another attack on motorists.</p> <p>Instead the roads need policing I regularly see speeding and bad driving lowering limit will not alter speeding as you will probably not get caught.</p> <p>The police are useless on the roads as they have no presence (but then again where do they) they only turn up after the event.</p> <p>Your limit will be introduced as its already been decided by an inept liebor administration</p> | Ref 1 |
| 207 | <p>I have never heard such rubbish. It is not the speed limit that is the issue it is the poor standard of driving by some members of our communities. Speed limits are not enforceable it will not stop those drivers who regularly speed from driving at excessive speeds. Spend the money on prosecuting poor drivers and penalising drivers who obey the law. Lower speed limits add to congestion increased journey time and increased costs for businesses.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 208 | <p>I formally object the all the proposed speed limit changes.</p> <p>I drive in Birmingham city centre for commuting on a daily basis and I see that the vast majority of drivers are well behaved, respect the speed limits and obey traffic signals. However, I also see a handful of drivers that are a real threat to road safety and completely ignore the rules. These are the drivers that would need to be stopped. I have witnessed a couple of minor accidents and the scene was always the same: either pedestrian or driver did not followed the signal.</p> <p>The big dilemma is: how do we catch the needle in the stack? I believe that reducing speed limit would not tackle rogue drivers, they ignore these limit anyway. With this proposal, you are only penalising people who already follow the rule and are less likely to cause accident.</p> <p>Please invest this money in other programme, like educational programmes on road safety for the road offenders.</p> <p>A better educated society is much better than a society with stricter rules that are targeted to certain people and instead are only affecting the people that were not the initial target.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 209 | <p>All locations</p> <p>This is a weak and pointless non-priority that will divert attention from much higher priorities.</p> <p>Please focus on:</p> <p>Enforcement - speed cameras and cameras on intersections with fines for exceeding existing speed limits, aggressive driving, running red lights, and other dangerous driving.</p> <p>Extra traffic Police and camera enforcement to be paid from fines.</p> <p>Creating one-way low traffic areas and barriers at the end of residential roads and shutting off rabbit runs.</p> <p>Eliminating merging lanes just before and after intersections that contribute massively to blocking intersections during rush hour.</p> <p>Timing pedestrian crossing lights at or near roundabouts to prioritise and regulate traffic flow in roundabouts more sensibly.</p> <p>Building large free or low cost parking garages at all rail stations.</p> <p>I am sure there are lots of ideas out there, these are just a few off the top of my head. My experience driving around Birmingham is that what makes it most dangerous are drivers who do not obey the existing rules, and what generates the most pollution is quite obviously rush hour traffic. Enforcement of existing rules with real fines and penalties, and reduction of rush hour traffic should be much, much higher priorities than making speed limit changes that will never be enforced.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 6 |
| 210 | <p>I object to the reduction of speed limits simply because there is little enforcement of the speed limits. I frequently use the residential roads in Harborne which have been reduced to 20 mph, and I drive at 20 mph, and more often than not I have other drivers driving too close behind me, or overtaking aggressively: I am very much in the minority of drivers who abide by the speed limit, even though I find it inconvenient. Where the limits are currently 40 mph, with the proposition to reduce this, the roads are generally wide and safe: it is the speeders that make it dangerous (the young woman killed at a bus stop on a stretch of the A456 was killed by a car involved in racing). In my opinion, Birmingham's roads would be safer if you enforced the current speed limits. The racers will drive at 60 mph, whether the speed limit is 40 mph or 30 mph.</p> | Ref 6 |
| | <p>I object to the use of public funds being wasted on effectively just changing road signs as there will be zero enforcement of this change, and an already heavily in debt council will not have any impact on road safety through a reduction in speeds as they simply won't occur.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| 211 | <p>As has been shown with Welsh government moves, changing road signs does not impact the speeds of dangerous drivers or their behaviour, and all of the quoted deaths will doubtless have been carried out by highly reckless behaviour of drivers or pedestrians or cyclists, not by people travelling normally at 40mph.</p> <p>If money is to be spent it should be spent on pedestrian safety measures, or additional police enforcement, not on changing road signs.</p> <p>I expect all protests to be completely ignored as local government have no interest in common sense and simply want to be seen to have acted, to the detriment of the free movement of the local economy and to no detriment at all of hazardous drivers and pedestrians and cyclists.</p> | Ref 3 |
| 212 | <p>I object to reduction in 40 mph on all A roads and support enforcement of current limits.</p> <p>I do support 20 mph around schools and hospitals and also all residential roads.</p> <p>The roads traffic state hasn't improved despite so called improvements and the only increase has been potholes and fines. Safety isn't improving as LED lights everywhere on vehicles and on street lighting generates glare and as citizens! Vehicle owners already pay a higher level of taxation! Until all transport is electrified! The impact of driving in lower gears will increase revs and exacerbate pollution levels on the designated roads and surrounding living areas. Cars are designed to be efficient at 40 mph and the reduction makes ICE vehicles less efficient!</p> <p>A well intentioned objective which will have the opposite impact! ICE vehicles will be using 3rd gear more which is inefficient and counter productive to the intended aim!</p> | Ref 5 |
| 213 | <p>I OBJECT to this ridiculous and draconian proposal across all areas. Reducing speed limits will not stop dangerous driving these idiots don't care. It will as usual punish the majority for the minority.</p> <p>Yet again the council has not thought this through and pander to the minority of citizens. We all know this ridiculous proposal is no proposal and the decision has already been made. Going through 'the motions' because you must.</p> <p>Shameful.</p> | Ref 1 |
| 214 | <p>I am objecting to the whole speed reduction program on the basis that the 40 mph speed limit on these main roads is already the correct speed and reducing this speed will actually cause more pollution because cars are less efficient in lower gears. Also buses will be slowed down.</p> <p>What is needed is for this speed limit to be enforced properly.</p> <p>Another objection is that while stating the number of deaths as a reason for the consultation process, no data has been provided to indicate if the motorist involved was abiding by the speed limit in place or was driving well above this - in which case these accidents would still occur because a certain type of driver ignore all rules.</p> <p>An additional objection is that Birmingham Council seems to be trying to generate cash income from the motorist in order to balance it's books - this looks like a very good way for this to happen.</p> <p>so to recap - leave the speeds as they are and enforce the speed limit already in place</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 8 |
| 215 | <p>Formally object - all roads.</p> <p>Cars are safer than they have ever been. They have better braking systems, automatic driver alerts and braking and drivers are no longer allowed to use mobile phones.</p> <p>Reducing speed limits mean residents spend more time driving on the road and less time with their families or working. It will have a negative impact on Birmingham's residents and its economy. There is a huge cost that the Council won't see directly but it borne by residents from this change. Have you worked out the impact?</p> <p>As a rough idea of the scale of the cost - if you assume 10,000 people will spend 5mins per day longer in their cars and their time is worth £15 per hour, that is £5m. Purely due to lost time. That's the cost these measures place on ordinary residents.</p> <p>A better approach is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -identify what the root cause of the accidents is - poor signage, lack of pedestrian crossing, poor road markings? Deal with those specific issues. - speed reductions should only be put in place if speed increases are identified elsewhere. Otherwise when does this stop? Every few years speed restrictions will be lowered again and again until it's 20mph everywhere? <p>I'm sure the response to the survey will be positive as who has time to respond to these surveys - generally retired people who have plenty of time on their hands. But the average resident who has a busy family life will not approve of this and won't have the time to respond to your survey either. A better judge of public sentiment is to look at the backlash Welsh government got when introducing 20mph everywhere recently.</p> <p>I'd urge you to reconsider on this basis.</p> | Ref 4 |
| | <p>The consultation carried out in late 2023 showed overwhelmingly that residents were not in favour of these plans but they have been taken forward anyway. It has not been explained why.</p> <p>There is no evidence of a worsening road safety problem in Birmingham or indeed a "road safety emergency" as has been declared. The trend in deaths and serious injuries on Birmingham's roads is already down, based on data from the Department for Transport.</p> <p>The most effective way to continue and accelerate that trend is better enforcement of existing laws relating to speed, drink and drug driving, mobile phone use when driving, jumping red lights, and driving without tax, insurance and MOT. This deals with the drivers most likely to cause harm and does not penalise good and respectful drivers, which these proposals do. It has not been explained why speed limit reduction has been prioritised over enforcement.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|----------------------|
| 216 | <p>Undoubtedly the reduced speed limits will mean that good and respectful drivers adhere to the new limits but those that already broke the law will continue to do so. Collision statistics will certainly improve but at a bigger cost to the economy as drivers will avoid travelling into Birmingham due to increased journey times. A typical return commute between Birmingham and Sutton Coldfield could take around six minutes longer, not accounting for increased congestion around junctions that slower moving traffic will cause.</p> <p>Many of the roads covered by this consultation are two lane dual carriageways with adequate pavement facilities and pedestrian crossings. If these facilities are used correctly by all road users, there is no need to reduce the speed limit as pedestrians and motor vehicles will never come into conflict and there will be no collisions.</p> <p>In summary, there does not appear to be any evidence to support the need for these changes and no explanation has been offered as to why better alternatives are not being pursued.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 7 |
| 217 | <p>I wish to formally object to this plan.</p> <p>I live in Erdington so would impacted by the changes in and around Sutton Coldfield, Minworth and Walmley.</p> <p>I have not seen any evidence to show me that drivers who abide by the current 40mph limit are the actually causing the problem. Do the road accidents correlate with drivers sticking to the speed limit or those exceeding it?</p> <p>There is little or no police visibility on these roads. While I drive safely, many drivers exceed the existing limits considerably. They will continue to exceed a 30mph limit so it'll make no difference.</p> <p>I believe the actual solution would be to properly enforce the existing limits, either with a heightened police presence or new speed cameras. I believe average speed cameras are the best.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 6 & Ref 7 |
| 218 | <p>I formally object to all reductions on the grounds that the decision isn't based on any evidence that the reduction is necessary.</p> <p>What evidence is there that these roads are dangerous? A reduction in the speed limit does not in itself provide safety. There needs to be figures to prove this.</p> <p>What accidents/injuries/deaths have actually occurred on the designated roads since they have had a 40mph limit? Many of these roads will have a figure of zero.</p> <p>If there are any at all, what amount of those were travelling at 40mph or more? What percentage is this of total road journeys that day/week/year?</p> <p>Any person being hit by a car at 30mph will have less injuries than being hit at 40mph. However if the car had been travelling at 40mph, it wouldn't have hit that person.</p> <p>If the Council truly wanted to make these roads safer (rather than introducing unnecessary and irrelevant speed limits) then it should introduce more pedestrian/pelican crossings on the roads.</p> <p>So what's it to be? Lipservice to safety but not actually delivering it, or practical measures that actually make pedestrians safer?</p> | Ref 3, Ref 5 & Ref 7 |
| 219 | <p>This is a formal objection to the order and criticism, the various reasons are below...</p> <p>It is naive to assume reducing speeds on these roads is going to increase pedestrian safety by stopping people from dangerous driving, whether this be erratic driving to make "progress" on roads, or excessive speeding. If people want to drive this way then they will regardless of a speed limit, this is already evident with 20 MPH roads in Birmingham and more widely Wales where this is ignore by 90% of drivers.</p> <p>This plan is also contradictory. Some of the roads listed such as the A47 Heartlands parkway from spitfire island all the way to the island that meets the Saltley Viaduct could also be considered an "urban highway" due to its similarities in pedestrian use and design and therefore should also be exempt. I reiterate people will drive dangerously regardless of the posted speed limit.</p> <p>What needs to change is driving culture in Birmingham and beyond, a harder task but one with significantly more impact. Additionally, there needs to be measures on these roads especially ones that pass through high pedestrian areas to monitor dangerous driving through modern through the use of average speed camera and fancy AI camera that can manage driver behaviour and submit suspected dangerous driving to a human to verify and issue PCNs.</p> <p>More widely the council should invest or support advances in technology such as a non-invasive black box where data can be gathered after an incident, this will aid preventing dangerous driving in the first place by being able to use as evidence to support charges.</p> <p>Another point which this council should lobby and support is restricting new drivers to lower engine powers exactly in the same way as motorcycles. To support this you must consider usually motor car engine powers have drastically increased since their design. An inexperienced driver is more likely to be involved in an accident due to their lack of experience but it increases when you allow drivers in higher powered cars that may have a rear wheel Drive (RWD). New drivers should be restricted on power and powertrain such RWD until they have gained more experience and completed additional courses in skid control and the dangerous of speed.</p> <p>Policing these changes is another issue entirely but this criticism is short, there's not enough policing to prevent dangerous driving at the current posted limit, lowering speed limits will not change this at all.</p> <p>Finally point is the city/authority needs to take a tougher stance on penalties for offences, it is sickening to read a man driving dangerously and resulted taking the life of a 12 year old boy only has 8 years in prison which they'll most likely get out early, this should be a minimum of 15 years in my opinion, get real with sentences.</p> <p>In conclusion, I view this plan as ill-conceived full of unfound assumptions through incorrect use of available data. It does not tackle the real reasons of why people drive dangerously in the first place, nothing to make a driver think "I'm not getting anywhere faster", or "the penalties make this not worth it", and does nothing to actually improve our safety and the works involves is a waste of tax payers money. To the MPs and councillors supporting this, the plan is a terribly lazy way to say "look I'm doing something about this". You need to do better</p> | Ref 5, Ref 6 & Ref 7 |
| 220 | <p>I oppose all of the suggested speed limits.</p> <p>It's obvious that whoever is behind this just want to leave their legacy behind. But people like me who live in the real world need to move forward and need higher speed limits. Most of these limits are not harming anyone.</p> <p>Just leave them alone and get your heads out of your asses Birmingham city council. You the most incompetent authority around and now you want to mess up the lives of millions of people on a whim.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 8. |

| | | |
|-----|--|-------|
| | <p>Use your rsdourcex wheee it matters more. For example ghe cuts you are planning to social servuces etc.</p> <p>Wake up. The traffuc is bad enough as it is dont mess it up more. We pay for alk thix through our council tax so use the money how people wznt it go b used , not for yoyr brainfarts!</p> | |
| 221 | <p>I object to the change.</p> <p>If the current limits were enforced there would not be a problem.</p> <p>I do not have the statistics but believe the vast majority of accidents occur involving vehicles that are speeding. If the limit is reduced to 30mph the speeding cars will still speed.</p> <p>The careful drivers who abide by the speed limits are being punished due to the actions of the minority who will not change their behaviour.</p> | Ref 7 |
| 223 | <p>I object to the speed limit changes in all areas as I think the speed limit isn't the cause of the tragic and unfortunate incidents which have occurred. If the speed limit was to blame, completely or even partly, I would 100% agree but I don't agree that it is and I don't see any reason to make changes to the current speed limit in these areas.</p> | Ref 3 |
| 224 | <p>I am opposed to the 30mph restriction because I think the Council should spend time and money on enforcing speed restrictions as they are. There is little to no enforcement now, let alone, whether there will be a change to 30mph.</p> <p>I don't believe the Council will enforce a 30 mph limit. How will you do it? I drove past the new mega hospital in Birmingham wjich has a 30mph speed limit outside. Not one car was doing 30mph, they were all at least 40mph. Yet I did not see any speed cameras or average speed camers. Therefore, why bother with signage across the city when you and I know, people wont stick to it?</p> <p>If the proposals clearly state average speed cameras to be rolled out across all these streets, then I would be in favour. However, you wont do that as it costs too much and you are a broken council.</p> <p>I see this as a cosmetic exercise, pretending to do something, with no actual change. It is a cheap way of "pretending" to improve road safety. You will go ahead, say you did a public consultation, tick all the appropriate boxes, put up the signs and then say we have done all we can. Knowing full well, there will be no change in driver attitudes and no enforcement. You will then blame the police for lack of action - shighting the responsibility from the Council . This is a clear case of risk avoidance, which is a recognised phenomenon of local government, particularly those who are broken - pass the buck to someone else. Then claim it is not your responsibility.</p> <p>Therefore, NO, I do not agree with your proposal, nor with the Council's management of it.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 225 | <p>I object strongly to the proposals.</p> <p>The speed limit in the area is not the issue as such.</p> <p>The absolute lack of enforcement is the problem.</p> <p>I drive into the areas you are proposing 5 x a week and drive back 5 x a week too.</p> <p>There is absolute 0 enforcement behind the occasional police car or speed enforcement van with a camera on the heartlands road.</p> <p>I have seen people driving in the 30 mph sections doing 40-50+ and I have seen people driving in the 40 section driving faster than that.</p> <p>If you truly want to bring the amount of deaths down you either need to install average speed cameras in these areas, switch on the cameras in the area and add some in or have consistent police enforcement in these areas so that people cannot continue to use the areas as their personal race lanes.</p> <p>If you change the speed limit and continue to have 0 enforcement people will continue to disregard the speed limits in place as they already do.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 226 | <p>I object to the changes. The safety issue is not the 40mph limit. The issue is quite simply the people that ignore any speed limit, exceeding it by significant amounts and drive dangerously. People who ignore a 40 mph limit will ignore a 30 mph limit.</p> <p>The lack of police on the the roads, the lack of speed cameras, the lack of prosecutions and removal of dangerous drivers are the issues. Successive government's, councils and police are all to blame. Deal properly with the dangerous drivers rather than the law abiding.</p> <p>Every car journey I take in the West Midlands could sees numerous significant law breaches, deal with those people.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 227 | <p>I wish to object to the speed limit order for the followin reasons:</p> <p>1, I live in a 20mph zone and no one adheres to it. Therefore, why would anyone adhere to 30mph, how will this be enforced?</p> <p>2, The roads mentioned are designed for 40mph traffic, if not more, therefore you have made a rod for your own back. You have built fast roads, which encourage speed, then you want people to slow down on them. This is known as "technological determinism", where the built environment encourages certain types of behaviour, such as driving because the roads are large and expansive. I believe the only way you will really reduce speed is by actually putting in road restrictions, such as speed cameras, avrage speed cameras, speed bumps/cushions and strict enforcement such as on the ground policing (which let's be honest doesn't exist in Birmingham). Therefore, you need to restructure the roads and use the money for this rather than sigange.</p> <p>3, The Council is currently bankrupt partly due to maladministrative practices regarding equal pay and failing departments. How. as residents, are we meant to trust you can roll this expensive proposal out correctly. You claim to represent people of Birmingham, yet your own pay policies discriminated against women and other groups at the Council - how can we trust you? I don't think we can, therefore, I don't think you should be in charge of any scheme.</p> | Ref 6 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----------------------|
| | <p>4, I think this is a bit of a con too. You may decide to put up some sort of signs, etc, but this wont mean anything to most people. Yet, you can then claim you responded to pressure groups and the issue is one you no need to be concerned with. However, the problems will continue, but you can claim you did ebverything you could.</p> <p>5, The only way you can deal with the atrocious drivers of this city is to force them to be safe by restructuring the roads, implementing average speed cameras across the city, installing cycle paths. WHich you cannot do as you don't have the money nor the means to do it.</p> <p>Therefore, I am against the idea because although I think it is a brilliant idea, I think this Council is not really going to address the problem and will do what it normally does, pretend to do something, but not actually tackle the problem</p> | |
| 228 | I am against the proposed plans of reducing the speed limits. Infact 20 mph is too slow and should be set back to 30 mph. | Ref 1 |
| 229 | <p>I formally object to the proposal as lowing the speed in this area will have no impact. Average speed cameras need in place at the 40mph currently speed. Lowing the speed limit to 30mph is lazy policymaking as this will only increase conjunction times, traffic, journeys times and also increased pollution.</p> <p>Average speed cameras need implementing on these specific areas as it will have more of a impact and will mean more money for greedy and corrupt Birmingham city Council.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 230 | <p>I wish to object to speed limit reductions on the following roads.</p> <p>5: Webster Way/Thimble End Road 7: A38/B4148 Tyburn Road 8: B4148 Eachelhurst Road 9: A38 Kingsbury Road 11: A452 Chester Road</p> <p>My reason is that the majority of these roads are dual carriageways where there is ample separation between vehicles travelling in either direction and ample separation between vehicles and pedestrians. Reducing speeds on these roads will not significantly reduce accidents, relative to the high associated economic costs and frustration that speed reductions will cause to local road users.</p> <p>I also object to the heavy focus towards roads in and around Walmey and Sutton Coldfield (where I live). Why have we been targeted so badly. Is there a local councillor here who has too much power and is running thier own personal agenda? This is not wanted.</p> <p>These measures are not necessary and will only further add to journey times, so further reducing economic productivity and increasing everyone's commute times. Local people already struggle with heavy traffic and poor road surfaces (pot holes etc.). We don't want our journeys getting even worse.</p> <p>And just in case you don't believe I understand the negative consequences of road traffic accidents may I share with you that my own brother has been wheelchair bound and severely disabled since being knocked down by a car 39 years ago (when he was 5 and I was 8 years old). He, me and my whole family have been devastated by that accident for nearly 40 years now. So very sadly I fully understand about road accidents, but I'm also a person living and working in the affected areas who can balance the reality of the risks of road accidents with the economic costs and lost time for motorists and other road users living and working here.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 231 | <p>Objection to 30mph at locations 1-27. I understand there is a desire to reduce speed limits but I am not convinced this will prevent deaths on the roads as there is no mention in any press release regarding how many deaths were caused by pedestrians behaving negligently, crossing in dangerous areas and not looking carefully before crossing the road. I have seen with my own eye pedestrians doing really stupid things like trying to cross between cars on the four lanes of cars close to st chads cathedral. I have also seen people glued to their phones typing and crossing a road without looking up, with the driver having to react. I see people walking on to cross walks when the cars have a green light, and then swearing at the driver when they beep at the pedestrian who is in the wrong. The highway code states that pedestrians are the highest risk interns of types of road users, but the pedestrians themselves fail to take responsibility for their poor behaviours and actively put themselves in jeopardy.</p> <p>Until I see how evidence and statistics around how many road accidents are caused by driving at 40mph compared to how many are caused by pedestrians putting themselves in harm's way, I am opposed to speed reductions.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 7 |
| 232 | <p>This is my formal objection to the scheme.</p> <p>My objection is based on observation of speeding vehicles and those being dangerously driven.</p> <p>Moving the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph will not deter the speeders and dangerous drivers. They current exceed the 40 and 30 mph limits so I'm concerned this will not make a difference.</p> <p>No details have been given on how this change would be enforced. Why not?</p> <p>When the Bristol Rd had an experimental 30mph limit all it did was lead to severe bunching of traffic this is also an issue.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 233 | <p>I would like to comment negatively against all of these. Reducing the speed limit means journeys take longer. When cars are on the road for longer, not only is it environmentally damaging, it also increases the risk of accidents espeically with pedestrians as there are more cars on the road overall. Also, most of these are high traffic roads. Reducing the speed limit does make people more annoyed, espeically if it causes a longer journey and causes them to use more fuel, meaning people drive in a bad frame of mind and take risks. My understanding is that some of these roads do not have pedestrian access so that already reduces the risk of pedestrian accidents.</p> <p>Overall, I think these changes will be taken very negatively so will cause people to drive more recklessly. Journeys taking longer means more cars on the road for longer and overall has a high risk of pedestrian safety</p> | Ref 2, Ref 3 & Ref 4 |
| 234 | I don't see it as necessary on major roads or duel carriageways. Slowing routes could even be dangerous as drivers would need to keep checking their speed rather than actually looking for hazards, ie pedestrians | Ref 5 |
| | Webster way/thimble end road - I object to this reduction as this road is on a steep incline and cars roll down this hill at 40mph. Making it 30mph will ensure the cars having to brake continuously to maintain under the speed limit. There are typically no house frontages on this road and therefore does not need to be 30mph. | |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|
| 235 | In fact I object to all reductions to 30mph on these roads. Why because these are typically major routes and will ensure some drivers will drive closer to 25mph rather than 35 currently causing a higher collision risk as more drivers will look to overtake on these roads which is not a good idea. | Ref 5 |
| 236 | I formally object to the Speed Limit Order - changing the speed limit from 40 to 30 will not prevent people from dying from over speeding - if someone wants to overspeed they will do it regardless of the speed limit. This limit will increase traffic and congestion on these roads, making it difficult for many commuters from entering areas of work including town. Furthermore, many of these roads are large A roads which is not pedestrian heavy in use eg Sattlely Viaduct to Fort, so the effect of reducing speed will not 'safe lives' rather just cause nuisances to drivers from Birmingham. If the majority of voters from the previous survey object, it shows that the public are not in the favour for this change. Instead there should be more pedestrians crossing available on these roads. | Ref 3, Ref 5 |
| 237 | I am opposed to this proposed reduction in the speed limit. I live near the Hagley Rd and I don't see any difference in the level of driving between the current 30 & 40 limits. Undoubtedly there are some very dangerous drivers around. However, if someone behaves in a reckless manner I can't see them being deterred by a 30 limit. In fact some of the most dangerous driving I've seen is in the 30 limit. There was recently a lethal accident on the Soho Rd which is 30. There seems to me an obsession with reducing limits without any evidence that it makes the roads safer. I don't see why considerate drivers should be inconvenienced because of the actions of a minority. | Ref 7 |
| 238 | What's the point you take no notice. | Ref 1 |
| 239 | I object to the speed limit being reduced on Monmouth drive , Chester road , Eachelhurst road, the fort parkway and all the areas in Sutton Coldfield as I do not think it is needed as it is not unsafe and most people drive in a considerate manner | Ref 5 |
| 240 | Changing speed limits to 30mph will increase commuting times. It will lead to increased driver frustration. There is no guarantee lowering the speed to 30mph will make roads safer unless speed enforcement is effectively in place. I would like to formally object to this proposal for reasons mentioned above. | Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 241 | I object to this order. This is an unnecessary spend by BCC when there are so many issues like pot holes are not followed up. My objections are mainly for the roads in Sutton Coldfield and also Perry Barr and Chester Road. | Ref 8 |
| 242 | I strongly object to the proposal of 30mph speed limit throughout Birmingham. The current speed limits on all the roads are working fine and I fail to understand why you are proposing the reduction. Your reasoning of roadside mortality doesn't specifically look at the causes of the deaths on the road. Majority of these are done by careless drivers who will not be affected by any measures you take except more police on the road. Please stop wasting your time on these ridiculous anti-motorist ideology and pay more attention to the real issue i.e. motoring offenders, illegal parkings, uninsured cars on the road and traffic jams. | Ref 3 & Ref 7 |
| 243 | There seems to be a belief within the council that accidents occur due to incorrect speed limits. I do not believe that this is the case. The underlying problem is that existing speed limits are not enforced. We all see daily cases of idiots driving recklessly around our roads and these people take absolutely no notice of speed limits. These are the people who cause serious accidents. Needless to say - I ask that no changes should be made to the speed limit in the areas proposed. | Ref 6 |
| 244 | I object. Motorists are being vilified when what is needed are more/better crossing points and an enhanced programme of education on road safely for pedestrians. So often I have a pedestrian step out into a road while wearing earphones and staring down at a smartphone. Cars themselves have more safety measures built in than ever before. Cars are the safest they ever have been. Laws are already in place to prosecute unsafe driving and unsafe activities such as jaywalking. No changes to the law or speed limits are required. Education and behaviour are key. Safe crossing points will also help. | Ref 6 |
| 245 | I am against all of these restrictions. Most accidents are caused by people who completely ignore the speed limits and drive in an irresponsible fashion. The reduced speed limits will make life more difficult for those of us who obey the limits. My personal experience of obeying the reduced speed limits that have been introduced in the past is that I get tailgated and have been overtaken in inappropriate places by irresponsible drivers who probably wouldn't have done so had I been travelling faster. | Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 246 | I object to these proposals. There are far more effective measures the council could and should be making to reduce the incidents of road harm | Ref 3 |
| 247 | A45 Small Heath Highway and A45 Coventry Road/A45 New Coventry Road I am formally objecting to the speed limit change: - Given the tight pressures on budgets this is a vanity project and one that will not produce any tangible financial benefit for the region. - The reduction in speed limits will reduce traffic into the city centre and surrounding areas, thus reducing people shopping and spending money. The city centre is already becoming increasingly poor given the bad decisions already taken with the war against cars. - Placing speed restrictions on the road will not deter the speeders. They will continue as they do now and continue to cause accidents. - Traffic cameras are inadequate to make others think about reducing speed limits. Additional costs will be incurred to put even more cameras in place to catch people (yet another stealth tax and expenditure, no doubt increasing council tax bills). - The bus lanes being put in place are already creating congestion and pollution. Coupled with reduced speeds and cars idling then pollution will increase. - If traffic cameras are used to try and slow people down on the A45 then all that will happen will be for cars to use side roads where there aren't any. This creates additional stress and problems for people living nearby the routes. | Ref 3, Ref 4, Ref 5 & Ref 8 |

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| | <p>I believe that this is a waste of money/does not provide value for money and will not do anything to improve the quality of life for people, nor reduce accidents (which are more likely to be caused by those individuals who have a disregard for speed limits etc anyway).</p> <p>There are higher priorities for residents of Birmingham, including fixing potholes.</p> | |
| 248 | Nonsense. These roads are built to sustain traffic at 40mph. They have safety features built in. Please do not do this. | Ref 5 |
| 249 | <p>I formally object to the whole scheme/ proposal.</p> <p>The vast majority of road users are sensible and safe. It's the minority who are unsafe.</p> <p>How many of the reported accidents have been caused at 40mph? I would suggest there far in excess of that. By racing/ ASB type behaviour.</p> <p>I believe enforcement of the current limit would improve safety.</p> <p>And furthermore not punish/ slow down/ add to the commute of the hard working vast majority of safe road users.</p> <p>Those who exceed the current 40mph limit will likely continue to exceed any limit without enforcement.</p> <p>Targeted enforcement opposed to blanket restrictions/ punishment.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 250 | <p>I object to all proposals.</p> <p>The drivers who speed excessively will still speed excessively. Changing a limit from 40 to 30 will not stop them.</p> <p>Also, I follow many drivers who do not seem to want to drive at 40 but instead do 35. My frustration is compounded when on the same stretch of road the limit drops to 30 but they continue to do 35 !!</p> <p>No change will get the behaviour, I imagine you seek, without policing it. Letting even one driver avoid banning with over 200 points is ludicrous. Average speed camera controls with no ability to avoid penalty is the only solution.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 251 | <p>I formally object to all proposed speed limit reductions apart from (18) Monmouth Drive.</p> <p>Reason: Speed is appropriate, would be better off enforcing 40mph with more working speed cameras than reducing speed needlessly which won't be followed by the majority anyway</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 252 | Proposals 5, 8, 18, and 27 are all totally unnecessary. These roads are wide with good pedestrian footpaths meaning cars driving at 40mph are not a danger to pedestrians | Ref 5 |
| 253 | <p>I would like to formally object to the proposed speed limit reduction.</p> <p>I have outlined a few specific reasons for this objection down below. In essence, this policy will make the roads a much more dangerous and unpredictable place to navigate and I fear for the safety of drivers, pedestrians, cyclists and other road users city-wide.</p> <p>Public Resistance: Many drivers may feel that lowering the speed limit is unnecessary and feel frustrated by the change. This could lead to non-compliance, with drivers ignoring or circumventing speed limits, potentially making roads less safe.</p> <p>Potential Increase in Dangerous Behavior: Slower speeds may encourage more aggressive driving behaviors, such as tailgating, unsafe lane changes, or speeding up to pass other vehicles, which could increase the risk of accidents.</p> <p>Loss of Roadway Efficiency: On highways or major arterial roads, a lower speed limit may not be justified by the existing road design and traffic volume. It could reduce the overall efficiency of the road network and lead to bottlenecks or gridlock during busy periods.</p> <p>I hope you take note of these objections and make the right decision.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 254 | <p>I would like to formally object to the proposed speed limit reduction.</p> <p>I have outlined a few specific reasons for this objection down below. In essence, this policy will make the roads a much more dangerous and unpredictable place to navigate and I fear for the safety of drivers, pedestrians, cyclists and other road users city-wide.</p> <p>Public Resistance: Many drivers may feel that lowering the speed limit is unnecessary and feel frustrated by the change. This could lead to non-compliance, with drivers ignoring or circumventing speed limits, potentially making roads less safe.</p> <p>Potential Increase in Dangerous Behavior: Slower speeds may encourage more aggressive driving behaviors, such as tailgating, unsafe lane changes, or speeding up to pass other vehicles, which could increase the risk of accidents.</p> <p>Loss of Roadway Efficiency: On highways or major arterial roads, a lower speed limit may not be justified by the existing road design and traffic volume. It could reduce the overall efficiency of the road network and lead to bottlenecks or gridlock during busy periods.</p> <p>I hope you take note of these objections and make the right decision.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 255 | I object to all of the proposed speed limit changes as this will cause more traffic on the roads. I don't believe the speed is the limit and the people who are speeding will continue to speed regardless of the limit. Birmingham city council need to make more average speed check zones and increase enforcement as this is the only way to clamp down on speeding drivers. | Ref 6 |
| | <p>I would like to formally object to all of these reductions in speed limit from 40mph to 30mph. The issues on all roads around Birmingham poor and aggressive driving and lack of respect for other road users. Reducing the speed will have no affect on this as the people doing it have no regards for other people or the law.</p> <p>All reducing speed limits will do is create more erratic driving conditions were some people will do the speed limit and others will simply get frustrated and drive even worse.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| 256 | <p>I would recommend any investment in this scheme should be better spent trying to catch the aggressive and abusive drivers. In addition to this re-educate the young to follow the green cross code and get illegal electric bikes off the road. Idiots thinking our roads are a playground for doing wheelies in front of cars while being zoomed along at more than the speed limits by an electric motor crazy.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 257 | <p>I object to a blanket policy of reducing all roads from 40mph to 30mph.</p> <p>40mph is a safe maximum, not a requirement... and should not be artificially conceived as a threat.</p> <p>If there are problems from drivers who exceed the speed limit, deal with them through legal channels and re-education programmes. This is a blanket policy, to the disadvantage of safe, insured, road tax paying, responsible drivers. Irresponsible drivers are the target, not every driver in Birmingham.</p> <p>Traffic flow is an arterial system. It requires to run smoothly, without build up and delays in the rush hour, or when there are restrictions to the flow caused by emergency vehicles, breakdowns, very large vehicles, road works and public transport. The logistic problems far outweigh any conceived benefits.</p> <p>What is the point of a clean air zone if your plan leads to traffic build up and subsequent raising of the pollution levels in the city centre and the suburbs. This is an oxymoron which conflicts with itself.</p> <p>There are very real hazards from the frustration and inconvenience that it will cause for road users. This will impact on the safety of pedestrians due to the inevitable traffic increase on side roads and secondary routes, from motorists trying to avoid clogged up major roads. Therefore, additional pollution created in the suburbs will affect the health, safety and quality of life of all Birmingham residents.</p> <p>The principal is wrong because it will lead to :</p> <p>traffic build up;</p> <p>inaccurate effectiveness of traffic lights and controls;</p> <p>congestion which, affects the movements of emergency vehicles;</p> <p>delays in the operation of delivery vehicles;</p> <p>increased high levels of pollution;</p> <p>a lack of flow at traffic lights and controls;</p> <p>the danger of risk taking by drivers who have been made late due to traffic build up;</p> <p>pointless delay at times of low traffic;</p> <p>Unviable tinkering to the existing laws on which the driving tests and rules are based;</p> <p>Ambiguity for visiting non-residents leading to fines and prosecutions from a system that deviates from the National policy in all other areas;</p> <p>It has been reported that there are districts where there are many drivers who have no motor insurance and illegally fail to pay car tax. A high proportion of these drivers have caused serious accidents which have resulted in injury and death from dangerous driving. These are drivers are unlikely to observe any change in regulations as they engage with none. Maybe car documentation checks and 30mph limits should be trialled there to reduce accidents in target areas. This addresses a known problem, rather than universally affecting all of the vehicles used in Birmingham.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 258 | <p>I would like to formally object to the speed limit order.</p> <p>The current existing speed limits are not properly enforced due to underfunding, and this additional change will not result any further enforcement and stretch the existing enforcement infrastructure.</p> <p>My belief is increase numbers of police officers and encourage safer driving across all communities will result in less deaths, I do not believe speed limits impact these areas.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 259 | <p>I wish to formally object to the entire proposed Speed Limit Order scheme on the basis that you carried out a consultation with the people of Birmingham and were clearly told there was not support for the scheme.</p> <p>By your own figures, a third more respondents opposed the proposal than supported it. Opposition to the scheme was well over 50%, in other words a clear majority against. Only 37.93% of responses supported the scheme. To ignore this consultation is fundamentally undemocratic, you are choosing to do something that the people who live in the city, vote for councillors and pay for the services you provide do not want you to do.</p> <p>The excuse that some of the comments could be interpreted in a way which suits what you want to do, is dissembling. All of those people opposed the proposal, any attempt to co-opt their responses is deliberately dishonest.</p> <p>There is no point carrying out a consultation if you are simply going to ignore a clear instruction from Birmingham's residents not to do something. It would be better not to do any consultation and just impose things by fiat, than to do a consultation and then ignore the clear result. Having chosen to do a consultation and received a clear result, you should follow that.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 260 | <p>The speed limit reductions will make little or no impact on reducing accidents.</p> <p>They are NOT caused by the vast majority of sensible drivers who you now propose to inconvenience.</p> <p>They are caused by a mainly young, mainly male minority of drivers who are intent on driving recklessly way above any speed limits.</p> <p>If you looked at the causes of traffic accidents you would see this is true.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 6 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| | Once again you have the wrong solution, and once again we have to suffer through your incompetence | |
| 261 | <p>Another ridiculous scheme from the council which isn't fit for purpose. Those people who currently abide by the 40mph limit aren't the problem.</p> <p>The problem is the majority of incompetent and hooligan drivers that will exceed the speed limit regardless of what the signs say.</p> <p>You need to police the existing limit better and not force the limit down for everybody.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 262 | <p>I can not believe this nonsense. Wales spent millions on reducing speed limits and are now having to spend millions more reversing the policy. Hasn't this lesson been learnt?</p> <p>The council can not enforce parking effectively so can't see much chance of enforcing these changes, without which it becomes a complete waste of public money. Use the money on something worthwhile like keeping the libraries open.</p> <p>Stop rearranging the deck chairs and get on with sorting out the sinking city finances.</p> | Ref 8 |
| 263 | Pointless. It isn't going to save life's or bring down carbon emissions. More police on the roads to help bring up the standard of driving and this is coming from a professional hgv fuel tanker driver who drivers upto 45 hours a week professionally on the roads and that's without my personal driving time. | Ref 6 |
| 264 | <p>The locations I am commenting on are the A45 Small Heath Highway and the A45 Coventry Road/A45 New Coventry Road, as these locations are adjacent to where I live.</p> <p>In principle, I am in favour of a reduction in the speed limit on the A45 Coventry Road/A45 New Coventry Road, as I personally witness incidents of inconsiderate and dangerous driving including speeding, jumping red lights, failure to follow the Highway Code (e.g. lack of indicating). There have been several fatalities over the past few years on the A45 Coventry Road/A45 New Coventry Road, so hopefully a speed limit reduction may help. BUT without the visible and active authority in place to enforce this, it will not make any difference.</p> <p>Regarding the A45 Small Heath Highway, I think the speed limit should remain as 40mph as this road doesn't run through a highly populated residential area and it is supposed to act as a quicker way to travel between Birmingham City Centre and Birmingham Airport. There is a huge problem with street racing on the A45 Small Heath Highway, which I can hear from my house on a nightly basis. Reducing the speed limit by 10mph will not matter a jot to the type of people who flout the law and commit this crime in the first place. Again, we need proper visible and active deterrents to this, e.g. police presence and prosecution for those breaking the law.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 265 | <p>I object to the whole of this project to reduce speed limits to 30mph, the vast majority of accidents reported to support these decisions are due to drivers travelling above the current speed limits, these people will still ignore any proposed limit and still cause accidents.</p> <p>This reduction will only cause more traffic congestion and pollution due to bunching traffic as law abiding drivers and those speeding all congregate at any junctions or traffic lights etc and the speeding drivers will try and push the law abiding drivers so they can continue their fast journey.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 266 | <p>I write to formally object to the proposed reductions in speed limit in respect of all of the schemes listed.</p> <p>The proposals are unnecessary and will increase journey times. Reduced speed limits are not appropriate for the majority of the roads on which they will apply, which are generally dual carriageways that were built and that are safe for 40mph traffic.</p> <p>The proposals are nonsensical and do not have general support.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider and to abandon these proposals.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 267 | <p>I would like to formally object to all these proposals, in particular those relating to proposals 1 and 2.</p> <p>Firstly on proposal 1, A34 Walsall Road, A34 Perry Barr Expressway, A34 Birchfield Road, A34 High Street, this is a main A road into Birmingham City Centre from the north of the City. The traffic on this road is already extremely busy, particularly on weekdays and there would be no benefit to lowering the speed limit other than creating more tailbacks. The road is wide and a dual carriageway so it makes absolutely no sense to lower the limit to 30mph, drivers will continue to do 40mph, thus leading to an increase in accidents with those observing and not observing the proposed 30mph limit. With more drivers doing a greater variance of speeds, you will inevitably see road accidents increase, as well as traffic worse.</p> <p>On proposal 2, the A4041 Queslett Road, I live just off this stretch of road. There is a junction on Hamble Road and Sundial lane that is already very busy and in order to stop tailbacks on these two roads, it needs cars moving at full speed, to keep the junction clear, rather than the slower proposed limit. The proposal will inconvenience more people and increase accidents at the junction with many not observing the newer proposed limits. You are trying to fix a problem that doesn't exist.</p> <p>Finally I would like to comment that Birmingham City Council actually puts its resources into tackling car crime. It is well known that car crime covering Birmingham postcodes is the most common in the whole UK, I myself have been victim to car crime and the police were unhelpful, bordering on useless. Birmingham remains a hotspot for car stripping, carjacking and car crime, it would be helpful to see the council invest money into preventing car crime rather than waste resource and time on speed restrictions which bring little value or benefit to the wider community.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 268 | Object to all speed reductions on the basis that drivers who are driving their vehicle within the law and being penalised and more should be done to tackle drivers who disregard speed limits. BCC and West Midlands Police are aware that the inner ring road is often used as a race track late at night including sections of road from the Fort to Bordesley Green yet nothing is done to tackle this anti social behaviour. More needs to be done in educating pedestrians to Cross the road correctly using designated crossings and concentrating on the task rather than having screens glued to their faces. | Ref 1 |
| 269 | I wish to formally object to all parts of the speed limit order. The speed limit should not be changed to 30mph. the motorway speed should be increased from 70mph to 80mph. | Ref 1 |
| 270 | I have been using these roads for decades and continue to do so. 40mph is a sensible maximum speed limit on the roads earmarked for a reduction to 30mph. Many of these roads are dual carriageways, which makes 30mph limits even sillier. No evidence has been provided to show that any collisions or injuries are the result of the speed limit being 40mph. There are 3 speeds to consider: the speed limit, free travelling speed, and actual impact speed. With regard to pedestrian road deaths/injuries, I've looked at DfT casualty data that goes as far back as 2004. Consistently every year over 20 years the average percentage of pedestrian injuries that are fatal remains at 2% for ALL speed limits. It's clear therefore that the average impact speed of a vehicle with a pedestrian is below 20mph due to braking, avoiding action and vehicles travelling at speeds that match the prevailing road conditions. It's clear that the proposed speed limit reductions have little of nothing to do with road safety; they are part of Birmingham's war on motorised transport and revenue raising from speeding fines from roads with unreasonably low maximum speed limits. There's also the negative economic impact of increased journey times. I doubt that any notice will be taken of sensible objections like mine as 'consultations' are just a sham. | Ref 3, Ref 4 & Ref 5 |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|
| 271 | <p>I wish to formally object to all of the Speed Limit Order.</p> <p>My reasons for this are that it will not solve the problem of speeding drivers.</p> <p>Drivers who cause serious collisions ignore whatever speed limit is in place, they will continue to drive at speeds in excess of 50-70 mph whatever the speed limit is. These reckless drivers need to be tackled in other ways.</p> <p>Reducing the speed limit to 30 mph will massively impact on the majority of drivers who do not exceed the speed limit. Causing good, safe drivers to incur unnecessary fines.</p> <p>If this is what you intend to achieve then be honest about your intentions of it being a money making scheme and not a safety scheme.</p> <p>The Speed Limit Order will increase pollution, congestion and disruption in the West Midlands, which will have a negative impact upon the lives of citizens, visitors and businesses.</p> <p>I urge you not to go ahead with this in the strongest possible terms.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 3 & Ref 4 |
| 272 | <p>This is ridiculous, the issue is not that these speed limits are too high but that they are routinely ignored.</p> <p>Enforce the existing limits and there will be no issue, people who ignore the speed limits will continue to do so whatever arbitrary speed you seem to set them at.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 273 | <p>I wish to formally object to the whole of the intended orders as in my opinion they are misguided as it is not the current 40mph limit on the roads in question that is at all responsible for the casualties, ie the proposed solution will not have a material positive effect on the identified problem. BCC needs to do a proper analysis of WHY these accidents are occurring and then take targeted action, eg dealing properly with cruising/racing. The limits will further add to the growing list of factors discouraging people from travelling into the city centre for work, shopping or entertainment.</p> | Ref 3 |
| 274 | <p>In general I formerly object to the reduced speed limits.</p> <p>For safety reasons 20mph outside all schools, universities, hospitals and care homes would be very much welcomed.In</p> <p>In my experience of the A45 small heath highway buses and HGVs will extremely struggle to keep to 30mph.</p> <p>There are no public footpaths along there for pedestrians.</p> <p>The accidents I've witnessed or had near misses with have been with high powered cars that have no regard for the rules of the road so won't do 30mph.</p> <p>Education and more police in my opinion would be better.</p> <p>You can't put a price on preventable death.</p> <p>However with the mess Birmingham council is in how can we afford these changes.</p> <p>The clean air zone had many issues.</p> <p>My next door neighbour's niece was killed standing at a bus stop by a man in a high powered car. He got a small prison sentence, banned from driving but when he got out went back to driving without any thought of consequences.</p> <p>Maybe learn from the reduced speed limits in wales.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 5 & Ref 8 |
| 275 | <p>Most of these roads are main Artillery routes for travelling across the City. Most of these roads are permanently being worked on. and constantly being subject to speed restrictions. due to road works. It is currently unlikely that the General Road speed allowed on these roads can be achieved resulting in constant traffic Jams and hold ups. Daily. This causing a large pollution problem, and annoyance to traffic travelling along them, and serious increased cost to industry paying for stationary and slow moving vehicles during the day.</p> <p>I would suggest that a close a look at the road Accident statistic. Would show the most serious accidents occur. during the night. When their is far less traffic about to use them. It would also show what ever speed limit is given to the road. The drivers who are most likely to break the speed limit, what ever it is are about during the quiter night time periods.Most of them will willing brake the law any way. Monies to be spent changing road Side furniture ie. Speed signs ect. would be better spent in Policing the current regulations. correctly. Clearing the road works from them and allow these Roads to move at the speed that they were originally designed to do. Although I may agree to slowing traffic in Housing Estates and school Area.</p> <p>I can see no advantage to the lowering the death toll, Accidents levells or pollution levels. by lowering the speed limit to the majority of the above roads.Artillery Roads should Kept for that purposes.Allowing a working City to move. Eventually you will bring the City to a complete halt.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 3, Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 276 | <p>I object to blanket 30 speed zones instead other traffic carming such as speed jumps should be used on roads such as cottage lane due to the fact that it is only about 20 metres that is above 30. Also limits around islands should be lowered as minworth island is 40 mile speed limit but 3 of the exits off are already 30 limit. Roads such as the Kingsbury road where there are no residential propertys. Instead of lowering limits that won't be enforced due to lack of funds and man power try improving the state of road surfaces and the public transport system (bus services) to encourage more people to use them which would cut down the number of cars on the roads.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 277 | <p>Lowering the speed limit is pointless. The traffic flows as traffic permits. At certain times of the day you are lucky to move 20 feet before stopping again. Reducing the speed limit will have no affect but will coast the council millions of pounds in changing all of the signage. A bankrupt council creating more debt...</p> | Ref 8 |
| 278 | <p>I object to any lowering of the current speed limits, as this will create more road jams, more pollution, and more frustated drivers which in turn could lead to more accidents</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 279 | <p>I object to these proposals as the roads concerned are arterial routes into and around the city. Reducing the speed limit will actually result in greater air pollution, less economical use of fuel, greater likelihood of speed limits being ignored, and the probability of more accidents being caused as vehicles begin to be driven more closely to each other.</p> <p>Far more time, money and effort needs to be spent on improving road surfaces and public transport services around and into/out of the city, rather than on futile restrictions on private vehicles .</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 280 | <p>While this is clearly a measure that is intended to reduce accidents it does not take into consideration that the majority of the city is gridlocked on a regular basis in rush hour and this will make no difference at those times but will undoubtedly cause even more congestion in the build up to rush hour making the city a no go area for businesses, visitors and severely harming trade.</p> <p>This seems to be another knee-jerk reaction much like the much ridiculed 20 mph zones that have never been enforced and are very rarely adhered to by the majority of drivers.</p> | Ref 3 |

| | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| 281 | Keeping traffic moving is important if it's a clear road 40mph is fine it's just a few mad in inconsiderate drivers that spoil it for the majority of drivers | Ref 4 |
| 282 | <p>Object to the proposals.</p> <p>Responded to last consultation and am not convinced by your reasons for redoing this consultation. Have little confidence that you will listen until you have the answer you want.</p> <p>My primary objection is based on on the lack of co-ordination with the discouragement of car use with real improvement in public transport. The consequence is that you punish car drivers without any real alternative solution. I dont believe this is balanced and more an abuse of your power in promoting an ideology not widely supported. The case for this measure is not well argued but as you seem fixed on repeating the consultation until the public give the "right" answer.</p> | Ref 1 |
| 283 | Formally object as the reduced speed limit will increase journey times and increase traffic. Birmingham does not have a good enough public transport system such as tram system that people can use as an alternative to their own cars. Not happy about proposed changes. | Ref 4 |
| 284 | <p>Colossal waste of money to once again impose an unwanted retrograde restriction on ordinary people. But then Birmingham residents are well used to the council wasting our money!</p> <p>All this will do is further slow down the ability to travel in the Birmingham area as if it wasn't bad enough already.</p> <p>Clean air rules, ludicrously designed cycle lanes and millions of traffic cones make it a nightmare to get anywhere in Brum.... and now this!</p> <p>Why don't you just go back to horse drawn carriages and have done.</p> <p>This is just one more reason why we're selling our house and moving out of the area.</p> | Ref 8 |
| 285 | <p>The speed limits should remain unchanged.</p> <p>The money should be spent on enforcing current limits. Reducing the speed limit will not stop people speeding; rigid enforcement will.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 286 | <p>I object to all proposals 1 to 27 and do not agree to reducing the current speed limit of 40 mph .</p> <p>The majority of the locations are dual carriageways where a lower speed limit is not necessary.</p> <p>Instead we should be enforcing the current speed limit with the use of cameras .</p> <p>A better solution would be traffic light cameras as increasingly drivers are crossing red lights .</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 287 | I object to the proposals as I don't see why normal law abiding drivers should be penalised due to a few young drivers with powerful cars that can't handle them. Most of the time we can't reach 30mph let alone 40mph due to constant traffic. Instead of penalising every driver, the council and police should be out more catching the speeders. Speeding drivers should also be treated more harshly as a deterrent. Speeding drivers don't obey speed limits anyway so it wouldn't matter to them if it's 30 or 40 mph. | Ref 6 |
| 288 | Proposal is bad for residents and businesses it will discourage inward investment IMO, money would be far better spent upholding the current limits and placing variable speed cameras in the roads in question , this is a bridge to far LTN was bad enough. Concentrate on the shambolic state of Birmingham city council finances caused by the botched IT systems. | Ref 4 |
| 289 | What is the point of this survey? The council has made up their minds. They don't listen to the residents anyway. Why are they wasting our time and money. | Ref 1 |
| 290 | <p>I object to theses reductions in current speede limits, which where approved previously and have been working well for many many years.</p> <p>There is no evidence that this will be of benefit to the constituency residents or passers by.</p> <p>No one has asked for this.</p> <p>No one has voted for this.</p> <p>Look at Wales. The speed reductions there have been shown to be so unprofessional, unwanted, inappropriate and costly that they have been revoked a year after their unwarranted imposition.</p> <p>Do not do this.</p> <p>It is not wanted, needed, nor beneficial..</p> <p>Bad for journey times, emissions and noise due to being in a lower gear. There is no evidential benefit sighted.</p> <p>This would be a vast over-reach of council powers, a over zealous tyrannical move typical of an organisation that should be saving money to balance the books.</p> | Ref 3 Ref 7 |
| 291 | <p>I strongly object to the Proposed speed limit reduction to 30mph Birmingham area-wide.</p> <p>The majority of Birmingham citizens don't speed, it's irresponsible individuals and these people will continue to speed regardless of the speed limit.</p> <p>Yet again it's a collective punishment on the law-abiding citizens of Birmingham !!!!!.</p> <p>Birmingham council have no money, so how are you going to fund the works to change signage, speed cameras etc?</p> <p>How will you enforce this? the police don't have the capacity to police the roads, I see people speeding and driving irresponsibly on a daily basis. Lowing the speed limit will not stop this.</p> <p>This will not improve road safety.....</p> | Ref 6 & Ref 8 |
| 292 | I object to the reduction in speed limit to 30mph in ALL locations. I do not think it will reduce deaths or injuries. Drivers will increase speed on surrounding roads. In my experience as a driver and pedestrian drivers in B20 and B21 regularly speed on minor roads without fear of being caught. Exceeding 30 miles mph on these roads is where the problem lies not on the proposed routes. | Ref 3 |
| 293 | The council needs to stop penalising all motorists. These plans are knee jerk reactions. Maybe to gain more funding from somewhere. But these plans will only increase more delays and traffic in the City. It will have no effect on accident numbers because most take place in 30mph roads, and these are not because of speed necessarily but because of careless drivers, inexperienced drivers, and new generation of drivers who struggle to drive in heavy traffic, who struggle to drive in the dark and on wet and icy roads. Not to mention young drivers who are under the influence of drugs and gas, and boy racers who don't care about any speed limits. This seems to be another money making scheme, where you drop the speed limit and then put a camera there. It doesn't really address the real issues. The traffic is already bad in the city, with some of it being because of temporary lights and lane closures for days and weeks even, but with no actual work going in. It is these issues that need addressing, rather than using the motorist as a cash cow. | Ref 4 |
| 294 | I object to proposed speed limit but feel you should enforce the 40 limit more actively - the people that break the speed limit are boy racers driving loud cars at double speed limit - stop them and many troubles will be solved. Modern cars can stop very easily if drivers are concentrating - maybe have like French 2 speed limits 40MPH in dry and 30 MPH in rain conditions that works well. And 20 MPH by schools . | Ref 6 |
| 295 | <p>Complete and utter madness, another bout of nonsense from Birmingham City Council operating in a position of insolvency.</p> <p>Reduction of posted speed limit will not reduce vehicle speed. The routes have been constructed to carry vehicles safely at 40mph. Reduction of posted speed limit to 30mph will increase average average vehicle speed and potential incident.</p> <p>Furthermore, this action is unenforceable, both in terms of Police monitoring (still can't catch the car/bike thieves and house breakers) and cost from a council unable to manage income despite the extortionate and unacceptable increase in non-domestic rates and council tax.</p> | Ref 6 |

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| | | |
| 296 | <p>Formal objection.</p> <p>There is no need to reduce speed limits to 30 mph on these major roads you just need to Enforce the existing speed limits. This will have a dramatic effect on accident rates. People who consistently exceed the present speed limits will almost certainly exceed the new proposal 30 mph limit.</p> <p>Enforcement of the present speed limit has to be the way forward. Will the council keep running these consultations until they get the outcome they want?</p> | Ref 6 |
| 297 | The natural speed for the roads that I particularly use, Coventry Road & Small Heath Bypass, is 40 miles per hour. By restricting cars to just 30mph motorists will be driving with one eye on the speedo rather than giving the road their full attention and you will, in my opinion, making the roads less safe. | Ref 5 |
| 298 | this restricts DRIVERS HUMAN RIGHTS THE COUNCIL HAS NO MANDATE TO DO THIS AND IT WONT STOP THE BOI RACERS | Ref 1 |
| 299 | Changing any speed limits is a waste of time and money f they aren't enforced. We need speed cameras to make it work. A speed monitor was installed near my house (a 30mph zone). A good % of passing traffic exceeds this in a regular basis. A speed monitor has been installed but the just seems to encourage some drivers to speed up to see how high they can get recorded - I know of several occasions when they've managed over 80. If current speed limits aren't enforced, what is the point of introducing new ones? | Ref 6 |
| 300 | Did you not read the results from last consultation a year ago? (https://www.birminghambeheard.org.uk/economy/30mph-proposal/). 56.69% Rejected/opposed your stupid idea and yet you are running the consultation again, is it because you are hoping for different responses now? We do not want these lower speed limits. I live on one of the roads! I have never crashed here neither killed or injured anyone! Stop trying to make driving harder. I pay my council taxes and I have a say in this, my say matters and you cannot ignore the results you get and don't like until you get the results you want! The accident on A45 that kicked off the last consultation was because of a drunk/drugged driver in an average speed check zone, there was far more wrong there than speed. I don't drink drive so why do I have to put up with ridiculously slow speed limits? Scrap this proposal now. There is no need or safety issue related to 40mph limits. I have been driving in Birmingham for years and years. | Ref 1 |
| 301 | <p>I wish to formally object to all parts of the Speed Limit Order.</p> <p>Motorists who speed will continue to do so irrespective of the speed limit. In fact, recent pedestrian deaths occurred due to vehicles travelling far in excess of the legal speed limit.</p> <p>Enforcing a lower speed limit won't reduce the amount of irresponsible drivers who ignore the limits, but it will inconvenience those who do abide by the legal limits. Birmingham had become a congested, poorly thought out city to drive in. Traffic lights on islands, and the ill conceived caz has pushed traffic into the suburbs, frustrating drivers, making them more likely to rush because it takes so long to get anywhere in the city.</p> <p>Whilst you may want more people to walk and use public transport, it's a losing battle - public transport in the city is notoriously unreliable, expensive, limited and rife with anti social behaviour. You're not going to convince people that it's easier and more convenient to do their weekly shop on foot or the bus.</p> <p>Anti-social driving is a problem across the city, but if you wish to tackle it then you need more police patrols to actually deter people from being reckless. Changing the speed limit will not be that deterrent.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 302 | <p>Weeford Road: I frequently use this road, which is open to mainly farmland on one side.</p> <p>In 24 years of living nearby I have never seen or heard of an accident along the proposed limit reduction stretch of road.</p> <p>Traffic builds up near the Tamworth Road, and this inevitably slows progress.</p> <p>It seems to be an unwarranted imposition on vehicle users.</p> <p>Did someone just look at a map and get carried away?</p> <p>Is it a fundraising venture (through fines)?</p> <p>Eachelhurst Road: There are very few roads into Birmingham from Sutton Coldfield. It seems weird to slow down commercial, public and private traffic unless there are overwhelmingly high numbers (compared to other similar roads across the region) of serious injuries or deaths caused by accidents.</p> <p>Ox Leys Road: Another frequently used road if leaving this area ie. To access motorways, other A roads.</p> <p>I don't see a need to slow it down.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 303 | <p>I object to the following roads being considered under the Speed Limit Order with accompanying reasons:</p> <p>B4148 Eachelhurst Road - this is a dual carriageway that is sensible for a 40mph speed limit. If you want to reduce road safety issues with this road, you should concentrate on dealing with motorists who drive slowly in the outside lane when having no intention to turn onto the opposite side of the dual carriageway or to overtake. I have seen many instances of this happening and it leads to other drivers being frustrated and undertaking, potentially causing accidents. Changing this road to a 30 mph road will not reduce accidents and dealing with this issue of sitting in the outside lane will do so. I strongly object to this road being made 30mph, it won't work and will further alienate drivers in this City.</p> <p>A38/B4148 Tyburn Road - the objections to the speed limit order on this road are the same as those for the above B4148 Eachelhurst Road.</p> <p>A4097 Kingsbury Road - the objections to the speed limit order on this road are the same as those for the above B4148 Eachelhurst Road.</p> <p>A452 Chester Road - the objections to the speed limit order on this road are the same as those for the above B4148 Eachelhurst Road.</p> <p>A47 Heartlands Parkway/Fort Parkway - the objections to the speed limit order on this road are the same as those for the above B4148 Eachelhurst Road.</p> <p>Thimble End Road/Webster Way - this is a fairly straight road with limited pedestrian traffic. The 40mph speed limit is entirely sensible and reducing the speed limit will be a pointless gesture. There is no housing directly facing this road and reducing the speed limit will further alienate and frustrate drivers on the road, resulting in the accidents you say you wish to avoid.</p> <p>Ox Leys Road - again this is a country road with no accommodation or pavements that are used by pedestrians. A 30mph speed limit will not in any way affect the speed that drivers drive at as very soon after the road commences it turns into a much faster road. This change is completely unnecessary and pointless.</p> | Ref 5 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| | <p>A38 Kingsbury Road - again this is a dual carriageway that does not have much pedestrian traffic. As with Eachelhurst Road, you should concentrate on the manner of driving more than the speed and properly monitor the driving. Imposing a 30mph speed limit on this road will aggravate drivers and will not reduce accidents.</p> <p>With all of these roads, it is the manner of the driving, often with drivers who are racing and who don't have licenses that cause the accidents. Imposing a 30mph speed limit will not stop these accidents but will unfairly impede the reasonable driving of the majority, which is not what such schemes should do.</p> | |
| 304 | <p>I formally reject this idea for the reasons maked below.</p> <p>1) whilst I agree some of the roads mentioned are close to residential properties, some are not and would not reduce accidents.</p> <p>2) waste of money as the new restrictions will not be policed and therefore people will continue at the current speeds.</p> <p>3) is this really a money making scheme for the council to plug the finances by robbing the local residents further for there failings to manage?</p> <p>4) I can see no point to this in certain roads within the list other than to annoy local residents and put off investment of business by taking an age to navigate round the city.</p> <p>5) Maybe the money to implement would be better spent educating people with road safety and not penalising road users</p> | Ref 5 |
| 305 | <p>I formally object to the speed reduction proposals for the A34.</p> <p>Travelling into the city centre is already problematic and a reduction in speed limit would increase travel time. The A34 in particular would have a huge impact. The evidence of reducing spped from 40 to 30 miles per hours does not appear to be conclusive in the benefits gained and I feel the benefits are outweighed by the negative impacts.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 306 | <p>I agree with some 50% of the proposals for the area relevant to me, but I disagree with the proposals for location references 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. These particular locations are all dual 2-lane carriageways where the inner lane is not routinely used for parking. As such, these roads are designed for 2-speed traffic where the inner lane traffic typically travels at 30 mph and the outer lane is used for overtaking at 40 mph. I've never seen any problem with this arrangement in contrast with dual carriageways in more residential locations where parking is routine on the inner lane outside of residences and a 30 mph limit is consequently more appropriate.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 307 | <p>I wish to formally object to the Speed Limit Order for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Many of the roads where the proposal is suggested are main commuter road. A lower speed limit is likely to significantly extend travel times, especially for commuters with family responsibilities, causing additional unnecessary stress for fear of not collecting children on time from after-school clubs, or increasing costs for having to extend childcare hours. This is assuming that extended childcare provision is even available because if it is not, then parents are likely to have to suffer job losses, which increases financial stresses and strains in a challenging economic climate. In addition to this, extending travel times for both commuters and commercial vehicles, is likely to lead to inefficiencies and increase the fuel consumption, leading to increased air toxicity and ultimately, poorer health. In turn, this will impact on greater pressure on the medical profession and increased costs for NHS and the taxpayer in the provision of services.</p> <p>2. It is a known fact that slower speeds potentially create bottlenecks during peak hours as traffic density will increase on main roads. Again, fuel expenditure increases, as well as air pollution, which ultimately is detrimental to our health.</p> <p>3. In addition, the proposed reduction in speed limits will impact logistics and delivery times, which will increase business costs which rely on timely transportation when businesses are already detrimentally impacted by the proposed N.I. increase. Are we trying to stifle productively and create a perfect storm for a recession?</p> <p>4. Without a doubt, fuel consumption is proven to increase when vehicles operate at lower speeds, as they become more inefficient, notably in urban settings, leading to higher fuel consumption and costs. Is this affordable in the current economic climate, as well as the increased business costs stated in number 3 above, plus increased National Insurance costs which are about to be imposed?</p> <p>5. Significantly, have we taken into account the impact of inevitable driver frustration due to reduced speeds? Surely this will lead to some risky over-taking manoeuvres, and we must factor in aggressive driving behaviours which will result in an increased frequency of accidents. Ultimately, the impact of this will be increased road congestion, further delays where emergency services tend to such incidents and a greater strain on public finances to increase availability of emergency services to potentially reduce the serious injury/death rates.</p> <p>6. Unless there is significant evidence of increasingly frequent accidents or safety issues at the current 40mph limited, on the commuter roads where the cut is proposed, then reducing the speed limit cannot be justified. We already have data which shows that the reduced speed limit of 60mph on the motorways for the purposes of improving air quality is a false narrative. What justification do we have for reducing speeds when there is no such benefit? Infact, diesel vehicles, of which we have many on our roads, counteract any environmental benefits expected from slower traffic. Whilst the move is towards electric vehicles, how can businesses make the increased transition with all the other costs looming: increased employer national insurance contributions; rising fuel duty; increasing business rates; increasing business loan interest rates?</p> <p>7. Whilst the perspective of 'safety on our roads' should be given due consideration, it is the case that reinforcement and traffic calming measures will require a significant financial outlay, which should not be imposed on the Birmingham Council tax payers, especially at a time when we are bankrupt, made to pay an unaffordable (for many) 20% increase and are struggling to provide the basics for our respective families. Without additional, unaffordable expenditure, we will not see the desired reduction in speeds, especially since we experienced an exponential decrease in law enforcement over the recent years.</p> <p>8. Have you factored in the real possibility of reduced response times for our emergency services - fire, police, ambulance - who will experience delays when responding to emergencies? Is this really going to enhance the quality of life for us in Birmingham?</p> | Ref 2, Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 308 | <p>There is no need to reduce the speed limits to 30mph and it's outrageous that you are conducting another survey so soo after the last one had a majority to keep the 40mph limit. You are a clueless bunch of fools as evident by your total lack of financial discipline</p> | Ref 1 |
| | <p>I object to the proposal to reduce existing speed limits on roads in Birmingham from 40 mph to 30 mph for the following reasons.</p> <p>*It is a blanket reduction without any consideration for whether the existing limits on particular roads are realistic and appropriate as they stand at present.</p> <p>*I believe that for many of the roads identified a speed limit of 40 mph is appropriate as it is at present.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|----------------|
| 309 | <p>*Simply changing the speed limit to an inappropriate 30 mph will not reduce the speed of vehicles: it will just add frustration and annoyance to drivers, which in turn is likely to increase the potential for more accidents.</p> <p>* For the minority of drivers who are irresponsible and already speed above existing limits and generally cause accidents, a reduction in speed limits will be of no effect.</p> <p>* Changing all the road signs for this unnecessary step will be a waste of money.</p> <p>* There is hardly any enforcement of existing speed limits due to lack of resources, so there is no point in increasing this problem by adding more limits.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 8. |
| 310 | I wish to object on ground of insufficient evidence provide on the overall impact of these changes. Living in the 21st century we should look at accelerating and freeing our mobility not going backwards into the dark ages based on incomplete analysis and biased opinions. So far many studies have shown impact on safety is minimal from blanket reductions and proper enforcement is far more effective. As a council you should look at repairing and maintaining the road infrastructure properly and also at should look at driving standards across the city. In many of the areas highlighted the road discipline is very poor and lots of fraudulent claims skew results. Additionally many pedestrians don't properly observe the rules leading to excess accidents. You should focus on resolving the issue to treating one small symptom. Narrow focus on just imposing limits will undoubtedly have far reaching consequences for many in the city without bringing desired positive results. Personally if these limitations keep cropping up I would at regards strongly consider leaving the city. | Ref 1 |
| 311 | <p>Speed limits in terms of effects must be balanced with impacts to both local and UK economy. Increased journey times, unproductivity increase will impact all residents and businesses. This Policy is ill conceived and will cause people to have to move house and jobs to minimise impacts. Will also lead to significantly more cars on road for longer at rush hour and increased omissions not less. May save a couple of lives will lead to many businesses having to leave Birmingham and shoppers finding other places to visit (not in bham).</p> <p>Please consider the impacts to the economy and the million plus residents who will suffer everyday on terms of portions of life expended sat in traffic (for no good reason). Plan for 30mph and 20mph cannot be supported as has only considered 1 impact / has not considered several hundred other impacts.</p> <p>Please do better. Residents of this city deserve more.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 312 | <p>REF 7, 8, 9 10 I wish to formally object.</p> <p>The reduction in the speed limit will not make a difference to habitual speeders.</p> <p>They take no notice of the 40 mph limits because they know the chances of being caught are nearly zero.</p> <p>In 20 years living in Warmley I have only seen speed checks 3 times on Eachalhurst rd and motorists at night hit 60-70 mph.</p> <p>The cameras on Chester road, which is now 30mph were installed because of a drunk motorist speeding at 50-60 mph and hitting a child on a crossing. So everybody is now being penalised for the actions of a drunk.</p> <p>What is wanted by the public is more speeders being caught with cameras or mobile speed check units.</p> <p>If your proposal does not reduce the amount of speeding offences and accidents then it can be classed as a failure so would you reinstate the speed limits?</p> | Ref 6 |
| 313 | <p>This blanket reduction makes no sense whatsoever I oppose it . It is not the 40mph limit that causes the accidents but the drivers who ignore that limit knowing that they will not be caught. One example I travel on regularly is the Chester Road at Pye Hayes where the speed has been reduced already to 30mph and there are 2 static cameras but drivers speed passed you only to brake at the camera locations.</p> <p>I live on a road that is only 200 yds long with a 30 mph speed limit next to a school but some drivers travel well over that speed again knowing that they can get away with it.</p> <p>How many of these deaths were caused by drivers speeding over the limit.</p> <p>If there is money to spend on road safety improvements then it should be spent on average speed cameras the only effective deterrent to stop speeding and cameras on traffic lights. It appears that a red traffic light is now optional not a command.</p> <p>I am opposed to this blanket reduction and wasting money putting up new speed limit signs that will just be ignored.</p> | Ref 1 |
| 314 | Lower speeds create congestion, leading to frustration, and inevitably more speeding. Clear up the roads by managing roadworks schemes properly, improving road quality, and enforcement of the current limits. | Ref 2 & Ref 6 |
| 315 | 40 mph has been deemed safe on all these roads for many years. What has changed to necessitate lowering the limit now ? I understand you say that there has been an increase in accidents over the last 12 months but that could be a temporary surge. Without knowing the facts behind all the recent accidents it is difficult to make a rational judgement on this. However, from a motorists point of view, this measure would just add more time and frustration to an already painful commute. I would've thought that frustrated drivers are more likely to drive in an erratic or aggressive manner. Keep the roads moving. Other solutions might be: better road safety initiatives, particularly with the young; barriers on exposed, narrow pavement stretches; encouraging cyclists to use quieter, slower roads rather than 40 mph major routes. | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 316 | <p>This will make these roads even more dangerous</p> <p>I have often been undertaken by speeding motorists lowering the speed limit on these roads will increase the number of reckless drivers thinking they can do this and get away with it</p> <p>The differential speeds will cause more not less accidents</p> <p>Unless the speed limits can be enforced this is a waste of time, if 40 cannot be policed how will this be any different</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 317 | Formally object to all changes in speed limit. Road safety issues arise caused by those who already disregard the speed limits and rules of the road. Efforts should be put into ensuring that drivers adhere to proportionate rules that are already in place. | Ref 6 |
| 318 | I formally object to all locations but specifically locations 22 and 23. The traffic is already a nightmare on these roads with travel into the city centre taking up to an hour most weekday mornings (1.5 hours if by bus) from Halesowen. Slowing speed limits down here will only exacerbate the issue. Instead of punishing motorists and then saying you will sort public transport later, fix public transport first, actually give proper punishment to drunk/reckless drivers and let normal hard working people try to get on with their lives without punishing them. Birmingham's entire infrastructure in the last 100 years was built on private car usage. And whilst you may have ambitions of reducing car ownership, the simple fact is until proper working, punctual and acceptable alternatives are offered, people will continue to use private vehicles. | Ref 4 |
| 319 | I reject. To me it seems like the council are hoping to make money from motorists through fines. What they should do is enforce the current speed limits. | Ref 1 |
| 320 | <p>I formally object to the lowering of the speed limit on these from 40 to 30 mph.</p> <p>This will not stop people speeding.</p> | Ref 5 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| | Keep the limit at 40 mph and install average speed cameras along the length of ALL main arterial routes and ring roads in Birmingham is a much better option. | |
| 321 | I wish to object to the orders for Chester road and Monmouth drive along with Walsall Road. | Ref 1 |
| 322 | The plan to reduce the speed limits is wrong and short-sighted. However improving education for young people and increasing fines for those breaking the current rules is far better than inconveniencing everyone for the actions of a tiny minority of bad drivers. I am very much against the change. | Ref 1 |
| 323 | Why punish drivers who abide by the law and stick to the current 40 mph limit on main roads into the city? This council is turning into a police state. Longer journey times, more average speed cameras just to raise more revenue for your bankrupting of our city. It doesn't matter what we say you'll carry on with this plan regardless. Another nail in the coffin of this city. | Ref 5 |
| 324 | I do feel that some of this especially the heartlands spine road is unnecessary. I think more attention needs to be made to both enforcement and also bad driving. Without these there is no point as those who speed anyway will continue to do so. For example, the cars driving through the queensway tunnel seem to ignore the reduced speed limit from 40 to 30 anyway. It would appear that the only way you currently seem to have success with is when there are enforcement cameras as on the Chester road around the pype Hayes area. I also think consideration needs to be made when there are no pedestrians normally such as on the spine road | Ref 5 |
| 325 | I object to more than 50% of these proposals being in the Sutton Coldfield area. How many accidents are on these roads. Chester Road has had fatalities and has already been reduced to 30mph but this is not adhered to by drivers nor enforced by you. We have multiple crossings with no pedestrian crossings. When requested to include zebra crossings, these have been declined. How does the speed limit aide pedestrians if you continually fail to maintain traffic lights and provide crossing points. Pavement and double yellow line parking is horrendous yet you fail to enforce this at any time in Wylde Green, Walmley and Sutton Coldfield. You fail to manage the number of delivery drivers and congestion. So whilst changes must be made you need to open your mind and come up with some other measures. Plus, the A38 bypass - definition is to avoid congestion in a populated area but you've developed it so that's now a nonsense. Alongside there bring no ring road you've created a hellfest of congestion from North Birmingham city bound. Bus gates you've pushed the traffic into congested areas. All in all this will created more carbon monoxide over a greater period and increase petrol consumption. | Ref 2, Ref 3 & Ref 4 |
| 326 | I object to ALL these changes, it is blanket punishment of all due to the reckless behaviour of the few. Lower speed limits causes impatience and erratic overtaking which is much more dangerous | Ref 5 |
| 327 | I formally object to the proposal for speed limit orders for all major routes to reduce the limit from the current 40mph to 30 mph. The city will grind to a halt without first having the public transport offering to tempt people away from private car use. Dangerously speeding drivers will not take any more notice of 30mph than they do of 40mph. Only the current law abiding drivers will be slowed down - the dangerous drivers will continue to be dangerous. More mobile traffic officers are needed to enforce the current limits. Listen to the lawful and democratic objections of the city population. Law enforcement had to be by consent. Imposition will never encourage consent only rejection | Ref 4 & Ref 6 |
| 328 | I am formally objecting to the plans as a whole. Over the course of my driving years I have seen a number of roads in Birmingham already reduced from 40 to 30, and some from 30 to 20. Some of these, such as the stretch of College Road in Perry Barr between the library and the roundabout, made sense. Some, such as the majority of the Bristol Road, did not. It is endlessly frustrating as a driver to be adhering to the speed limit of 30 when a) you know full well, having done it for years with the road having had a higher limit, that you can safely drive at that higher limit provided conditions are suitable, and b) many cars around you are not adhering to this lower limit. It feels dangerous. It feels much more dangerous than everyone travelling more or less at 40. The fact of the matter is that collisions are not caused by speed itself but by speed which is not suitable for the conditions - whether that be the weather, the volume of surrounding traffic, the inattention of the driver or another factor. The people who were driving at the wrong speed for the conditions and caused a collision when the road was 40 are still the same people when the road is 30. Many will speed for the various reasons that people do. But in addition, generally slowing traffic down tends to cause frustration and impatience, both for those who will speed and those who won't. These states are not conducive to better driving. | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 329 | The proposals are flawed. Living in a 20mph zone I see the danger created by these limits as they encourage dangerous overtaking. A more sensible approach would be to enforce the existing limits. | Ref 1 |
| 330 | I wish to formally object to these proposals, most particularly in the A34 Walsall Road, A34 Perry Barr Expressway, A34 Birchfield Road, A34 High Street area. The existing 30mph zones are not adequately enforced and adhered to in areas where there are a greater levels of pedestrians. Extending 30 mph zones to areas where there are few pedestrians is a waste of resources when drivers are dangerously and widely flouting the existing 30mph zones and no U-turn zones at Tower Hill. Money should be spent on proper enforcement of the existing zones rather than expanding 30mph zones to areas with fewer pedestrians through a poorly targeted plan that will make life worse for motorists who already suffer from the embarrassing and disastrous failure of the Perry Barr regeneration scheme and increased air pollution harming local residents caused by the additional static traffic in the area that was created by it. | Ref 2, Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 331 | please tell us the location(s) : all. proposed measure(s) : all It is catostrophical that some of these highways which are extremely important links from one borough to the next and for those who commute between, are now under a cull. It's quite shameful that some councillors consider their own opinions above a majority. Noted that the "majority" that is vocal initially campaigns - however having websites like this monstrosity that require specific objections with specific time frames is akin to a coup when the average Joe doesn't know what this means!!! By all means, carry out your agenda, and watch how the majority suddenly realise that you have severely detrimented them.. I wonder how long said councillors will hold elected positions then and it will be a matter of months before repeal due to insufficient policing and/or inability to have understood ramifications. See Wales... | Ref 1 |

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| 332 | <p>City wide without related statistical evidence is just sloppy policy making. The proposed speed reduction is not a magic bullet, enforced compliance will still be necessary so the only visible outcome will be longer commute times, longer periods of rush hours, increased congestion. This will be particularly true on routes that are direct feeder ways to the motorway network so a side effect will be that the distribution of goods will be impacted. Slower speeds, engines running at the most inefficient levels, increased pollutants (even for the newest engines), you will just be chasing one problem caused by another.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 333 | <p>ave been a resident and driver in the Sutton Coldfield area for 12 years. I drive safely at the speed limit, with an awareness of my surroundings and this allows me to react appropriately ensure the safety of other road users and myself. I use eachelhurst road on my daily commute and I live just off thimble end road.</p> <p>My views are that the 40mph speed limits are not the issue, it is the excessive number of drivers who treat the roads like their own personal racetrack - driving at speeds of 50-60mph on these roads with little care for other road users. Reducing the speed limits means they will drive at 40-50mph instead, which again does not solve the problem. There are also a significant number of drivers who appear to think the law about using mobile phones at the wheel does not apply to them.</p> <p>Reducing the speed limit will not make any difference to the safety of our roads and the council would better serve the local people of Birmingham (and Sutton Coldfield in particular) by investing in speed cameras that are active and supporting measures to target those who use mobile phones while driving.</p> <p>The local area would also benefit from the roads being repaired fully rather than patched - they don't last and holes reappear. Swerving enormous potholes is another risk factor for accidents.</p> <p>There is also a piece of work to be done around educating secondary school children in the city about crossing roads and entrances to estates without looking.</p> <p>As a resident, I feel that the speed limits around Sutton Coldfield are appropriate and without the means to enforce them currently, reducing them to 30 miles an hour would make little to no difference.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 334 | <p>Object- it's already slow enough to travel around the city. Where traffic is heavy, 40mph often unobtainable.</p> <p>Where traffic is light, vehicles has the ability to reach the speed limit. Limits don't stop speeding, enforcement will. There is limited value in having law abiding drivers.</p> <p>The proposed change to Redhill Road is interesting, this is already signed at 30mph, does that meant the true speed limit is currently 40mph and it's incorrectly signed? Why is this not correct?</p> <p>The A38 South (Bristol Road) changes are in areas where there are low padestrian numbers and good crossings, these in my opinion are sufficient. Same with a number of the other proposals, they're dual carriageways.</p> <p>Better protection for pedestrians crossing should be provided.</p> <p>I witnessed a car go through a red traffic light (pedestrian crossing) new Belgrave Police Station. Traffic speed was 5-10mph which suggests speed wasn't a consideration.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 335 | <p>In my view, this has absolutely nothing to do with safety and every thing about money grabbing via fines etc.</p> <p>Vehicles have never been safer with all sorts of drivers aids solely designed to make them so. Anti lock brakes, traction control, auto braking, collision interpretation braking, pedestrian safe design feature such as flush wipers, scoop bumpers plus many more.</p> <p>30 and 40 limits have served us well for around a century and whilst it's true traffic volumes have risen, average speeds have fallen I suspect due to these higher numbers of vehicles in the same (often lesser because of interference in free flowing traffic imposed by restrictions on many routes) space.</p> <p>Forcing a lowering to 30 on certain current 40 carriageways ans a blanket of 20 on 30 limit roads will in my opinion be detrimental to safety and air quality and I will tell you why.</p> <p>On the safety front, drivers will be watching their Speedos a lot more for fear of going a mile or two above these Draconian limits, therefore not keeping their eyes on the road because they will be aware that the new limits will be enforced with zeal, fines coming thick and fact in order to help refill Birmingham's bankrupt coffers.</p> <p>Regarding air quality, slower speeds means lower gears which means higher engine revs which leads to higher potential emissions (already historically lower than in the past due to better technology) and also higher fuel consumption, raising costs for already hard pressed drivers who constantly seem to be seen as cash cows for Westminster and Local Councils.</p> <p>No, in my view, this just smacks of another way for our bankrupt and inept council to use vehicle drivers, yet again, to raise money. These changes are not in any way needed and should not be enforced.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 6 |
| 336 | <p>I want to formally object to the proposed speed limit reduction to 30 mph.</p> <p>Birmingham roads have already been totally messed up with the introduction of dedicated bus lanes, cycle lanes, one way schemes and pedestrianisation reducing access for cars about their normal day to day business. It already is impossible to get from A to B in a sensible and adequate manner. I personally feel the roads are more and more dangerous for the motorist. Remember it is the motorist that pays road tax which increases annually. The state of highways is dire on top of which the motorist is being pushed out more and more.</p> <p>I am horrified a further speed reduction is being proposed. Please DO NOT DO IT.</p> | Ref 1 |
| 337 | <p>I object - first example - Ref 25 Lindridge Road is already 30mph in the section highlighted.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the need to ensure pedestrian safety, Birmingham has severe congestion/traffic issues, and slowing traffic further will worsen this.</p> <p>Most RTAs and anti social issues are caused by speeding, kids on scooters, electric or off road bike, pulling wheelies, riding on wrong side of road, wearing ski masks without helmets etc. We need enforcement. We need visible policing. We need action. E.g. Falcon Lodge in Sutton is the most dangerous place to drive in the area, just because of the points above. And there's no visible police.</p> <p>Invest your time in sorting, rather than penalising safe drivers who drive within the current speed limits.</p> | Ref 4 |
| 338 | <p>I formally object. There are far better solutions to road safety than an attempt to make a blanket speed reduction. I even have to pull into question the length and breath of the discovery phase of this proposal as I have previously submitted requests around road safety which have appeared to have been ignored. Not only will reducing the speed increase travel times but it also increases the amount of pollutants into the air.</p> | Ref 2 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|
| 339 | Absolute lunacy tried in Wales and failed miserably. | Ref 1 |
| 340 | <p>I wish to formally object to all parts of the speed limit order.</p> <p>I travel around the ring road every day & the tunnels and it is a total nightmare now with traffic everywhere. It would make little difference changing the speed limits to 20MPH.</p> <p>i suggest you start putting some speed cameras up to stop people going over the 30 /40 MPH limits then spend the money you get from this to clear the mounting mush of leaves that you do not collect anymore which then clog up all of the drains in the city.</p> <p>the whole city is a disgrace with litter everywhere, rubbish fly tipped in most neighborhoods along with plenty of dangerous road that need repair.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 341 | <p>I am objecting to all parts of this Speed Limit Order.</p> <p>I writing this as a long term resident of Birmingham, a public transport user, and professional driver who spends up to ten hours a day on the roads of Birmingham.</p> <p>I am opposed to any further reductions of speed limits throughout Birmingham as I feel these measures discriminate against the ordinary law abiding motorist. The vast majority of drivers are quite capable of driving within the speed limit and in a safe manner according to the road conditions.</p> <p>However there are a small minority of selfish motorists who believe they are above the law. Red lights, stop signs, one way streets, and speed limits are optional to these people.</p> <p>As well as these types of drivers there are a large number of unlicensed and uninsured drivers who have no reason or incentive to drive within the limits of the law or adhere to speed limits.</p> <p>The reduction of speed limits across Birmingham will do nothing to address these bad driving issues and only serves to penalise the majority of ordinary motorists who abide by the law. Putting up a few signs with reduced speed limits just seems to be road safety on the cheap. A way of saying that we did something without addressing a much more serious problem.</p> <p>There have already been a number of speed limit reductions throughout Birmingham yet serious and fatal accidents are still occurring. I will assume that speed must be a contributory factor in most of these accidents. However if any of these accidents were caused by drivers who are acting outside the law then a blanket reduction of speed limits will have no effect on future road accident casualty figures.</p> <p>Rather than more blanket speed limit enforcement which penalises ordinary motorists, I believe more resources should be targeted at these bad drivers whose behaviour will remain unchanged.</p> <p>Drivers who are unlicensed, uninsured, unfit through drink or drugs, or who are driving/riding an illegal vehicle have no care for the laws of the road. It is these types of drivers that should be pursued and dealt with vigorously as this may have a more meaningful impact on accident reduction and make driving around the city less stressful for everyone.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 342 | <p>As usual the council and police look to punish law abiding road users who stick to the already safe 40 MPH limits on many of these roads.</p> <p>Many of the incidents which occur on these road are due to road users speeding well in advance of the posted limit, not to mention then anti social driving that occurs below these limits (tailgating, overtaking, poor road sense/manners etc) also the illegal use of so called e-scooters and other uninsurable/licensable modes of transport.</p> <p>A change in speed limit will not change the fact that many residents have either no insurance, license or road tax and simply shouldn't be on the roads regardless of the speed limit.</p> <p>Once more the council and police are not addressing the issue at hand - poor road craft and lack of suitable deterrent - many who would recieve points for violating these conditions dont have licences and shouldn't be driving anyway - vehicles should be seized and or crushed.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 343 | I formally object to this as it is already bad enough getting around the city without dropping speed limits which can actually be achieved in places, and as the city is bankrupt i would assume there is no money to achieve this anyway or are you putting this before children's services or day centres or anything else you have cut from your budget that actually helped people, money for this project could be far better spent elsewhere. I assume you'll be hoping to make a few quid in speeding fines instead to prop up your finances | Ref 8 |
| 345 | I object to all of the proposed speed limit reductions. The blanket reduction of all speed limits is a disproportionate measure and self-evidently will not achieve the desired result. It will cause inconvenience to law-abiding drivers who already drive carefully and will be ignored by the people who cause accidents. It will not have the desired effect without effective enforcement. The local 20 mph limits are already widely ignored because they are impractical. The proposed reduction addresses the wrong problem. The problem is not the speed limits, it is careless and dangerous driving caused by an almost complete absence of police and enforcement of existing laws. | Ref 6 |
| 346 | <p>I wish to comment on the council's laudable aims to reduce the number of road deaths in our region with no particular location in mind.</p> <p>I am against and therefore object to the proposals to reduce the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph on the designated main roads as I consider this the wrong method to tackle the road safety issue. Most of these tragic accidents were caused by irresponsible individuals, probably unqualified/disqualified from holding a current driving licence, possibly uninsured, who do not respect any speed limit whether that be 20mph, 30mph or 40 mph. Reducing the speed limits as proposed won't make a jot of difference to these individuals, they have nothing but contempt for such limits but this will impact the vast majority of drivers going about their everyday business whilst complying with such limits.</p> <p>Journey times will become longer and more frustrating, business will be less efficient, parts of the city less accessible. Speed limits of 20mph increase pollution as vehicles cannot get into top gear, perversely contradicting the aim of the clean air zone. I both drive and use public transport, Birmingham used to be far easier, safer and quicker to get around. Accessibility is critical for a modern day city to thrive.</p> <p>More targeted measures against drivers that flout the law so disastrously are required, measures that resonate with these individuals, not measures that afflict the law abiding majority.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 3, Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 347 | <p>I wish to formally object to this consultation. Reducing speed limits is not the answer especially that there are other ways to make roads safer. This will cause issues for people who make their livings on roads and encourage people to break the limits and drive dangerously. By reducing the limits like this, it will cause frustration with drivers and possibly to more dangerous situations.</p> <p>Specific artery roads should be allowed to have higher speed and should be designed to safely allow pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles to operate together.</p> | Ref 5 |
| | <p>I formally object to the proposed speed limit reduction to 30mph on the follwing roads</p> <p>A34 Walsall Road, A34 Perry Barr Expressway, A34 Birchfield Road, A34 High Street</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 348 | <p>A38/B4148 Tyburn Road - Gravelly Hill, Pye Hayes A452 Chester Road North A41 Hockley flyover (Soho Hill and Hockley Hill) A45 Coventry Road/A45 New Coventry Road A45 Small Heath Highway A4540 ring road - anti-clockwise (3 sections)</p> <p>The above roads are main highways in and out of the city and should be maintained at 40 mph. There are plenty of crossings for people, weather traffic lights or proper road crossings. Journey's in and out of the city will take longer and the traffic jams will last longer with the reduction in speed. With increased traffic jams the pollution will only last longer and increase due to slow speeds.</p> | Ref 2, Ref 4 & Ref 5 |
| 349 | This is utter madness, you need to address the speeding motorist not penalise everyone. Use unmarked vans to catch speeds and alter where you place them. We have speeding drivers in local roads with no police to catch them | Ref 6 |
| 350 | <p>I wish to formally object. I am an engineer and have to drive to different parts of Birmingham and the wider West Midlands area every day. Reductions in speed limits will increase the amount of time people have to spend in their cars. I think the existing speed limits are already appropriate. Modern cars can stop more quickly than older ones and are designed to be safer, by reducing injury to people outside the car in the event of a collision. Driver education and prosecution of those who drive far too fast is a better way to make the roads safer, rather than punishing everybody. Birmingham has some of the highest rates of uninsured drivers in the UK and getting these people off the roads would also be a more effective way of reducing injuries.</p> <p>I also feel this is the 'thin end of the wedge' which will result in the reduction of all existing 30mph limits to 20mph. Ask anyone who lives in Wales - this is very unpopular there. A 20 mph limit in areas where appropriate (eg outside a school) may be useful at certain times of day, but if for example its 11pm, I don't see that a reduced speed limit is necessary or appropriate. Perhaps signs stating that a 20mph applies during school hours would be better.</p> <p>Also, I used to cycle a lot, and found that the aggression from car drivers was frightening. Reducing speed limits won't reduce this aggression, and could actually make it worse due to drivers becoming even more frustrated.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 351 | <p>I don't believe the speed should be reduced, for many reasons. I will say the volume of people that unfortunately have died over the last is minimal compared to the volume of people whom use the roads whether they are walking, cycling or are drivers. I feel you want to create road rage, more congestion and make the air even worse than it is already. The bus system is useless, I would and cannot ever use the buses as I am unable to walk much distance, and quite frankly, the buses are not safe! You are taking people's freedom and choice away and that is so wrong! Dropping the speed is not going to stop the idiots whom do drive recklessly, so you in effect are punishing the majority for a few. My vehicle will become damaged doing 20mph alot of the time, I'll use more fuel creating more stagnant air your all concerned about, and i find i endup looking at my speedometer more rather than actually watching the roads. . It's all about making money from drivers!!!</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 3 |
| 352 | <p>I object to this plan, This will lead to more congestion especially at peak times, congestion has worsened year upon year and the council has not addressed this problem, The deaths on the roads are a tragedy, but these incidents usually involve dangerous driving, this needs to be tackled by police and council, instead of punishing all drivers the police need to target bad drivers, there is constant racing going on which leads to accidents.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 6 |
| 353 | <p>I formally object to the speed limits. On many of the 40mph areas, I see crazy drivers in fancy, modified cars going way above 40. Creating a blanket change is not the right approach. Instead you should assign police to monitor those areas and put up cameras. A few idiots shouldn't be allowed to ruin it for everyone else. Setting the speed limit to 30 won't make those aggressive drivers go any slower.</p> | Ref 1 |
| 354 | Firstly provide how many fatal accidents occurred in these proposed streets out of 23 death in the last 12 months. I overwhelmingly oppose to reduce speed limits as it will create more congestion and as a resident me and my kids health will be adversely affected as a result. Secondly, I believe this proposal will create an opportunity for council to generate more income as more drivers will be caught breaking speed limit. So, under health issue council created congestion zone and it adversely effect myself and my kids wellbeing as more congestion in next to my apartments than before congestion zone introduced and you need to provide me how much of income generated from congestion zone actually spend on healthcare. I assume none. | Ref 2, Ref 3 and Ref 4 |
| 355 | I object to this change. This will significantly reduce journey times, impact businesses and public transport. Vehicles with an internal combustion engine produce are less fuel efficient at lower speeds, producing more exhaust emissions. | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 356 | <p>I wish to formally object to ALL parts of the Speed Limit Order.</p> <p>The idea that there is a road safety emergency is risible. A recent article in the Sunday Times on this issue provides a figure of 7343 road deaths in 1934 while today, with a volume of traffic TEN times that of the 1930s, the equivalent figure is only 1645.</p> <p>If the argument is that we need 20. mph limits to prevent deaths, why not make it 15 mph? 10 mph? 5 mph? Why not just ban cars altogether?</p> <p>The reduction of speed limits does not have popular support. This can be seen from the pushback that has occurred since 30 mph limits were imposed in Wales. Where is the democratic demand for such a measure?</p> <p>I have read that the intention is to impose a blanket 20 mph speed limit across the city but crucially without the cost of changing road signs. This will lead to huge confusion, particular where a road crosses a boundary with a neighbouring authority. It will obviously result in a huge number of fines for motorists who have inadvertently broken the new speed limits. A cynic may say the revenue from fines is precisely why bankrupt Birmingham is proposing to introduce this measure.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 357 | I formally object to the reduction in speed limit from 40mph to 30mph in all cases. I believe that sensible drivers will drive safely according to the conditions. Drivers who drive recklessly will continue to do so even if the speed limit is reduced to 30mph, and may increase the risk of an accident by overtaking cars complying with the 30mph limit. | Ref 5 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| 358 | I object to the order. This will cause considerable back ip of traffic. These are mostly duel carriageways that should have a faster limit to flow. This we make no difference to air quality it is just another blow to car users. | Ref 2 and Ref 4 |
| 359 | I live close to, and use regularly, many of the roads concerned. I do not believe that this speed reduction will have any significant positive effect on road safety. It will most certainly cause delay and inconvenience to law abiding citizens. It will not deter or delay the reckless, who will merely laugh at speed limit signs, in the same way that they ignore (for example) traffic lights. Such people can only be dealt with by vigorous Police patrolling. The latter seems to be a thing of the past in Birmingham | Ref 2 & Ref 6 |
| 360 | Reducing the speed limit, will cause more pollution, delay the flow of traffic – the efficacy of business in the city. These traffic measures are being driven by a central government funded program, which has not been endorsed by any electoral body. If you want to act democratically, you would hold a referendum within the city so that the residents received the traffic system that they voted for. I travel through Birmingham, and if introduced, I would avoid the city and it will lose a small investment given that I would be only stay overnight Speed limit need to stay same on a34. Also object to 20miles speed as its too slow. | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 361 | My parents live in Birmingham and you are making it so hostile and time consuming for drivers to get anywhere. I have completely stopped shopping in Birmingham and only now visit my parents outside the city. Many thousands will follow It won't be long before residents do the same as Wales and petition for change and hopefully get rid of the left wing parties that have destroyed the city of my birth with their woke policies Bankrupt the city one year, drive the people away the next. I look forward to seeing Birmingham wake up to how useless Labour have been for 25 years | Ref 1 |
| 362 | Birmingham council have done enough damage to this city in last 10 years without this , there is no good reason for any reduction in the speed limit s on any of these roads , Thefact that they bankrupt the city already with there stupid decisions should be enough reason to scrap these projects , they have no idea about this city in any form . | Ref 1 |
| 363 | This has not been democratically decided. Local government is not for you to dictate what you think is best. You serve the people of Birmingham and therefore you should either hold this to a local referendum or campaign on this at the next local elections. You have no democratic mandate to do this. | Ref 1 |
| 364 | This is an unnecessary and unjustified step. The roads with 40 limits are, for the most part, the arterial roads that we would wish commercial and business traffic to stick to wherever possible. The higher limit is a key way to differentiate these roads from roads with a more local purpose, and 40 limits should be restored in several locations where they have been lowered, such as A38 Bristol Road/South and A453 College Road, and extended to the sections of A4540 that do not already have a 40 limit. Road safety is of course important, but so is facilitating the productivity of business within the city. This proposed reduction will harm productivity with minimal effect on road safety. By all means enforce the existing limit. But reducing limits will not achieve what it purports to and will be damaging. | |
| 365 | Firstly, unless I indicate otherwise, I'm only commenting on roads I use/know well. Secondly I can't see a problem per se with single carriageway roads in the scheme reducing to 30mph. Thirdly some of the dual carriageway roads have, as far as I am aware, relatively little pedestrian use and some provision for cyclists. These roads - unless they are short stretches such as (11) which already has traffic/pedestrian lights and roundabouts to control speed/flow - might reasonably stay at 40mph. Fourthly it's a bit like the domino principle. Once a speed limit has been reduced from 40 to 30 then you would need to look again at best ways forward as the arguments for retaining a 40 mph limit will have changed. Fifthly without statistics respondents can't see the potential degree of danger currently experienced on all of the roads in this proposal Finally the most important element for road safety, in my opinion, needs to be addressed. This is how are speed limits enforced and lawbreakers persuaded to follow rather than break the law by suitable consequences. Let me give three instances as examples. Using the A38 Expressway I regularly get overtaken by drivers using the safety lane when the tidal flow system is in operation particularly in the morning outbound towards the M6. In the evenings drivers wanting the M6, habitually use the fourth Erdington/Lichfield lane to dodge the slower queues if you follow the overhead signs, and pull in at the last minute with apparent impunity. Secondly I was recently driving along Walmley Ash Road mid-afternoon towards Asda, 30 mph limit in place when a black pick-up overtook me at speed through the pedestrian lights outside the school. It sped off before I could get a VRN. Lastly having a limit doesn't make the roads and their users safer. The A452 between the Yenton and the Tyburn House has been reduced to 30 mph for a number of years now following a fatal accident close to pedestrian lights.. Yet a large number of drivers persistently drive in excess of this limit on a daily basis. How many motorists have been fined for speeding on this stretch of road since the speed limit was reduced? Schemes 3,11 and 27 I fully support. Schemes 5,9 and 13 I'm not as sure about. | Ref 5, Ref 6 & Ref 7 |

| | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| 366 | <p>This is madness. A one-size fits all approach does not work. There are lots of places where 40mph is appropriate. For example, Monmouth Drive in Sutton Coldfield has houses that are set back a very long way on one side of the street and a fence to a park on the other side of the street - the fence side is not used by pedestrians. 40mph is an appropriate speed along here. Similarly, almost all of the locations listed are suitable for 40mph. 30mph is going to make journeys take even longer than they already do in this congested city and will mean cars are on the road for longer emitting even more fumes than they currently do. This is not London, it's Birmingham, and we deserve to have fast moving roads where it is appropriate. Coupled with the plans to turn all 30mph roads into 20mph roads, this is just copying what London has done, but we are not London and everyone knows what a disaster 20mph roads have been in London.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 367 | <p>I believe a 3mph speed limit will be detrimental and not bring the benefits as desired:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People that want to speed will continue to do so regardless of the speed limit, potentially negating the intended safety benefits. - Reduced speed means traffic flow will be more disrupted, which means longer commute times and congestion around the roads. Maybe even increase traffic through neighbouring roads. - Have delivery times been thought of? It will decrease productivity. - People will also be more angry, Birmingham is already horrible for traffic, I can't imagine decreasing the speed will make people happier. In fact, I believe people will tend to be more aggressive. - Fuel consumption and emissions must be considered as well. Lower speeds means higher fuel consumption for the same travel distance. We have done the CAZ and now negating the effort by increasing the emissions somewhere else. - Furthermore, if the existing infrastructure is able to cope with higher speed, what has changed that is leading to this proposal of speed limit change? Why aren't we focusing on the actual root cause of the issue? <p>I hope these reasons are enough for you to accept my formal objection to this proposal.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 368 | <p>Formal objection</p> <p>These proposed restrictions will cause the traffic system to grind to a halt. Most of the road stretches listed are of a design compatible with the existing speed limits. They allow traffic to get from A to B in a safe and efficient way. 99% of modern cars are perfectly safe at the current limits, the engines run more efficiently and economically, and emissions are kept to a minimum.</p> <p>There are a small minority of drivers who are reckless and they cause most of the accidents on the roads. This minority pay no attention to the current speed restrictions, so reducing the limit will have absolutely no effect upon them or the havoc they cause.</p> <p>Roads of interest include Monmouth Drive, Queslett Road, A5127 Four Oaks, & A34 expressway, but I would include most of the others too. They are broad, well designed, high capacity highways, ideal for travelling about the area efficiently and the current speed restrictions suit them ideally.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 369 | <p>I wish to object to the speed limit reduction to 30mph on Monmouth Drive, Sutton Coldfield. I am unaware of any serious or fatal accidents in recent years, but do recall a fatal accident possibly 5 or 6 years ago, when a young motorcyclist was speeding, pulling wheelies, overtaking cars and collided with an oncoming vehicle. The reduction in speed limit will have no positive affect on such incidents. People who drive well above the speed limit will do so whatever speed limit is in force.</p> <p>I fail to see how the proposal of making speed limits more consistent across the city will aid enforcement as the majority of drivers travel at speeds within the spirit of the speed limit. Significant speeders are very much in the minority.</p> <p>A reduction in the speed limit on Monmouth Drive could easily have the opposite effect. Making traveling speeds lower and hence longer, could easily lead to greater frustration and less consideration for other road users, making exiting from side roads more difficult. Emotions within drivers will inevitably increase, leading to less rational and considered driving styles. Potentially increasing the risk of accidents.</p> <p>The recent introduction of two short distance 30mph sections was proposed and introduced for different reasons. The one close to the junction with Chester Road North was because of the close proximity with a children's playground. The second section is in the vicinity of the roundabout at the junction with Stonehouse Road and is in conjunction with the introduction of a Pedestrian Crossing to aid pedestrians going to and from the park's Boldmere gate. As a regular driver along Monmouth Road I have not observed any difference to driving habits. Drivers in these two sections rarely exceeded 30 mph due to there close proximity to Traffic Lights and a Roundabout. I view this as a "Tick Box" exercise only.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 370 | <p>Looking at locations 20, 21 and 26, I oppose the changes in the speed limits as I do not believe they will lead to a reduction of accidents and will penalise residents who need to leave the city in order to meet their needs. As regards all the lowering of the speed limits at all the other locations (which I do not generally use), they will add to congestion without reducing accidents. There have to be through routes in cities for them to work effectively. There appears to be an assumption that the city is a self-contained unit in which its citizens can satisfactorily lead their lives but this is increasingly not the case. Many people need to be able to enter and leave the city efficiently to meet their needs.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 4 |
| 371 | <p>Deaths on roads in Birmingham are mostly caused by dangerous drivers in high performance cars, with no regard for any current speed limits or general driving rules. THESE need to be caught & punished with prison sentences. This will hugely reduce road deaths.</p> <p>Inflicting a snails pace limit upon all the other law abiding drivers only causes more traffic jams & pollution. Does NOT save lives.</p> <p>Every law abiding driver in the city knows this....why does BCC not? Get a grip !</p> | Ref 1 |
| 372 | <p>I wish to formally object to both this proposed policy of reducing 40mph roads to 30mph as well as your latest ludicrous proposal to blanket reduce most 30mph roads to 20mph.</p> <p>As an advanced driver and a member of the Institute of Advanced motorists (IAM Roadsmart) this blanket approach makes no sense. As a driver that uses Birmingham roads pretty much every day I can't see that introducing blanket speed limits will reduce the number of road casualties at all.</p> <p>I am all for reducing targeted speed limits on particular sections of roads, such as near schools or other hazardous areas but making a blanket decision makes no sense at all.</p> | Ref 5 |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------------|
| | <p>Instead, spend the money on enforcing the existing speed limits, as well as introducing better driver training. I see far too often motorists that far exceed the existing speed limits, so lowering a limit will make no difference to that type of careless or dangerous driver.</p> | |
| 373 | <p>I am concerned that reducing the speed limit on these roads means that drivers without cruise control, will have to take concentration away from being alert to other traffic & pedestrians, to focussing excessively on their speedometer. I believe that makes for potentially unsafe driving.</p> <p>I am concerned that driving at 30mph rather than 40 mph will use more fuel, so adding to pollution & countering any actions to reduce climate change, which is possibly the biggest issue facing the world. Therefore I see the reduction as being a negative action which will have a global impact.</p> | Ref 2 and Ref 5 |
| 374 | <p>I would like to formally object to the plans.</p> <p>Currently as a resident I don't see people observing the existing rules of the roads from speed to red light observations not forgetting parking.</p> <p>I believe dropping the speed to 30mph will have zero impact and resources would be better spent enforcing existing rules as it is.</p> <p>I have witnessed many times existing 20mph areas in south Birmingham being violated regularly and fights/road rage breaking out when people breaking the speed limit encounter people following the speed limits, myself included. These incidents are frightening and the reality is those who will speed will continue to do so. Dropping the speed just will just affect law abiding citizens for what I feel would be no benefit at all.</p> <p>Please rethink this plan and focus on enforcing existing rules first then look at dropping limits.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 375 | <p>I would like to formally object to the proposed speed limit reduction to 30mph across the Birmingham area. While the intention behind this measure may be to enhance road safety and reduce accidents, I believe that the implementation of a blanket speed limit reduction could have several negative consequences that outweigh its potential benefits.</p> <p>First and foremost, reducing the speed limit without adequate justification or consideration of specific road conditions can lead to increased traffic congestion. Many roads in Birmingham are designed to accommodate higher speeds, and enforcing a lower speed limit may result in slower traffic flow, causing frustration among drivers and potentially leading to an increase in aggressive driving behavior. This congestion could also have a cascading effect on public transportation, emergency services, and overall travel times in the city.</p> <p>Additionally, a uniform speed limit of 30mph may not be appropriate for all areas. Certain roads, particularly those in suburban or less densely populated regions, may safely accommodate higher speeds without compromising safety. Instead of a one-size-fits-all approach, I urge the council to consider an assessment of individual roads and their specific characteristics, allowing for speed limits that reflect the actual conditions and needs of each area.</p> <p>Lastly, I am concerned about the potential economic impact of this speed limit change. Increased travel times could have repercussions for local businesses, delivery services, and the overall productivity of residents commuting within the city. A more nuanced approach that balances safety with efficiency would be far more beneficial for the community.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe that the proposed speed limit reduction to 30mph in Birmingham should be reconsidered in favor of a more tailored strategy that addresses the unique characteristics of different areas. Thank you for considering my objections.</p> | Ref 4 and Ref 5 |
| 376 | <p>Whilst I agree that lower traffic speeds reduce chances of accidents in theory, I don't support the wholesale reduction of speeds in these areas for a number of reasons. In all these areas (and some of the existing 30mph areas), there is a constant disregard for the speed limits by a large number of drivers and I see little evidence of enforcement of these limits. On most occasions when I drive along these roads at the speed limit I am overtaken by several cars traveling well over the speed limit. In addition, I often experience aggressive driving from others as they wait to overtake. I believe a reduction in speed limit will create a larger mismatch between the speeds of law abiding drivers and those who disregard it. This will, I believe create more instances of road rage. I believe also that the current 2 lane layout on many of these roads contributes to the speeding problem and potentially to accidents as I believe this encourages overtaking and creates the perception that these roads are dual carriageway and thus higher speed. I therefore believe that other options such as improving enforcement and road design would be more effective than a blanket speed reduction in tackling the problem</p> | Ref 5 |
| 377 | <p>I formally object. In many areas there is no justification for lowering speed limits. On West Boulevard for example, the existing 40mph limit of perfectly fine. There is one set of traffic lights which is perfectly visible from range, and pedestrians the length of the road have a clear view of traffic.</p> <p>Lower, unjustified speed limits lead to frustrated motorists and an increased risk of tailgating and dangerous overtaking.</p> | Ref 5 |
| | <p>I would like to formally object to this entire speed limit order as reducing the speed limits across the city will cause more traffic chaos, more queues, more pollution, and increase the time vehicles spend on the roads and ultimately make it more dangerous for road users.</p> <p>The roads are already congested and some inconsiderate drivers queue jump, blow red lights, attempt dangerous under/over taking manoeuvres no matter what the limit is.</p> <p>Now to reduce the limit from 40mph to 30mph, which will make journey times longer, create more road/noise and air pollution makes no sense. I currently live on a 20mph road (which was a 30mph and should never have been changed) and I can honestly say this strategy has not worked and needs to go back to the drawing board.</p> <p>Also I want to call into question the legality of the funding of this scheme, as the surplus money from the CAZ is being used to fund it; the same CAZ which was only brought in as a temporary measure (I believe a 2-3yrs trial) and should have been scrapped by now, but it has been kept on as its a cash cow for the bankrupt Bham City Council.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| 378 | <p>All the roads that are currently 40mph zones are main dual carriageways where vulnerable road users are limited and road users (cars, vans, Lgvs, Hgv's, Pcv's) use to get in around the city. Lowering the limits will impact delivery times, estimated time of arrivals, journey times and can cause a knock on effect that can impact businesses financially.</p> <p>The never ending road works in the city, Hs2 sites, construction sites, etc all rely on truck drivers to complete their jobs to keep things moving, and as an ex transport supervisor (with over a decade of experience in the industry) I can say from experience lowering the limits will have a negative impact on all timescales for project/job completion.</p> <p>Lets say for example a driver loses 10mins per journey, and he has 6 loads to do in a day, thats a minimum of 1hour lost throughout the day, he/she will never make up that time and will only be able to compete 5 loads. If 10 drivers lose 1 load, over the working week that's 50 runs not done, this will eventually bring back timescales, completion dates, and ultimately bring the whole operation to a standstill.</p> <p>I don't think any of the wider implications (just some examples briefly mentioned above) have been thought through and this whole idea needs to be dropped.</p> <p>To make things safer, how about cracking down on drivers illegally parked on double yellow lines and zig zags; crack down on racers tearing up the streets who cause accidents and fatalities; crack down on those selfishly blowing red lighs, which causes chaos for everyone else and crack down on those who overtake on single carriageways on the wrong side of the road because they can't be bothered to wait in a queue.</p> <p>Unfortunately accidents happen, speed kills but so does idiocy.</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 379 | <p>I formally object to the scheme. This is being done because you say there have number of serious and fatal collisions occurring on the road network.</p> <p>Where are the stats for this and why aren't they showing against the list of roads on the plan so people can agree or object on informed basis. Until I can see these facts I strongly object to this scheme.</p> <p>I can't help but think it's a case of we have some money stashed away lets find ways of spend. Instead of using it to fix the pots all over the network.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 7 |
| 380 | <p>I object, traffic is already horrendous. The speed limit you review was on vehicles in the 1970s. Braking distance much better. Takes fucking 2 days already to get around Brum</p> <p>Stop fucking it up. Just going to have more cars speeding and hopefully we get blade runners like London</p> | Ref 1 |
| 381 | <p>I do not agree with the 30mph change to speed limit. This will actually cause more accidents and traffic. What needs to be done is manual officers more active with speed guns. Also the addition of average speed cameras in order to control speed abusers automatically. This is what needs to be done, changing to 30mph will not do anything but cause more accidents and traffic.</p> | Ref 6 |
| 382 | <p>I feel reducing speed limits from 40 to 30 on major road will cause havoc at busy times causing ques and road rage when drivers get frustrated seriously do not think this is a good idea</p> | Ref 4 |
| 383 | <p>My understanding is this action is in response to a declared emergency following an unacceptable number of deaths on our roads.</p> <p>My opinion is that this type of blanket change is the wrong response to the problem.</p> <p>I drive on a number of these affected roads and many others in our city. In general, I think that the speed limits are reasonable. The issue on our roads is that a small minority ignore the current speed limits and so are unlikely to adhere to reduced ones either. In fact, the type of motorist who drives at over 50mph on our roads is more likely to engage in dangerous overtaking actions if speed limits are reduced.</p> <p>There may be a few of the roads identified that could be reduced for specific local issues. These can be addressed individually.</p> <p>I would like to see better enforcement of the current speed limits.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 6 |
| 384 | <p>If you want to bring birmingham to a complete standstill, fine. Bikes and walking are unfortunately not practical for most people and have you tried using public transport or paying for a taxi to get to a hospital appointment. I would prefer to use public transport, but if you're honest, buses are unreliable and dont turn up and trains are cancelled at a moments notice. As a user of the cross city line, often platforms are changed last minute without proper notification which leaves commuters struggling to get up and down stairs, then trains double up leading to over crowding. If stops such as shenstone are on a scheduled cancelled train, the next train doesnt stop there, or else trains are terminated at Four Oaks rather than travelling the whole route On friday 6th december, late trains from birmingham were cancelled because of no drivers and on the 7th, the city was brought to chaos when there were no trains from about 5 o'clock... And as for using taxis, £80 was then quoted for a trip to shenstone. These things can happen..... much too often than they should..... but until they are ironed out, people need to use cars and it is naive to think differently. It is a pathetic transport system the city provides with money being wasted on totally inadequate road systems and pie in the sky schemes</p> | Ref 8 |
| | <p>I am totally opposed to this Speed Limit Order in its present form. It is a blanket reduction of 40mph limits to 30mph except for two short stretches. I was extremely surprised to discover this as press reports suggested that the reductions would only cover roads where there was a safety reason.</p> <p>There is no justification that I can find in the supporting documents for this drastic action. In particular there is no information on accidents on the stretches of road where it is proposed to reduce the speed limit. I assume that the reduction is mainly proposed to reduce danger to pedestrians, as a car going at 40mph can be very dangerous if you're on foot. I would have expected some measures of pedestrian / vehicle conflict to be part of the justification for these proposals and can find none.</p> <p>The proposals for some of the roads are not in any way justifiable.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|----------------------|
| 385 | <p>The A45 Small Heath by pass from Bolton Road to Heybarnes Circus is effectively an urban clearway except at Poets Corner where the limit is lower already. It has no footways. Pedestrians can't be prohibited from using it but there is absolutely no encouragement for them to do so. I have driven this road for over thirty years and can hardly remember seeing a single pedestrian on it in all that time. I was a city councillor and a member of the Technical Services (Highways) Committee between 1980 and 1992 and can remember a proposal then to raise the limit to 50mph which did not in the end happen, but seemed reasonable to us all given the lack of pedestrians.</p> <p>The A47 Heartlands Parkway from Saltley Circus to Spitfire Island is very similar. It has footways but they serve frontages and if you start walking along one you must walk to the next junction to get off. Unsurprisingly, no one does. I have driven this road, especially east of the Bromford Road junction, for many years, and again, can hardly remember seeing a pedestrian on it.</p> <p>For both these roads, the measure of pedestrian / vehicle conflict must be effectively nil, because there aren't any pedestrians.</p> <p>There are also several shorter lengths of road which are similar. The A41 Hockley flyover has no footways. It was not designed for pedestrians, it has no space for them, and any pedestrian using it would be extremely foolhardy. The A38 Kingsbury Road between Minworth island and Chester Road (the A452) mostly does not have footways and was not designed for pedestrian use.</p> <p>Again, for these roads the measure of pedestrian / vehicle conflict must be effectively nil, because there aren't any pedestrians.</p> <p>There is nothing in the accompanying documents to suggest that there is significant danger, especially to pedestrians, on these stretches of road. There is a complete disconnect between general figures for road casualties, and the actual proposals here.</p> <p>I imagine that the Transportation Department would deny that it is waging some kind of "war on the motorist" but everything about these proposals suggests that is happening.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above, I'm totally opposed to these proposals as they stand. In regard to the roads I've listed above (stretches of the A45, A47, A41, A38) this is a formal objection and I ask that you treat it as such.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 5 & Ref 7 |
| 386 | <p>General objection to the proposal, but in particular for refs 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,18 and 19</p> <p>Ring fencing CAZ money for transport schemes does not mean the money should be spent for the sake of spending it and general roads upkeep could be improved as an alternative to this scheme which would benefit all roads users, not just those in vehicles.</p> <p>BCC are trying to push car drivers onto public transport by making car ownership and use less and less attractive. However to do this there needs to be a valid alternative and in this part of Birmingham (North/Sutton Coldfield) there are none. Trains are not that local, buses are not any quicker, nor welcoming to use. Cycling just isn't practical for the majority. I do not see how the majority of the scheme objectives as stated in FAQ are going to be realised by reducing speed limits.</p> <p>It is also surprising that given over 50% of those who responded to the initial consultation were against it, BCC see fit to have another consultation until the response better suits.</p> <p>BCC have stated that Road Traffic Collision data has not been used in the selection process. The common view held by the majority of road users will be that reducing speed limits is only done to reduce accidents and there is zero evidence to say this is the case here. Again, most road users are not interested in BCC 'delivering a consistent speed limit across the road network'. They want to get to where they are going in the most efficient manner.</p> <p>ROSPA have produced statistics that show Germany has a lower risk of fatal injury between 30mph and 40mph than the UK - this would suggest lower speed limits are not the necessarily the answer to reduced fatalities or to assist with the scheme aim to 'Deliver positive impacts on road safety'</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <p>Ref 5 - This road was initially opened as as alternative to driving through Walmley. Reducing the speed limit may mean users decide to drive through Walmley instead which already suffers from traffic issues as well as being a much more built up area. The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). The pavement is wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 6 - The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). There is no pavement which should mean lack of pedestrians using this section of the road.</p> <p>Ref 7 - Main commuter route and two lane road. Majority of housing is set back from the road, so reduced risk from people and cars. Pavements are wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 8 - Two lane road with all housing set well back (and in some cases separated by other roads), so no risk from people and cars. Pavements are wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 9 - Two lane commuter route. The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). The pavement is wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |

| | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| | <p>Ref 10 - Two lane road. The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). The pavement is wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility. The rest of the road should not have had a reduced speed limit in the first place.</p> <p>Ref 13 - Initially touted as an alternative route for commuters. Two lane road. The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). The pavement is wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 15 - The ring road is a key route around Birmingham (and more so since CAZ). There are little direct frontages to this road. Roads are well lit, pavements are wide and well lit and junctions are clear.</p> <p>Ref 18 - Housing is set well back from the road, so reduced risk from people and cars. Pavements are wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 19 - The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). Junctions have plenty of visibility and pavements are wide.</p> | |
| 387 | Disagree with all proposals. Don't see a problem in the first place. | Ref 1 |
| 388 | Formally object to all roads proposed as I see no issue or danger in leaving at 40mph. This is just a waste of money with no future gain. Speeds too slow can cause other distractions to occur as the vehicle is simply too slow making some drivers think no or less concentration is required. | Ref 1 |
| 389 | <p>I have read with concern Birmingham City Council's plans around the proposed blanket reduction of the vast majority of 40mph limits to 30mph and would like to make a formal objection to these proposals.</p> <p>Firstly, it is highly disappointing that the council has chosen to, following the first consultation when a clear majority of respondents (56.7% against, only 37.9% for) were against the proposal, go against the findings of the initial public enquiry. It would be good to see the views of road users taken into account as the proposals will have a significant negative effect on those using the roads.</p> <p>Councillor Majid Mahmood was quoted by the BBC in saying "Key to tackling road harm is delivering a significant reduction in the speed and volume of vehicles on our roads, reinforced with strategic enforcement activities, particularly on higher volume roads," he added. - [BBC News 23/11/2024]. This will not have any effect on reducing volumes of traffic as often there is no viable alternative. Public transport is unreliable, expensive and often infrequent – investment into public transport to improve it would help to build its usefulness and encourage people out of their cars, and would be a far better and more effective way of spending this money.</p> <p>I read on the BBC website that "It came after campaign group Better Streets for Birmingham stated that at least 23 people had died on roads in the city between June 2023 and July this year". [BBC News 23/11/2024]. This is then echoed on the consultation website, which states "[...] due to the number of serious and fatal collisions occurring on the road network [...]". This appears to be referring to the whole road network in a similar way to the BBC report, rather than purely on 40mph roads. The focus on the whole road network in justifying the proposals is inappropriate, and instead there should be a focus on the safety of and fatalities on just the 40mph roads in question as it is purely these roads that are under consideration of speed reductions. If this data was available as well as the readily available whole-network fatality figures it would help to enable more informed decisions.</p> <p>It is also concerning that the council has felt it necessary to use such emotive terms as a "Road Safety Emergency". When such a significant change is being proposed, it is important that facts are stated objectively to enable people to make an informed decision. The use of the term "Road Safety Emergency" in a public consultation is not an objective factual statement, but rather appears to be designed to scare people into supporting the proposal which is not an appropriate way to carry out an impartial objective consultation. The WHO lists the UK on their website as 11th safest country in the world to drive in, the UK government website shows no increase in fatalities and a decreasing trend in casualties and no evidence is given by the council of an increase. The term Emergency is defined by the Cambridge dictionary as "a dangerous or serious situation, such as an accident, that happens suddenly or unexpectedly and needs immediate action". If there has not been such a sudden increase, and tied to the WHO data, the term "emergency" does not appear appropriate"</p> <p>It is also interesting to note that, quoting from ITV.com, 26/07/2024 "Mr Mahmood said following information received from the police, the causes of the most serious and fatal collisions appear to be largely related to alcohol, drugs, dangerous driving, and nighttime street racing." If the council believes these are the key issues affecting road safety, (and I would be inclined to agree with him on this point), it is noteworthy that this does NOT include 40mph limits. If this comment is right, it would indicate that the reduction in speed limits will not hit the key reasons for road fatalities, and so should not go ahead.</p> <p>One final general point is that many of the roads in question are designed to be used safely at 40mph. Reducing the speed limit where unnecessary will encourage breaching the limit. Whilst this is less of a risk on these higher speed roads, if this mindset then spills over to other roads, it then becomes a significant risk. As such the proposal risks increasing rather than decreasing fatalities.</p> <p>I regularly use some of these roads both during my working day and for personal reasons and would like to make the following points:</p> <p>A38/B4148 Tyburn Road / A38 Kingsbury Road This is one of the busiest main roads into Birmingham, which I use regularly. It is clearly designed for 40mph, and this is a reasonable and safe speed. The imposition of a 30mph limit on this road would make significant increases in journey time for a very large number of people and businesses. The limit as set at the moment is totally appropriate, and reducing would inconvenience large numbers of people with no benefit whatsoever.</p> <p>A5127 Lichfield Road Again, a good wide road. Visibility is good, and 40mph is appropriate. Ox Leys Road This road is a country lane and it is difficult to see why a 40mph limit was imposed at all. 30mph would be totally inappropriate.</p> | Ref 4 & Ref 5 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-------|
| | <p>A4097 Kingsbury Road Wiggins hill Rd to city boundary By reducing the dual carriageway section to 30, this will then encourage overtaking slower vehicles on the single carriageway section in Warwickshire rather than on the safer dual carriageway section. A 30mph would be unreasonably slow on this section of (formerly 50mph) road.</p> <p>A47 Heartlands Parkway/ Fort Parkway / A47 Nechells Parkway This is a decent dual carriageway with limited pedestrian usage. Crashmap.co.uk shows no fatalities 2018-22, and the road is clearly designed and is suitable for 40mph. A reduction in speed would simply encourage non-obeyance of the limit and is unnecessary.</p> <p>Weeford Road This road is quiet, wide and has good visibility. 40mph is safe and reasonable, and forcing a lower speed limit is completely unnecessary</p> | |
| 390 | <p>I think that the stretches of the a47 particularly 13 on your list make no sense. The fort parkway is not in a residential area and was built for faster traffic so a speed limit below 40mph makes sense. I wouldnt object to it remaining as a 40 with camera enforcement as the main issue is people exceeding 40 and car cruising at times. Most others I can see the rationale for as they are in built up areas, but you should apply common sense in more rural locations where the roads are predominantly non residential. Otherwise it appears dogmatic and lacking in common sense.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 391 | <p>This is completly missing the point. The dangerous are caued by people doing way more than 40 on these roads.</p> <p>The speed limits on a whole do not need reducing they need enforcing. I regually drive down A47 Heartlands Parkway/ Fort Parkway (Reference 13) and because off the two plus lane you are undertaken by people going much faster than 40. How is reducing the limit to 30 going to help this ? The people who currently speed will keep speeding.</p> <p>Furthermore ref 13 is a dual carriageway without any houses on it. Why does this need to be a 30. I cant personally comment on all the roads but this one seems exceisve making it a 30.</p> <p>To summerise we need more road policing to stop people going way above the speed limits and having big crashes. The danger is not the people doing 40 its the people going a lot faster.</p> <p>https://www.westmidlands.police.uk/news/west-midlands/news/news/2024/november/motorcyclist-sadly-dies-following-collison-with-van-in-castle-bromwich/</p> <p>The link above happened in a 20mph. I am going to guess the crash did not happen with all the veichles going at 20. How exactly did reducing the speed limit help here ?</p> | Ref 5 |
| 392 | <p>I drive tyburn road, entire length of A47 from city to spitfire, A452 and A45 on most days. I do not see what problem you are trying to address and disagree with reduction on any of these roads. Come on BCC get a grip instead of chasing vanity projects.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 393 | <p>I have genuinely tried to make sense and agree with at least reductions but these makes no sense. Ox leys road after the roundabout with no pedestrians or even barely any joining roads. What even are you trying to achieve here if not for making driving simply a nuisance? Due to the nature of my business a travel a lot in and out of West Midlands. Slowing me down will achieve nothing, your proposals are really bad. Please do not reduce these limits. You are just trying to punish drivers I cannot make any other sense of this.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 394 | <p>The only one I can agree with is lindridge road but otherwise I think this proposal is a poor idea and should not go ahead. Instead Birmingham should improve road layout and fix broken roads. Some red and green lights are hard to see in sun so you should use brighter lights or cover them under shade so they are easier to see. Street lights should be upgraded to improve visibility at night and also put signs up where there might be bends or use variable limits but only on school roads. So when schools kids are out (morning and afternoon) then use those 20mph variable limit signs otherwise leave the speed limits alone.</p> | Ref 5 |
| | <p>I wish to object in general to the proposal, but in particular for road schemes reference 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,18 and 19</p> <p>Although I agree that CAZ money should be actively used for transport schemes I believe that it would be better spent on general road upkeep and maintenance. The improvement of road surfaces by resurfacing whole roads not just patching pot holes would be a better alternative to this scheme. The improvements I have mentioned would increase the safety of all road users, including cyclists and those in vehicles.</p> <p>I understand that there is a need to improve road safety and move people out of cars and on to public transport. It seems that BCC are trying to achieve this by making car ownership and use less and less attractive. There are sections of society such as the elderly, infirm and disabled people for whom pubic transport is at best difficult and more often not a viable option at all. Indeed the car is the best form of transport for these minorities and by reducing these speed limits and penalising road users you are disadvantaging these groups further.</p> <p>There are few valid alternatives to car use in this part of Birmingham (North/Sutton Coldfield), with buses and trains being both unreliable and crowded. In Walmley in particular with the lack of a train station within walking distance using public transport extends journey times significantly. The introduction of these speed limits will increase bus journey times and the time it takes to reach the train stations, making public transport an even less appealing option. Cycling just isn't practical for the majority of Sutton Coldfield residents as distances and journey times do not facilitate its use for commuting. I do not see how the majority of the scheme objectives as stated in FAQ are going to be realised by reducing speed limits.</p> <p>I am surprised that BCC have decided to spend further monies on yet another consultation when over 50% of those who responded to the initial consultation previously objected. It seems like if we keep getting asked the answer will change as people get fed up of objecting.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| 395 | <p>BCC have stated that Road Traffic Collision data has not been used in the selection process, which I find perplexing. Would the money not be better spent targeting specific accident black spots and rectifying the road layouts to reduce accident and resulting fatalities? Surely this is what the residents of Birmingham want and expect, rather than 'delivering a consistent speed limit across the road network'. They want to get to where they are going in the most efficient manner, on roads with safer surfaces, clear signs and improved lighting.</p> <p>I do not believe that the scheme will 'Deliver positive impacts on road safety', as stated above there are other glaringly obvious issues with the state of the roads in North Birmingham and particularly in Minworth, Walmley, Pye Hayes and Erdington. In fact ROSPA have produced statistics that show Germany has a lower risk of fatal injury between 30mph and 40mph than the UK - this would suggest lower speed limits are not the necessarily the answer to reduced neither accidents or fatalities.</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <p>Ref 5 - This road was designed to bypass Walmley village and so reduce traffic through the village's older, narrower roads. Reducing the speed limit as proposed may mean users decide to drive through Walmley instead. The increase of traffic along Walmley Road etc, which already suffers from traffic issues, will in fact decrease safety as these roads serve a much more built up area and are the main route for school buses and emergency services. Often there are groups of children waiting at each bus stop along Walmley Road and crossing the already busy roads morning and evening and increase in traffic will increase the likely hood of an incident. When emergency vehicles need to pass on Walmley Road there is little room for other road users to move out of the way, an increase in traffic will increase this problem. The road on which you propose changes has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). The pavement is wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>There is no need to reduce the speed limits in the following area for the reasons noted.</p> <p>Ref 6 - The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). There is no pavement which should mean lack of pedestrians using this section of the road.</p> <p>Ref 7 - Main commuter route and two lane road. Majority of housing is set back from the road, so reduced risk from people and cars. Pavements are wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 8 - Two lane road with all housing set well back (and in some cases separated by other roads), so no risk from people and cars. Pavements are wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 9 - Two lane commuter route. The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). The pavement is wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 10 - Two lane road. The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). The pavement is wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility. The rest of the road should not have had a reduced speed limit in the first place.</p> <p>Ref 13 - Initially touted as an alternative route for commuters. Two lane road. The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). The pavement is wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 15 - The ring road is a key route around Birmingham (and more so since CAZ). There are little direct frontages to this road. Roads are well lit, pavements are wide and well lit and junctions are clear.</p> <p>Ref 18 - Housing is set well back from the road, so reduced risk from people and cars. Pavements are wide and well lit and junctions have plenty of visibility.</p> <p>Ref 19 - The road itself has no frontages from housing meaning there is no risk from house users (people and cars). Junctions have plenty of visibility and pavements are wide.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my objections and I trust you will consider them when making your decision.</p> | Ref 3 & Ref 5 |
| 396 | I object to the reducing of speed limits in the Birmingham area | Ref 1 |
| 397 | <p>Sir. I am OPPOSED to yet another restriction being placed upon motorists I do not see that any reduction will ensure less casualties as drivers who are so minded will exceed any chosen limit. Speed acknowledgement signs have an effect as do speed cameras which the Council has in place on numerous roads but are inoperable due, we are told, to the cost of maintaining them. A very poor excuse when road safety is at stake. You can waste tax payers money on installing little used cycle lanes, eg Bristol Road in Selly Oak but not keep expensive camera up to date.</p> <p>I repeat that reducing speed limits will not have a major effect on casualties if a driver is intent on speeding they will exceed whatever limit is in place.</p> <p>I believe this is no more than a PR stunt. Difficult to argue against but looks good with no effect. If 30 why not 20 and so on and on. More fines on particular roads will soon get the message across.</p> <p>Police have the unmanned vehicles. They should use them against the minority</p> | Ref 1 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|
| 398 | <p>I'm writing this email to object to the proposed speed limit reduction from 40mph to 30mph</p> <p>My reasons for this are as follows:</p> <p>1: The proposed roads for the reduction are all busy - you're just going to pollute the air quality more than it is by having people drive slower which in turn will cause more congestion and traffic jams in turn causing harm to residents in areas surrounding these roads</p> <p>2: Why are you looking to penalise the 95% of law abiding drivers looking to go from A-B and get about their day rather than going after the 5% of idiots. Surely it makes more sense to position more police patrols in these hotspot areas and get the morons off the roads for a long time. How can you justify penalising the many over the actions of the few?</p> <p>3: More people are going to get frustrated by the build-up of traffic and end up behaving stupidly - this is human nature. Frustration leads people to do some insanely stupid things which is what's going to happen here. Then in a years time you'll be making a big deal out of people behaving stupid and take more measures to penalise the law abiding citizens even more</p> <p>I hope the council sees common sense and stops this absurdity</p> | Ref 2 & Ref 4 |
| 399 | I do not support the reduction of the 40mph to 30 as I cannot see how it will make some the roads in the scheme any safer. On the Bristol road at night there are young drivers racing each other ; they are a menace. Reducing the speed limit will do little to stop bad drivers breaking it. | Ref 1 |
| 400 | Yet again the vast majority of drivers getting punished for the small minority of idiots on the road! These same people will still crash whatever your limit is! Taking away the choice and enjoyment out of driving and getting a good revenue on the side. | Ref 1 |
| 401 | <p>I use these roads regularly across the Birmingham and that would considerably slow traffic unnecessarily. These roads are dual carriage ways and help traffic clear up quicker.</p> <p>Please abandon these plans, or share us the figures of accidents between 30 and 40 zones to compare.</p> | Ref 5 |
| 402 | <p>I object to this request</p> <p>As an engineer trying to work in and around Birmingham it is almost impossible to traverse around the city at the present .</p> <p>You are strangling the city</p> <p>No No No</p> | Ref 1 |
| 403 | Just to clarify a very unnecessarily long survey I filled in of irrelevant liberal woke questions, where I didn't find the place to make a comment. It is not a part of the road where there have been accidents in the last 45 years, except boy racers going into the island on an occasion. Such drivers will ignore whatever speed limit is in place. Therefore, I am against the unnecessary reduction of the speed limit on this stretch of road. Such a reduction will only frustrate drivers and make the road more dangerous. | Ref 6 |
| 404 | <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed city-wide reduction of 40mph speed limits to 30mph, particularly regarding the A45 Small Heath Highway section.</p> <p>Grounds for objection:</p> <p>1. Misidentification of the Core Problem The proposal appears to address a symptom rather than the cause of road safety issues. Based on collision data, accidents typically involve either excessive speeding (well above current limits) or adverse conditions - not law-abiding drivers traveling at 40mph.</p> <p>2. Impact on Compliant Drivers This blanket reduction unfairly penalises majority of drivers who respect existing speed limits. The focus should instead be on targeting and deterring the minority who deliberately flout traffic laws.</p> <p>3. Modern Vehicle Capabilities Contemporary vehicles are designed with superior safety features, handling, and braking systems that make 40mph entirely appropriate for major routes. In fact, many roads like the A45 Small Heath Highway, with its wide, multi-lane design, could safely accommodate higher speeds of up to 60mph given their infrastructure and design.</p> <p>Alternative Solutions:</p> <p>I propose the council considers -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing speed limits on suitable major routes (like the A45) while simultaneously installing more speed cameras. - This balanced approach would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Gain public support for road safety initiatives * Better reflect modern vehicle capabilities * Create more efficient traffic flow * Generate additional revenue from those who exceed the new limits - Installing smart traffic monitoring systems to identify and prosecute persistent speeders. - Enhanced enforcement focusing on dangerous drivers. - Driver education programs targeting high-risk behaviors. <p>The current proposal risks reducing traffic efficiency while failing to address the actual cause of accidents - deliberate dangerous driving. A more nuanced approach of raising limits on suitable roads</p> | Ref 3, Ref 5, Ref 6 & Ref 7 |
| 405 | <p>I will oppose any plan to reduce speed limits to 30mph</p> <p>I understand near schools, heavily pedestrian areas and accident black spots but not this proposal.</p> <p>We need to move around, the police already have plenty of speed traps around.</p> <p>No for me</p> | Ref 1 |
| 406 | I feel this is a waste of time. We have speed limits of 20mph yet irresponsible driver still drive over 20mph AND STILL CAUSE ACCCIENTS AND INJURIES. The biggest prevention is active policing. Those who believe the reducing the speed limits work. Just go and have a walk around and use your eyes. You can join me at any time. You don't see Police Officers or patrol car. Use the congestion fund to support the police. And to be honest I believe the council really knows What goes on in this once great city. Which they managed to bankrupt and nobody a been held to account for it. Surveys are a complete waste of time and money because this council take no notice. | Ref 6 |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|
| 407 | <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed scheme to reduce speed limits from 40 to 30 in Birmingham. I believe that this is a misguided decision that could have negative consequences for both drivers and pedestrians in the city.</p> <p>Firstly, there is no clear evidence to suggest that reducing speed limits will actually improve road safety. In fact, studies have shown that lowering speed limits can lead to an increase in rear-end collisions as drivers brake suddenly to comply with the new limits. This could result in more accidents and injuries on the roads, rather than reducing them.</p> <p>Furthermore, reducing speed limits could also lead to increased congestion and longer commute times for residents of Birmingham. With slower traffic flow, drivers may become frustrated and impatient, leading to aggressive driving behavior and road rage incidents. This could create a hostile and dangerous environment for both drivers and pedestrians alike.</p> <p>In addition, the cost of implementing and enforcing the new speed limits could be significant for the city. Resources would need to be allocated to installing new signage, educating the public about the changes, and enforcing the lower limits through increased police presence. This could divert resources away from other important priorities in Birmingham, such as improving infrastructure and public services.</p> <p>Overall, I believe that reducing speed limits from 40 to 30 in Birmingham is a bad idea that will not achieve the desired outcomes of improved road safety. I urge the city council to reconsider this scheme and explore alternative solutions that are based on evidence and will truly benefit the community.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerns.</p> | Ref 3, Ref 4, Ref 5 & Ref 7 |
| 408 | <p>One more pathetic attempt to persecute drivers under the pretence of saving lives.</p> <p>As usual it's all about revenue to enable an incompetent Birmingham City Council to waste money on hare-brained schemes such as unused cycle lanes. Maniac drivers will not be deterred from bad habits, but the vast majority must be penalised. Sick to death of lying politicians and idiots who yield power.</p> <p>This consultation is a sham, it is obvious that the decision has already been made.</p> <p>Democracy!!?</p> | Ref 1 |
| 409 | <p>Overall speed restrictions on the City.</p> <p>.</p> <p>I think the proposals are totally stupid.</p> <p>Your whole approach seems to be to impede the free flow of traffic in the City leading to frustration bad temper and further bad driving. The result will be that many motorists will totally ignore the speed limits leading to even more bad driving and further annoyance in drivers like me who try to obey the law.</p> <p>My suggestion is to review all the speed limits in the City. Not just to put on a blanket limit</p> <p>Replace them with more suitable, well thought out limits and then enforce them.</p> <p>I would also look at bus lanes which have been applied all over the City without proper thought in many cases halving the traffic flow on many roads.</p> <p>In short proper assessment of the needs of all road users rather than the bigoted pursuit of the City Council to punish people who own cars.</p> <p>I know you will take no notice of me because you will go ahead and do whatever you have decided to do and then try to legitimise it by putting out a consultation document</p> <p>No wonder the City is bankrupt.</p> <p>I am pleased to have been able to express my heart felt opinions hoping that it will inspire a modicum of common sense in the decision makers.</p> | Ref 1 |
| 410 | <p>I wish to object to the reduction in speed limits across the city on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Speed is not the only cause of accidents. Today's vehicles have screens with scrolling menus to carry out basic functions such as turning up the heating for instance. These distract drivers. A plethora of road signs can be equally distracting. Not driving at the correct braking distance can be a major factor. Constantly looking at the speedometer to ensure one is not going to get a speeding ticket caused many accidents in Wales after they imposed lower driving speeds. 2. Deliveries have been shown to be delayed or cancelled as drivers are no longer able to complete their rounds. This can have disastrous impacts on housebound people, especially those waiting for essential medical supplies 3. Driving at lower speeds has an adverse impact on fuel consumption 4. Deaths from other causes are likely to be far higher than road traffic accidents - such as the elderly freezing to death, or starving to death in these post lockdown cost of living crisis times. Not to mention the sky rocketing cancer cases, heart disease etc. Why pick on road traffic accidents? <p>These are just a few of my reasons.</p> | Ref 2 and Ref 4 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| 411 | <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed reduction of speed limits from 40mph to 30mph across various roads in Birmingham. My objection is based on concerns about the lack of transparency, the oversimplified nature of the approach, and the apparent disregard for established guidelines and road design principles.</p> <p>The proposal appears to be a populist blanket reduction of speed limits that does not consider the varying road designs, differing engineering recommendations, or the complexities of human behaviour. Speed limit reductions do not have a monopoly on improving safety—roads can become more dangerous if limits are set either too high or too low relative to their design speeds. A mismatch between posted limits and road design risks frustrating drivers and fostering non-compliance, undermining the goals of the scheme.</p> <p>For example, the data for West Boulevard, with an average speed of 43.7 mph and an 85th percentile speed of 55.9 mph, indicates that it only just meets the criteria for a 40mph limit under current guidelines. There is already high non-compliance with the existing limit, with 62.7% of drivers exceeding it. Introducing a 30mph limit on a road with an 85th percentile speed exceeding 50mph is extremely dangerous. It risks normalizing the behaviour of exceeding speed limits, making such violations more socially acceptable. This undermines the purpose of speed limits, which is to single out and target the most reckless drivers likely to cause harm.</p> <p>Neglecting Pedestrian Expectations and Signage Clarity Historically, the rules for placing speed limit repeaters made sense, as most urban roads designed for higher speeds had these signs, while 30mph limits were indicated by their absence. Reducing speed on these roads inadvertently removes signage that warns pedestrians to expect faster-moving traffic and drivers and pedestrians are told the road is 30 simply by an absence of signage. This could compromise safety while making little difference to actual traffic speeds, as driver behaviour is often more influenced by road design than by posted limits.</p> <p>The Importance of Evidence-Based Speed Limits Current guidelines explicitly state that "mean speeds should be used as the basis for determining local speed limits" and that limits should "be evidence-led and self-explaining." They also emphasize that speed limits should reinforce people's assessments of safe speeds, encourage self-compliance, and be seen as the maximum, not a target. Yet, the proposal provides no data on mean or 85th percentile speeds for the roads affected. This omission undermines the scheme's credibility, failing to show how these reductions align with evidence-based principles or road user psychology.</p> <p>Councils' Obligation to Acknowledge Deviations from DfT Guidelines It should also be noted that while councils are no longer strictly prevented from setting speed limits against DfT guidelines, they are legally obliged to acknowledge when they are doing so. This obligation ensures transparency and accountability in how decisions are made. However, the current consultation fails to mention whether any of the proposed reductions deviate from DfT guidelines, despite some roads clearly not meeting the criteria for a 30mph limit. This omission is misleading and does not provide the public with a clear understanding of the likely effects of these changes, especially given the lack of corresponding engineering adjustments to the roads.</p> <p>The claim is that this scheme aims to reduce speeds; however, evidence from the DfT demonstrates that raising 'unrealistic' speed limits can sometimes reduce speeds and accidents by alleviating driver frustration. While not part of the current guidelines, the DfT's findings in Circular Roads 1/80 on the introduction of 40mph limits highlight a key misunderstanding: "It is a common but mistaken belief that drivers allow themselves a set margin over the prevailing speed limit, and that if a limit is raised by 10 mph, they will travel 10 mph faster. In fact, an increase in an unrealistic speed limit rarely brings an increase in traffic speeds. ('Unrealistic' is here used to mean 'substantially below the 85th percentile speed'). It is much more likely that there will be no change, or even a fall. It seems that drivers relieved of the frustrations of too low a limit rarely abuse the higher one. Indeed, it is not unusual for the accident rate to fall when a poorly observed limit is raised. This may mean that reduced frustration leads to changes in driving behaviour conducive to accident reduction. The evidence for asserting that speeds and accidents do not increase in proportion to an increase in speed limit comes from studies made before and after unrealistic local limits have been raised. " In other words, they found raising what they saw to be an unrealistic speed limit often caused a slight drop in average speed.</p> <p>This evidence challenges the notion that simply lowering speed limits will result in safer roads or even lower speeds. It's also quite damning on the assumption that by lowering the limit those who drive too fast will only dare 5 or 10mph over the prevailing limit. What's more concerning is that research into dropping speed limits shows that even when average speeds do go down. This emphasizes the importance of aligning limits with road design and realistic driver behaviour to achieve high compliance and improved safety outcomes. How the assumption that this scheme will increase compliance is difficult to comprehend. It's likely to cause a large increase in non-compliance in exchange for a small drop in actual traffic speeds, that is if speeds don't increase. However, even if they do, often, it's the speed of the fastest drivers—those most likely to cause harm—that decreases the least when limits are lowered. Properly set speed limits are more effective at singling out and curbing the behaviour of these high-risk drivers.</p> <p>Questioning the Scheme's Motivations I cannot ascertain whether this proposal stems from ignorance of historical context or a populist desire to appease specific stakeholders, but it seems to disregard the nuanced reasons for the introduction of 40mph limits. These limits were not implemented arbitrarily but were based on evidence and careful consideration of driver behaviour and road design. Ignoring these principles risks undoing the benefits they brought—namely, improved compliance and reduced accidents. While it is possible some roads may benefit from a reduction in speed limit, this blanket approach plays into people's misconceptions and prejudices about how speed limits work, and the assumption that a lower limit is always the safer option.</p> <p>Setting Realistic Limits Should Be the Goal While reducing some limits may make sense, the goal should always be to set realistic limits that reflect the road design, traffic patterns, and local conditions. In some cases, raising a speed limit could be the safest and most appropriate action, provided that the road design supports it. Lowering a speed limit without corresponding changes to the road design can be detrimental to the safety of both drivers and pedestrians. It can give vulnerable people a false indication of actual traffic speeds, make reckless drivers harder to single out and cause an increase in speed deviations increasing accident risks for those attempting to drive at the limit by driving significantly slower than the mean traffic flow.</p> <p>Request for Transparency and Qualified Input To ensure that this scheme is rooted in sound engineering and evidence, I respectfully request the council clarify the following:</p> <p>Were qualified traffic engineers involved in recommending these reductions? How were the mean speeds and 85th percentile speeds considered for each road? How does the proposal align with DfT guidelines, which advocate for evidence-led, self-explaining speed limits?</p> <p>In conclusion, while I support efforts to improve road safety, this proposal oversimplifies the complex relationship between road design, driver behavior, and speed limits. Without a more data-driven and context-sensitive approach, these reductions risk causing more harm than good. I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and ensure that future decisions are informed by comprehensive evidence and expert input."</p> | Ref 3, Ref 5 & Ref 7 |
| 412 | <p>Hand written letter signed by two residents- Summarised text 'We object on the grounds that the plan is ill conceived and lacking in depth of thought and judgement. A blanket speed limit does not recognise the variability and density of traffic movements'' A more cynical view might consider the prime object of the proposal is to create a situation where the monitoring of the regulation provides a valuable source of income for a cash-strapped Council.</p> | Ref 5 & Ref 8 |

BCC Reply for objections

| Ref no: | Comment | BCC reply |
|---------|---|--|
| 1 | No specific objection stated | There are no stated grounds listed within the objection made. |
| 2 | Air Quality (Worsened) | As part of the early scheme development an Air Quality Assessment was undertaken to consider whether the reduced speed limit would have an adverse effect on air quality. The assessment has shown that the scheme will not have an adverse effect on air quality. In practice, it is most likely to improve air quality within all the assessment corridors. It has not been possible to quantify the scale of these improvements, and in practice they are likely to be too small to measure using BCC's air quality monitoring network. Nevertheless, these improvements are expected to benefit a large number of people (almost 70,000 residential and commercial properties, 46 schools, and 2 hospitals). |
| 3 | Existing speed related collisions on roads/scheme won't reduce number of collisions/could increase collisions | <p>The selection of roads was not based on Road Traffic Collision data, the scheme objectives are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver a consistent lower speed limit across Birmingham's road network, based upon clear evidence that lower speeds reduce road harm risk • Support the core principles of the Birmingham Transport Plan by reducing the speed, volume and dominance of vehicular traffic • Reduce road harm risk across the city, transforming Birmingham's streets to create attractive conditions to support significantly more journeys being made by public transport and active travel modes, such as walking, cycling and wheeling. • Directly support delivery of both the refreshed West Midlands Regional Road Safety Strategy 2023-2030 and Birmingham's emerging Road Harm Reduction Strategy. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 4 | Economic impacts/increased journey times/increased congestion | <p>There has not been a detailed review of the economic impacts as a result of the proposed reduced speed limit. To illustrate the potential impacts to journey time a comparison was undertaken on the A45 Coventry Road/A45 New Coventry Road:</p> <p>Journey time comparison:</p> <p>The length of existing 40mph on the A45 Coventry Road/A45 New Coventry Road to the city boundary with Solihull is approximately 3.6 miles in length. Using the formula Time = Distance/Speed if you were to travel this route:</p> <p>*At a consistent 40mph the journey time would equate to: 3.6 miles/40 mph= 0.09 hour (5 mins and 24 seconds).</p> <p>*At a consistent 30mph the journey time would equate to: 3.6 miles/30 mph= 0.12 hour (7 mins and 12 seconds).</p> <p>Or in other terms for every mile travelled at a consistent speed of 30mph it takes a motorists 29 seconds longer in journey time compared to travelling at a consistent 40mph speed limit.</p> <p>If you considered for traffic, junctions, traffic signals, pedestrian crossing point etc and therefore assumed that the current maximum speed being realistically driven in a 40mph speed limit is around 35mph, the increased journey time over one mile could be approximately 15 seconds.</p> <p>Road traffic collisions can have significant economic impacts which are experienced by those affected, their families and society as whole. These costs are primarily associated with collision response, medical treatment and aftercare, but also loss of productivity as victims and their families are unable to work, sometimes for extended periods.</p> <p>There are also costs associated with transport network delays and damage to infrastructure, which can often be high. In this context, reducing the numbers of road traffic collisions, and especially those resulting in fatalities and/or serious injuries can deliver significant economic benefits through reducing societal costs.</p> |
| 5 | Suitability of road for reduced speed limit/Not in line with The Department for Transport's (DfT) own guidance on setting local speed limits (including why are you included roads with none or very limited residential frontages/footways) | <p>The legislative power for setting local speed limits lies with the traffic authority. DfT guidance is not binding to the traffic authority. For any roads that have a new 30 mph speed limit introduced, the relevant speed limit order will be in place and the speed limit will be 'signed' accordingly. Noting that on roads that have street lighting present there will be no additional signage as these roads are classified as a restricted road by virtue of having street lighting present. The speed limit on roads that have street lighting is deemed to be 30mph unless otherwise signed. For roads that have no street lighting these will require 30mph signage to replace the existing 40mph signage.</p> |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| 6 | Speed limit enforcement (lack of) | <p>West Midlands Police (WMP) already undertake speed enforcement on many of these routes, prioritised on the basis of Road Traffic Collision data involving deaths and serious injuries. Enforcement will continue with any reduced speed limit. Where routes have Average Speed Enforcement (ASE) cameras installed, these devices will be calibrated to the lowered speed limit. Some of the locations proposed for speed limit reduction also feature on a list of prioritised routes for consideration in the next round of ASE expansion, for which the technical and business case work is about to commence. A parallel information campaign will be undertaken when the changes are made, to make people aware of the changes, the reasons for the changes and to promote driver behaviour change.</p> <p>WMP are supportive of the scheme proposals, the speeds on the roads proposed for a lowered speed limit will be monitored and if compliance was consistently poor, further highway measures can be considered to assist in lowering speed of traffic.</p> <p>Currently Fixed Penalty Notice fines that are paid by motorists as a result of committing speeding offences go to HM Treasury's Consolidated Fund, and so are not reinvested in enforcement activity locally.</p> |
| 7 | Current recorded speed data | All roads have had recent speed/volume surveys data collated over a 7 day period. This includes 85th percentile speed data (the speed at or below which 85 percent of all vehicles are observed to travel under free-flowing conditions past a monitored point). A summary of this data will be shared as an update on the Be Heard page. |
| 8 | Use of Council funding | The scheme is funded from the Clean Air Zone's (CAZ) surplus income. This funding is ringfenced for use on transport schemes only and cannot be used for other purposes. |