Caerlaverock Community Association

Caerlaverock Community Association Response to letter dated 18 December 2018

Opening para - At what time of the day was the site visit?

Background

Para 2 – Safety of shared space must be balanced, and it is not, for all of the reasons stated in our proposal.

Para 3 - We consider 30 mph too high for all of the reasons stated, and do not consider this a satisfactory reason for refusing our request.

We question:

- What evidence has been collected?
- Over what period of time?
- Where in the village were the observations made?
- Over what time period?

Our longer experience does not support your observation.

This is not about dealing with recorded incidents but a thorough risk assessment, which we have carried out, to ensure that accidents are prevented in the future. We do not consider it appropriate to wait for recorded evidence, injury or worse.

Speed Limit Guidance

Para 1 - Our assessment is that a 20mph limit is a safe speed to travel based on our risk assessment and community experience of near misses. This redresses the balance on the safety of shared space between users.

Para 2 - We are not asking for signs to be set too far out but a proportionate distance to the risk. You have accepted that they should be moved out to north and south yet equal or greater risk exists to the east, near the school, which you have ignored.
Given that your Council has accepted that a 20mph limit is required around the school it seems logical that the 30 limit will have to be moved out on the east side to accommodate this. It makes sense to move this limit out at the same time as the others, anything less is nonsensical and a complete waste of resources.

Para 3 – We question:

- What date was the data compiled?

We have identified material changes which we do not believe you have taken into account.

Para 4 - We consider that there are material changes which we have detailed and hence place an obligation on you to properly review the speed limit in Glencaple.

Para 5 - We have identified the development in the south to provide an additional 24 houses, and hence on average another 48 cars, together with the changes at The Boathouse, Glencaple Quay.
The significant increase in motor home use is an additional factor, which you have failed to reflect merely referring to "tourism" in general terms.

Para 6 - 24 new houses proposed and a recommendation to the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Para 7 - See our previous comments and so if not included for review in 2012 and 2013 the data on which you have relied excludes Glencaple. Your comments are therefore flawed.

Para 10 - We have demonstrated, by objective risk assessment, why this is not appropriate in this case. This statement does not say "always appropriate". Our risk assessment demonstrates why it is not in this case.

Extension of 30 mph limits

Para 2 - You refer to visibility not proximity to the settlement. From experience, the signs are sited too close to the village in each case, hence vehicles do not slow down when they enter. The guidance on visibility will still be adhered to on all 3 approaches. The 30mph to the east (school) entrance will remain well within guidance if moved further out of the village.

Para 4 - As we have stated this is too close to the edge of the settlement.
What date will the work to move the signs be carried out (we are moving swiftly through 'early 2019')

20 mph Speed Limit Policy

Sub-Para vi – "*locations requested by the community, and where need and support can be demonstrated (minimum of at least 5 residents")*

This is contradictory. This community has requested the reduction.
You have a petition with many more than five residents requesting this.
No fewer than 20 people attended a meeting to discuss the 20mph speed limit, unanimously agreeing to it.
The Community Association, and hence community, has unanimously supported this so what justification does D&G have for declining a democratic request?

Final Para - It remains a fact that D&G is in breach of its own policies.

You have failed to say when action will be taken at our school.

Please give a specific date for compliance with your own policies.

School Road Safety

Final Para - We are ensuring the safety of both child and parents in requiring a 20mph limit. As referred to earlier this is about addressing the balance for all road users. These comments are therefore irrelevant and seek to pass responsibility to parents with total disregard for their own safety, along with that of other users to whom we have referred.

Speed Limit Reviews

Para 2 - See our previous comments on risk assessment.

Para 3 - These comments add nothing to your case; if all drivers behaved in such a manner, there would be no need for speed limits.

Summary

Para 1 - We are not asking for a footway

Para 3 - There is nothing in our proposal that would impact the character of the village. Residents and businesses of Glencaple unanimously support the speed restriction to 20mph.

Para 4 – This indicates that this is not about safety but about budgetary constraints.

Final Para - This community has made representations to Scottish Government supporting the bill.