Dear [Name],

FOI Reference No: IM78359I Strang Road traffic calming
Request under The Freedom Of Information Act 2015 (“The Act”)

Thank you for your request dated 16 February 2017.

You requested

I would like to make a freedom of information request on the recent traffic scheme undertaken on strang road.

1. (a) what discussions were held with the residents on imposing a traffic calming scheme
   (b) what were the replies/comments?
2. What were the replies/comments from the residents after telling them what type of traffic calming was to be implemented?
3. what alternative methods for traffic calming were discussed why were they dismissed?
4. Has the current bus stop position been considered within the scheme in regards to its location and its impact on other traffic when stopped?
5. Was any thought given to the current parking bays in relation to the traffic calming scheme and layout?
6. Has there been a risk assessment undertaken? and can you provide a copy?
7. Can the Department provide accident statistics on Strang road before and after the traffic calming scheme was introduced and make comments on the findings?
8. Are there any standards relating to traffic calming in this type of manor?
9. Can the Department provide proof that the scheme is working. Are the speeds down, is there less traffic and are people driving in a more consistent manor? Or are people speeding between the plant pots, in a more erratic manor and is the road still taking the same volume of traffic.
10. Finally if the scheme is working, and it has reduced the volume of traffic using that 'A' road does the Department know where additional traffic is going and what knock on effects this may cause.

Response to your request

While our aim is to provide information whenever possible, in this instance we are unable to provide some of the information you have requested; the reasons and statutory exemption sections are shown as part of the corresponding answers below.
1. (a) The information you have requested is contained in Appendix 1
   (b) The information you have requested is contained in Appendix 2
2   The information you have requested is contained in Appendix 2
3   The information you have requested is contained in Appendix 2 and 3
4   The information you have requested is contained in Appendix 4
5   Yes, the Department did look at it. All the information you requested is contained in Appendix 5
6   Yes, the Department does assess the risk to other road users but, not on a pro-forma.
7 Under section 11(2)(b) a practical refusal applies, referencing section 11(3)(a) the public authority does not hold... the information that the applicant has requested. Alternatively you may wish to consider submitting a request to the Isle of Man Constabulary. Should you submit this question to the Constabulary it would be really helpful if you could clarify the time frame for the information you require.

With regards to the second part of your question - it is best practice to undertake the post implementation assessment approximately 6 months after a highway scheme has been installed, therefore until this assessment has taken place we are unable to provide final comment.

8 Though various jurisdictions have technical guidance on the design of traffic calming, in practice the Department has historically used many of the UK produced traffic related guidance documents as a useful starting point when undertaking the design of both highway and traffic management schemes within the context of Isle of Man legislation.

Please note the list below is not an exhaustive list.
- TAL 9/94 Horizontal Deflections; Department for Transport (1994)
- TAL 12/97 Chicane Schemes; Department for Transport (1997)
- TRL 385 Traffic calming in villages on major roads: Final report; TRL (1999)
- TAL 1/04 Village Speed Limits; Department for Transport (2004)
- TRL 641 'Psychological' traffic calming; TRL (2005)
- Manual for Streets; Department for Transport (2007)
- LTN 1/07 Traffic Calming; Department for Transport (2007)
- LTN 1/08 Traffic Management and Streetscape; Department for Transport (2008)
- Designing Streets; The Scottish Government (2010)
- Manual for Streets 2; CIHT (2010)
- LTN 1/11 Shared Space; Department for Transport (2011)

TAL – Traffic Advisory Leaflet
TRL – Transport Research Lab
LTN – Local Transport Note

9 The information you have requested is contained in Appendix 6
The information you have requested is contained in Appendix 6 however, this information does not give a true reflection of the impact of the scheme as traffic flows have been affected by maintenance work currently being carried out on Eyreton Road, Crosby. The Department does intend to carry out further surveys once Eyreton Road is opened again.

Your right to request a review

If you are unhappy with this response to your Freedom of Information request, you may ask us to carry out an internal review of the response, by completing a complaint form and submitting it electronically to foi.doi@gov.im or by delivery/post to Mr Ian Harris, Department of Infrastructure, Sea Terminal Buildings, Douglas, IM1 2RF. An electronic version and paper version of our complaint form can be found by going to our website at https://www.gov.im/about-the-government/freedom-of-information/

Your review request should explain why you are dissatisfied with this response, and should be made as soon as practicable. We will respond as soon as the review has been concluded.

If you are not satisfied with the result of the review, you then have the right to appeal to the Information Commissioner for a decision on;

1. Whether we have responded to your request for information in accordance with Part 2 of the Freedom of Information Act; or

2. Whether we are justified in refusing to give you the information requested.

In response to an application for review, the Information Commissioner may, at any time, attempt to resolve a matter by negotiation, conciliation, mediation or another form of alternative dispute resolution and will have regard to any outcome of this in making any subsequent decision. More detailed information on your rights to review is on the Information Commissioner’s website at: www.inforights.im/

Should you have any queries concerning this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Further information about Freedom of Information requests can be found at https://www.gov.im/about-the-government/freedom-of-information/

Yours sincerely
Dear Resident/Occupier

**Proposed Traffic Management Scheme – Strang Road**

The Department is intending to install a revised traffic management scheme (see accompanying plan) to reduce vehicular traffic speeds and deter unnecessary through traffic from using Strang Road.

Before and after monitoring by the Department of vehicular traffic flows on Strang Road has shown that there has been an increase in vehicular speeds and daily through traffic after completion of the recent traffic management scheme.

This data, as well as observations from officers, residents and the public indicates that additional measures are required to mitigate the enhanced attractiveness of the route caused, in part, by the improvement in the ride quality of the carriageway.

The Department has considered two alternative modifications to the current highway to deter to reduce vehicular speeds and unnecessary through traffic: a) installation of road narrowing measures and build outs on Strang Road between its junction with the A1 and its junction with Ballanawin; b) installation of speed cushions on Strang Road between its junction with the A1 and its junction with Ballanawin.

The Department has chosen to implement scheme a). The combination of some road narrowing and build outs placed on the south east side of Strang Road is considered on balance to have a better combined speed reduction and deterrent effect on through traffic than speed cushions, especially on southeasterly bound traffic. Whilst build outs and road narrowing will minimise, as far as possible, impacts on bus ride quality.

Installation works is expected to take place in mid-March.

If you have any comments on this proposal, please email or send them in writing to me by the 4th March. Whilst we do not normally enter into individual correspondence on these consultations, all replies will be analysed and concerns addressed where practical.

Yours sincerely

**Mr K Almond**

**Network Planning Manager**

Encl.

**Department of Infrastructure**

Sea Terminal Building, Douglas, Isle of Man, IM1 2RF
Dear Resident

**Strang Road Traffic Management**

As promised at the meeting organised by Minister Howard Quayle with residents earlier in the year, the Department’s designs for Strang Road have now been modified and are attached to this letter.

It is hoped that the revised traffic calming scheme will encourage drivers to travel along the road at an appropriate speed which allows people to use the road to access the hospital yet does not cause problems for bus traffic.

During the meeting we agreed to consider a number of specific concerns and requests raised by residents, which for the most part have now been addressed, as follows:

- **Only the lower part of the road was being considered.**
  Traffic calming has now been extended to the top half of the road.

- **Improvements to the crossing at Ballanawin**
  The proposed action to reduce speed on the upper part of the road will create a safer crossing point, as will moving vehicles away from the kerb line.

- **Improvements to the Strang Road/Peel Road junction**
  Signage will be improved and the hedgerow cut back to the highway boundary. This will improve visibility along the Strang Road for pedestrians.

- **Improvements to the pedestrian crossing at Strang**
  There is, unfortunately, little that can be done at this location above and beyond what is already in place.

- **General concerns about parking**
  Unfortunately, the level of parking on the lower half of the road will not be improved.

The road layout uses well-established techniques currently widely used elsewhere, which are beginning to be adopted on the Island. In part these measures are popular because they reduce the otherwise utilitarian nature of many road locations.

**Department of Infrastructure**
Sea Terminal Building, Douglas, Isle of Man, IM1 2RF
The traffic calming works on Strang Road are scheduled to commence on 25th July 2016. I trust you will find the Department’s plans as outlined above acceptable.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Almond
Traffic & Transportation Manager

Enc: Revised Traffic Calming Plan
Dear Resident,

**Update on the proposed traffic management scheme – Strang Road**

The Department is writing to you to inform you that the proposed traffic calming scheme will not be installed today (25th July) as previously indicated. This is due to a review of the installation method. It was planned that Strang Road would remain open during the installation of the traffic calming features so as to minimise disruption to residents and road users. However, on review, it has been decided that to minimise the risk to Department staff and road users during the installation phase, the installation work will be undertaken under a temporary road closure.

The installation of the traffic calming scheme will be rescheduled as soon as possible. However, available dates will be constrained by: the statutory process required to make the traffic regulation order for the temporary road closure; the upcoming Festival of Motoring; and the existing maintenance programme.

The Department will write to you as soon as possible once the new installation date known.

The Department apologises for any inconvenience the delay may cause and thank you for your continued patience on this matter.

Regards,

Kevin Almond
Dear Mr Almond

I refer to your letter left at my house late this afternoon which informs me that there will be a delay in starting your latest traffic calming scheme. This gives you added opportunity to consider your reply to the following four questions raised in my letter and email sent to you on 20 July which were in reply to your letter and email of the same date (both attached below):

1. I suggested speed bumps at four areas, but you consider the road would need them at seven. I bow to you professional judgement. So, why cannot there be suitably engineered speed bumps, the preferred solution of the residents, reinstated at regular intervals?

2. You accept that parked vehicles do have an effect on vehicle speeds. But you have failed, for whatever reason, to answer my simple question, just how does removing any number of parked cars along a road help in any way to slow down passing traffic?

3. Linked in with number 2 above, I fail to understand your conclusion that “The proposed scheme has therefore, been designed to overcome factors”. In what way does clearing 1 to 24 parked vehicles (no matter what types of vehicle or durations of stay) from large areas along Strang Road help slow down passing vehicles?

4. Are Minister Phil Gawne and Middle MHK Howard Quayle happy with your scheme? I fail to understand why you consider that 13 ugly planter boxes allied with 7 substantial no parking areas are more suitable than just 7 simple speed bumps. More thoughtful drivers slow down at bumps, but your latest scheme gives speeding drivers of private and public vehicles a lovely clearway to race through. The long suffering residents who have been affected by the speeders for a long time will continue to be so, but will also lose up to 24 parking spaces. This is not fair. A cheap and more satisfactory method is the use of properly engineered speed bumps. The whole purpose of the scheme has been turned on its head over the last year. Someone has changed the agenda.

I look forward to your reply.

Regards,

---- Original message ----

Date: Wed, 20 Jul 2016 21:49:12 +0100 (BST)
From:
Subject: RE: Strang Road traffic calming measures
To: "Almond, Kevin", "Gawne, Phil (MHK)"
Cc: "Robinson, Jeffrey", "Quayle, Howard (MHK)"

Dear Mr Almond

I attach my response to your letter of today which I also attach for the reference of the others. As you know, Minister Phil Gawne has been talking with Middle MHK Howard Quayle on the matter.

You ask that if I require any further information then I should contact you, which
I now do. A straightforward and early reply from you, Jeffrey Robinson and/or Phil Gawne is looked forward to.

Regards,

--- Original message ---

Date: Wed, 20 Jul 2016 14:37:59 +0000
From: "Almond, Kevin"
Subject: RE: Strang Road traffic calming measures
To:

Dear

I attach my response to your recent letter.

If you require any further information please feel free to contact me.

Kevin Almond
Mr K. Almond
Traffic and Transportation Manager
Department of Infrastructure
Sea Terminal Building
Douglas
IM1 2RF

Dear Mr Almond

Strang Road traffic calming measures

I refer to your letter dated 29 June 2016.

I am disappointed that you have dismissed the concerns of the residents living along the Union Mills end of Strang Road by your continued proposal to install a number of planter boxes, paint a series of no-parking yellow lines and do away with up to sixteen on-road parking spaces. Your proposal will simply allow motorists to speed between and past the boxes and to continue to speed along the new no-parking stretches.

From having no traffic calming plans along the Strang end of Strang Road, you have abandoned the increased speed limit choice and propose to have boxes and no-parking yellow lines.

A couple of strategically placed full width speed bumps on each of the two sections of the road and an improvement to the road crossing at Ballanawin are all that would be needed to slow down the traffic and protect the residents and the pedestrians.

But if you are adamant not to use speed bumps then a compromise might be acceptable to the residents which would still have the boxes but without the no-parking yellow lines on the north side of the road, thereby allowing parked vehicles to become part of the speeding deterrent. You propose to have two boxes on either side of the road outside ‘Cummal Veg’ and ‘Hy Holme’ and just up the road from ‘Glenburn’ at which parking will be allowed. This situation could equally be applied elsewhere along the road and could also include an alteration from one big box to two small boxes on each side of the road near ‘Tymescot’ and outside ‘Avondale’ and ‘Glentraugh’ to slow down traffic whilst at the same time enabling parking. Something similar could be done near the top of the hill to allow parking outside ‘Thumper Cottage’ and to protect vehicles exiting from it and the other houses.

I would be obliged if you would respond to the above points and, in particular, inform me how no-parking stretches on a road help slow down traffic better than parked cars.

I look forward to your early reply.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Mr Almond

The plans as they stand appear to be fine. Yes, traffic does need to slow down but there will always be certain drivers, especially 4x4’s and large vans who will ignore all measures including speed bumps. I have lived on Strang Road for 25 years so have plenty of experience of driving on the road. When the speed bumps were introduced it soon became apparent that they were detrimental to the roadway as potholes started to appear around the bumps. They did not slow down vehicles which could go over them. Cars speed up again between the bumps then slam on breaks before the next one. Motorbikes travelled down the middle of the road to avoid them. Introducing planters near the driveways of those who do not have a clear view when accessing the road seems the most sensible option. My own experience is that when cars are parked to the left of my driveway it is impossible to have a safe and clear view as it necessitates creeping out to the opposite carriageway to get past them.

Sent from my iPad
From: Almond, Kevin  
Sent: 22 February 2016 12:05  
To:  
Subject: FW: Questions on latest proposals for Strang Road traffic calming  
Attachments: 20-30mphRF.pdf

From:  
Sent: 19 February 2016 16:26  
To: Almond, Kevin  
Cc: Gawne, Phil (MHK); Quayle, Howard (MHK); Houghton, John  
Subject: Re: Questions on latest proposals for Strang Road traffic calming

Dear Mr. Almond,

Thank you for your reply. First, with regard to the section of the road between Ballanawin and the Strang, please find attached my response to the proposed speed limit change (which I have also printed in readiness for sending in).

Second, the scheme plan has just been delivered. I am astonished to find an apparent repetition of the debacle whereby one of the failed chicanes was placed right outside this house.

In an email of 28 Oct 2015, Gary Saunders stated:

**Clearly the Department will not install chicanes or other obstructions that may devalue the property of residents, but that is not to say that chicanes are not a viable solution to the problem of speeding vehicles.** I was also told separately by your department that if the lack of a driveway had been noticed, the chicane would never have been placed outside the house - yet almost the exact same thing seems to be being proposed again.

Unless you are proposing to create an adequately-sized offroad parking/pickup/delivery area in front of the house, in the space currently occupied by the gate and bank, this scheme is fatally flawed.

No doubt you will be receiving similar representations from other residents whose parking/pickup/delivery access is set to be severely impacted, and who, like me, are overwhelmingly in favour of replacement speed cushions instead.

I look forward to a reply at your earliest convenience.

Regards,

On 18/02/2016, 15:37, Almond, Kevin wrote:

My apologies for the short delay of my reply as I been away from the office.

In answer to your queries:
1. As part of the Departments examination of Strang Rd the section of Strang Road between the junction of Ballanawin and Bradden Rd has been reviewed. An assessment of the current and historic vehicular traffic and road traffic collision data indicates the level of risk on this section of Strang Rd to road users is a low, as is the rest of Strang Road. With regards to deterring through traffic, the Departments proposed design encompasses a similar length of Strang Rd to the earlier traffic calming scheme.

2. Bus Vannin have commented that Strang Rd provides an important operational link for the school busses servicing Douglas and Peel Schools and the provision of the scheduled service to Strang.

3. One of the reasons the deterrent effective of the chicanes was diminished was that they were placed in isolation. Traffic calming features tend to be more effective when placed in series along a road at regular intervals. The proposed scheme incorporates more traffic calming features which should provide a greater deterrent to potential through traffic than the previous trial scheme.

4. The Design Team have identified and mapped the residential vehicular accesses and have placed the traffic calming features so as not to infer with vehicles entering or exiting these accesses. Kerbside parking will still be available to residents and visitors.

5. The Department is now in a position to send the scheme plan and an accompanying information letter to the residents of Strang Road. It is expected this will be completed by the end of this week.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Kevin Almond

---

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 05 February 2016 13:01
To: Almond, Kevin
Cc: Quayle, Howard (MHK); Gawne, Phil (MHK)
Subject: Questions on latest proposals for Strang Road traffic calming

Dear Mr. Almond,

[Redacted] kindly sent me a copy of your reply to him. As a resident of Strang Road I have the following questions and comments.

- Why do both the schemes you mention only cover part of the road, from Ballanawin to Union Mills? The traffic you are trying to discourage also uses the section between Ballanawin and the Strang, and speeds are excessive on that section too (especially downhill). For maximum effect, whatever is ultimately implemented really needs to cover the whole road. This is a key point.
- Why the focus on buses? As far as I am aware, this road is used by the bus authorities simply as a convenient short cut, rather than to pick up many passengers. Most or all buses could easily be routed along Peel Road, with the hospital and Strang being served by a loop from the Jubilee Oak. If they insist on relying on this road, I believe they should do so in a more subservient spirit.
- You state that the chicanes did not have the desired effect. Could you explain why you think the proposed buildouts will be more effective? One reason the chicanes failed was that they had to be wide enough to allow buses through - which also let cars and vans through without their needing to slow down much (if at all).
- How will the buildouts be situated to avoid causing significant disruption to residents? Your own officers have stated that this road is not ideal for siting chicanes/buildouts. I can confirm this, as one of the chicanes was situated right
outside this house, which has no driveway and therefore relies on roadside parking. I later received an apology for this having been overlooked, and a comment that the chicane should not have been placed there.

- If the buildout scheme goes ahead, will you be sharing details of the plans before they are implemented, so interested parties can raise reasonable and legitimate concerns or objections?

I look forward to hearing your responses to these points, and (like my fellow residents) seeing an equitable solution to this long-running problem agreed on and implemented very soon.

Thanks,

---

Isle of Man. Giving you freedom to flourish

WARNING: This email message and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may be subject to legal privilege. You must not copy or deliver it to any other person or use the contents in any unauthorised manner without the express permission of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee of this e-mail, please delete it and notify the sender as soon as possible.

No employee or agent is authorised to conclude any binding agreement on behalf of any of the Departments or Statutory Boards of the Isle of Man Government with any party by e-mail without express written confirmation by a Manager of the relevant Department or Statutory Board.

RAIUH: Spreevaajagh yin chaikeurasgh poshi shoh chammaris coadaranyn eree curiri marisht as ta shoh coopit ac y leigh. Chai, rhegin ditu cipal ny cur rh da pelagh abede elley ny immiyce yin choorレイヤシ on aghel abee dyk ked leeyw weh chimoylagh. Mannaagh cee shiu yin minyeaagh kiili jen'h fih'=shoh, dill-=shoh magh eh, my sulju, as buh-shiu tys da'h choytakgh cha leah as oddys shiu.

Cho nel ked curni da bleyyehgh ny pantagh btrree cowaari y wannu riish pelagh ny possan abee lesh posti er son Rheyn ny Boayrd Slatyssaggh erree jen Reillys Ellen Veenin dyn co-ni-noghey sculri leeyw veh Releyder y Rheyn ny Boayrd Slatyssaggh teh bortyn nih.
Department of Infrastructure  
(Attn. Mr N. Black, CEO)  
Sea Terminal  
Douglas  
IM1 2RF

Dear Mr. Black,

I write to object to the Strang Road - Rural Roads (Speed Limits) (Amendment) Order 2016, Ref: PER39. The reasons are as follows:

- The DOI’s stated intention is to discourage traffic from using Strang Road as a shortcut, and reduce speeds of said traffic. This is in line with what was agreed after the hospital opened in 2004, and which has been reiterated in very recent communications from the department. Increasing a speed limit on half of a section of the road in question will not reduce either the volume or speed of traffic - quite the reverse.

- Plans are in hand to provide traffic calming measures on the other half of the road, between Ballanawin and Union Mills. There is no sense in treating the two halves of the road differently. Whatever measures are put in place should also be applied to the section between Ballanawin and the Strang, rather than relaxing the current speed limit.

- I regret to say there has been a demonstrable and serious lack of professionalism over the way the whole subject of traffic calming on this road has been approached. The evidence is in two parts, and I believe shows that the whole subject needs revisiting:
  1. After the resurfacing was completed, no calming measures at all were put in place for several months. Naturally, this encouraged higher traffic volumes and speeds, as shown by your own department’s figures. Next, residents were told that marked parking bays were expected to have a beneficial effect. They had no useful effect. (Again, as per your own department’s figures).
  2. After it was admitted (again by your own department) that the parking bays were useless in calming traffic, a trial was carried out of two chicanes. These not only failed to calm traffic (because they had to be wide enough to accommodate buses), but took away roadside parking near this house, which has no offroad parking. Your officers later admitted that they had failed to notice there was no driveway, and said that if they had done, the chicane would not have been put outside. The most charitable response to this is that at least they were honest about this truly astonishing blunder, and apologised.

- Residents have overwhelmingly requested additional traffic calming measures, not fewer. Your own department’s survey clearly showed this, and the input should be acted on.

Yours faithfully,
Thank you for your observations. I am pleased that you are able to position your car downstream of the planter opposite your property with minimal impact on the traffic flow. It is unlikely at this juncture that parking upstream will be allowed following ongoing feedback from Bus Vannin.

The current planting will be reviewed once they have time to establish themselves but it is still our intention to incorporate taller plants as per our original design.

Regards,

Kevin Almond

-----Original Message-----
From: Sent: 31 January 2017 14:03
To: To: Almond, Kevin
Cc: Cc: Robinson, Jeffrey
Subject: Subject: ETA for tall plants in Strang Road planters

Dear Kevin,

Further to last week's meeting and my follow-up email, I am happy to report that use of the downstream planter shadow for parking is proving to be very successful: there is both plenty of depth, and more than enough width to accommodate an average-sized car without obscuring the road signs. As mentioned previously, I do hope it will be feasible to leave the upstream shadow free of double yellow lines too, as an overflow space.

My main point concerns the planters. You indicated that taller ones should have been put in. You also mentioned that assessing the success of the new traffic calming scheme would be done in multiple stages, with a later part noting traffic flows after people had got used to the new scheme. With the latter point in mind, don't you need to get the taller plants in as soon as possible? In any event, I think they will significantly enhance flow regulation, because more care will (as you mentioned) then be needed to navigate round the planters. At present, there is probably a tendency to speed up through the planter sections when no opposing traffic is visible. Do you have an ETA for installation of the tall plants?

Thanks,
My apologies for the short delay of my reply as I been away from the office.

In answer to your queries:

1. As part of the Departments examination of Strang Rd the section of Strang Road between the junction of Ballanawin and Bradan Rd has been reviewed. An assessment of the current and historic vehicular traffic and road traffic collision data indicates the level of risk on this section of Strang Rd to road users is a low, as is the rest of Strang Road. With regards to deterring through traffic, the Departments proposed design encompasses a similar length of Strang Rd to the earlier traffic calming scheme.

2. Bus Vannin have commented that Strang Rd provides an important operational link for the school busses servicing Douglas and Peel Schools and the provision of the scheduled service to Strang.

3. One of the reasons the deterrent effective of the chicanes was diminished was that they were placed in isolation. Traffic calming features tend to be more effective when placed in series along a road at regular intervals. The proposed scheme incorporates more traffic calming features which should provide a greater deterrent to potential through traffic than the previous trial scheme.

4. The Design Team have identified and mapped the residential vehicular accesses and have placed the traffic calming features so as not to infer with vehicles entering or exiting these accesses. Kerbside parking will still be available to residents and visitors.

5. The Department is now in a position to send the scheme plan and an accompanying information letter to the residents of Strang Road. It is expected this will be completed by the end of this week.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Kevin Almond

Dear Mr. Almond,

kindly sent me a copy of your reply to him. As a resident of Strang Road, I have the following questions and comments.

* Why do both the schemes you mention only cover part of the road, from Ballanawin to Union Mills? The traffic you are trying to discourage also uses the section between Ballanawin and the Strang, and speeds are excessive on that section too (especially
downhill). For maximum effect, whatever is ultimately implemented really needs to cover the whole road. This is a key point.

* Why the focus on buses? As far as I am aware, this road is used by the bus authorities simply as a convenient short cut, rather than to pick up many passengers. Most or all buses could easily be routed along Peel Road, with the hospital and Strang being served by a loop from the Jubilee Oak. If they insist on relying on this road, I believe they should do so in a more subservient spirit.

* You state that the chicanes did not have the desired effect. Could you explain why you think the proposed buildouts will be more effective? One reason the chicanes failed was that they had to be wide enough to allow buses through - which also let cars and vans through without their needing to slow down much (if at all).

* How will the buildouts be situated to avoid causing significant disruption to residents? Your own officers have stated that this road is not ideal for siting chicanes/buildouts. I can confirm this, as one of the chicanes was situated right outside this house, which has no driveway and therefore relies on roadside parking. I later received an apology for this having been overlooked, and a comment that the chicanes should not have been placed there.

* If the buildout scheme goes ahead, will you be sharing details of the plans before they are implemented, so interested parties can raise reasonable and legitimate concerns or objections?

I look forward to hearing your responses to these points, and (like my fellow residents) seeing an equitable solution to this long-running problem agreed on and implemented very soon.
Dear Mr. Black,

I write to object to the Strang Road - Rural Roads (Speed Limits) (Amendment) Order 2016, Ref: PER39. The reasons are as follows:

- The DOI’s stated intention is to discourage traffic from using Strang Road as a shortcut, and reduce speeds of said traffic. This is in line with what was agreed after the hospital opened in 2004, and which has been reiterated in very recent communications from the department. Increasing a speed limit on half of a section of the road in question will not reduce either the volume or speed of traffic - quite the reverse.

- Plans are in hand to provide traffic calming measures on the other half of the road, between Ballanawin and Union Mills. There is no sense in treating the two halves of the road differently. Whatever measures are put in place should also be applied to the section between Ballanawin and the Strang, rather than relaxing the current speed limit.

- I regret to say there has been a demonstrable and serious lack of professionalism over the way the whole subject of traffic calming on this road has been approached. The evidence is in two parts, and I believe shows that the whole subject needs revisiting:
  1. After the resurfacing was completed, no calming measures at all were put in place for several months. Naturally, this encouraged higher traffic volumes and speeds, as shown by your own department’s figures. Next, residents were told that marked parking bays were expected to have a beneficial effect. They had no useful effect. (Again, as per your own department’s figures).
  2. After it was admitted (again by your own department) that the parking bays were useless in calming traffic, a trial was carried out of two chicanes. These not only failed to calm traffic (because they had to be wide enough to accommodate buses), but took away roadside parking near this house, which has no offroad parking. Your officers later admitted that they had failed to notice there was no driveway, and said that if they had done, the chicane would not have been put outside. The most charitable response to this is that at least they were honest about this truly astonishing blunder, and apologised.

- Residents have overwhelmingly requested additional traffic calming measures, not fewer. Your own department’s survey clearly showed this, and the input should be acted on.

Yours faithfully,
In answer to your query,

The questionnaire was employed to collect the views of residents regarding any future traffic calming scheme proposed for Strang Rd, and as such was used to supplement the Departments decision making process regarding the design of the scheme. The Department, nevertheless, had to take into account other factors, such as the likely deterrent effect of various traffic calming features on through traffic and their impact on other road users when deciding its preferred option.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Kevin Almond

--- Original message ---

Dear Mr Almond

I have another question for you to add to my previous ones:
9. Why have you ignored the response you received from the residents - in reply to the questionnaire that your Department issued through Jim Davidson on 25 June 2015 - which showed that 41% preferred speed cushions/bumps as opposed to 26% who preferred chicanes/priority junctions (which I assume include your road narrowings/build-outs as they do not appear anywhere else on your questionnaire), indeed what in your opinion was the purpose of this questionnaire if you ignore the opinion of the majority of respondents?

From: 25

Sent: 06 February 2016 10:34
To: Almond, Kevin
Cc: Gawne, Phil (MHK)
Subject: Re: Strang Road traffic calming

Dear Mr Almond

I refer to your email to which he has kindly sent a copy to me. I would appreciate your advice on the following:
1. You told that a "combination of road narrowings and build-outs placed on the south east side of Strang Road is considered on balance to
have a better deterrent effect on through traffic than speed cushions". Yet
Minister Phil Gawne told me on 5 October that "the officer advice
suggested that the removal of the speed bumps and replacement with other
controls was likely to have little impact on speed". I find it difficult to
relate these two statements to the single purpose of deterring both through
traffic and dealing with speed on Strang Road. Can you explain please?
2. What impact will the placing of road narrowings and build-outs have on
the ability of residents of nearby house to safely enter, exit and park
outside their own house?
3. Do you appreciate that these house owners will see a decrease in the value
of their properties when you place narrowings and build-outs outside,
neighbour or opposite their properties?
4. Are you aware that two houses on the road, 'Thie Cronk' and 'Glentaugh'
do not have off-road parking and that their owners rely on the ability to
safely park outside their own houses?
5. I fail to understand how road narrowings and build-outs are liable to be
more effective than the failed chicanes. Can you explain please?
6. Residents on Strang Road hill between Ballanawin and the Strang
crossroads are also concerned about speeding traffic on their section of the
road. Why are you not proposing to do to assist them in their dilemma?
7. Buses seem to be playing a major part in your considerations. Why do so
many of them have to use the narrow Strang Road?
8. Do you intend to show any plans of any schemes to the residents of the
road before proceeding with implementation?
I look forward to your advice on the above.
Mr K. Almond  
Traffic and Transportation Manager  
Department of Infrastructure  
Sea Terminal Building  
Douglas  
IM1 2RF  

15 November 2016

Dear Mr Almond

Strang Road traffic calming measures

Thank you for your email and letter of today’s date.

I accept your apology for your tardiness in replying to my letter of 6 August and my reminder of 3 November 2016. Everyone has holidays and varying degrees of workload, but few fail to reply to queries within a given target time, which I understand for the DOI is ten days.

Putting the above to one side, I still feel your replies to my numbers 2, 3 and 4 questions fail to give plausible answers:

2. The questionnaire you issued to the residents of Strang Road in 2015 asked their opinions on nine different forms of traffic calming measures. As I keep repeating, not one of your options was for a scheme which included planters and no-parking areas. At the public meeting called by Howard Quayle in 2016 you heard the objections to such a scheme. As I have said before, you have twice sought the opinions of the residents and you have twice ignored them. So much for our so-called caring government.

3. Your explanation on the rationale for bus routes ignores my query as to why and who changed a scheme for traffic calming in 2015 into a scheme to benefit buses and speeding vehicles to the detriment of the residents in 2016.

4. The latest proposed scheme will certainly help benefit the manoeuvring spaces for vehicles exiting four houses on the south side of Strang Road, but you know that it does so at the loss of fourteen roadside parking spaces for visitors and tradesmen visiting nine properties on the north side. Your plan positions a planter opposite and disallows parking outside this residence and parts of the adjoining two residences. You also know that has no off-street parking. This part of your works could be done away with, and, as long as it was not repositioned outside another residence,

Yet again, I encourage you to look again and come up with a scheme which benefits everyone.

Yours sincerely,
Dear [25],

Thank you for your letter of 22nd February, I have noted your observations. In answer to your questions contained within your letter.

1a. The installation of a traffic calming scheme will generally influence driver behaviour in two ways, firstly; drivers are likely to drive at a slower speed and secondly; the presence of traffic calming features influences the route choice of the driver.

1b. The Department undertook further assessment work and considered that that an alternative scheme design could achieve the required speed reduction and deter unnecessary through traffic.

2. As part of the design and assessment process the benefits and dis-benefits of a given design are considered. The Department then has to make balanced decision with regards to the aims and objectives of the scheme, impact on road users and local residents.

3. I am unable to comment on the view expressed by Mr Saunders. As previously stated the Department has no statutory duty to consider house prices when undertaking highway works.

4a. Regarding house values, please see my response to question 3.

4b. The Department understands that in some instances residents will need to park in alternative location to those which they been accustomed to.

5. Please see my response to question 2.

6. The Department understands individuals’ views of road safety problems are strongly influenced by the particular concerns that they have in relation to using the highway. Even at a local level an individual’s perception of how dangerous the location is and what its particular problems are can vary markedly. Factors such as their mode of travel, their age, their level of mobility and any difficulties they have personally experienced influence this. Road and traffic factors such as the volume of traffic, number of lorries, width of footways and availability of pedestrian facilities also influence this view. It is a complex process by which any individual measures or assesses relative safety or danger. In addition, their views are likely to change over time with human factors such as maturity, parental responsibility, experience or involvement in an accident or near miss. Against such a background the Department must take a structured risk based approach to identifying and tacking road safety problems.

7. I am unable add anything further to my previous comments on this matter. I will, however pass your comments on to Bus Vannin for their consideration.

8a. I am unable add anything further to my previous comments on this matter.

8b. With regards to speed cushions, though speed cushions generally cause bus passengers low levels of discomfort, this occurs only when the bus can properly align with the cushion on its approach so it straddles the cushion correctly. Where kerbside parking occurs in or around speed cushions, the correct angle of approach may not always be available to the bus driver.

Yours sincerely,

K Almond
From: [Redacted]
Date: 25 February 2016 at 16:07:52 GMT
To: "Almond, Kevin" <Kevin.Almond@gov.im>
Subject: RE: Strang Road traffic calming

Dear Mr Almond,

In your email replies to me a week ago you stated that if I should require any further information 'please do not hesitate to contact me'. This I did in the attached letter in which I asked could you give me the information requested before Howard Quayle's meeting this Saturday morning. Are you yet in a position to do so?

Isle of Man. Giving you freedom to flourish

WARNING: This email message and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may be subject to legal privilege. You must not copy or deliver it to any other person or use the contents in any unauthorised manner without the express permission of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee of this e-mail, please delete it and notify the sender as soon as possible.

No employee or agent is authorised to conclude any binding agreement on behalf of any of the Departments or Statutory Boards of the Isle of Man Government with any party by e-mail without express written confirmation by a Manager of the relevant Department or Statutory Board.

RAAUE: S’preевааджagh yn ʧагhтeraght post-l shoh ʧammah’s coadanyn erbee currit marish as ta shoh coadit ec y leigh. Cha nhegin diu coipal ny cur eh da peiagh erbee elley ny ymmydey yn chooid t’ayn er aght erbee dyn kied leayr veih’n choyrtaigh. Mannagh nee shiu yn ennyssagh kiirit jeh’n phost-l shoh, doll-shiu magh eh, my sailliu, as cur-shiu fys da’n choyrtaigh cha leah as oddys shiu.

Cha nel kied currit da failleydagh ny jantagh erbee conaant y yannoos rish peiagh ny possan erbee lesh post-l er son Rheynn ny Boayrd Slattysagh erbee jeh Reihtys Ellan Vannin dyn co-niartagh ey scruit leayr veih Reireyder y Rheynn ny Boayrd Slattysagh t’eh bentyn rish.
Dear Mr Almond

Strang Road traffic calming measures

has been chasing you again recently, and you have informed him that the planters and no-parking scheme is scheduled for the week commencing 12 December 2016.

1. I refer to my letter to you of 6 August 2016 to which I have never had a reply. I understand that a number of other residents of Strang Road also wrote to you around this time, and they too received no reply. Why?

2. In the summer of 2015 you issued a questionnaire to the residents of Strang Road. In question 10 you asked: ‘What form of traffic calming would you consider to be the most effective?’

- Speed cushions/humps
- Chicanes/priority junctions
- One way system
- Do nothing
- Smiley face speed indicator signs
- Ban buses and HGVs
- Original plans shown to Braddan Commissioners
- Cul-de-sac at Ballanawin
- Random police checks

The majority indicated that they preferred speed cushions/humps, but you completely dismissed their opinion and went for the chicanes option. You will clearly see in the questionnaire that you made no mention of planters and no-parking areas as an option. Anyway, your chicanes experiment failed. So you then went for the ludicrous planters and no-parking scheme which was opposed at a residents’ meeting arranged by Howard Quayle. You again dismissed the residents’ opinions. So, you have twice sought the opinions of the residents and you have twice ignored them. Why?

3. What started out as means of traffic calming and slowing down speeding vehicles has now been completely changed into a scheme to accommodate buses which will consequently encourage other motorists to speed along the clearways you wish to create. The traffic calming scheme has subsequently been hijacked to benefit buses and speeding vehicles to the detriment of the residents. Why?
4. You have referred to your new no-parking scheme benefitting access into and out of their driveways for residents on the south side of Strang Road. If you look at your plan carefully this can only be at four properties: ‘The Sycamores’, ‘Angler’s Walk’, ‘Forest Lodge’ and ‘Ravensdale’. You therefore dis-benefit residents and their visitors from parking outside nine houses on the north side: ‘Tymescot’, ‘Avondale’, ‘Lynwood’, ‘Sedbergh’, ‘Thie Ooylagh’, ‘Knotty Ash’, ‘Glentraugh’ (which if you look carefully at your plan you will see that it has no off-street parking), ‘Clovelly’ and ‘Thumper Cottage’. Your argument therefore satisfies the needs of a minority of four over the needs of a majority of nine. Why?

So, four questions which seek your reply on matters of concern which you are imposing on the residents of Strang Road. Yet again, I encourage you to look again and come up with a scheme which benefits everyone.

I have copied Howard Quayle, Middle MHK, in on this letter. I look forward to your, Jeff Robinson’s or Minister Ray Harmer’s speedy reply.

Yours sincerely,
Mr K. Almond
Traffic and Transportation Manager
Department of Infrastructure
Sea Terminal Building
Douglas
IM1 2RF

1 August 2016

Dear Mr Almond

Strang Road traffic calming measures

I refer to your letter attached to your email, both of today’s date.

Over the last year you have completely changed the focus of the above issue. In the summer of 2015 you issued a questionnaire to the residents of Strang Road. In question 10 you asked: ‘What form of traffic calming would you consider to be the most effective?’

- Speed cushions/humps
- Chicanes/priority junctions
- One way system
- Do nothing
- Smiley face speed indicator signs
- Ban buses and HGVs
- Original plans shown to Braddan Commissioners
- Cul-de-sac at Ballanawin
- Random police checks

The majority indicated that they preferred speed cushions/humps, but you completely discounted their opinion and went for the failed chicanes. You will clearly see in the questionnaire that you made no mention of no-parking areas and planters as an option. The traffic calming scheme has subsequently been high jacked to benefit buses and speeding vehicles to the detriment of the residents.

You state that ‘buses must use Strang Road’. You are wrong, they must not. Long before you, your colleagues and your opposite numbers in Isle of Man Transport ever came to the Isle of Man, the Manx Government spent a large amount of taxpayers’ money on constructing a long and high retaining wall going from the lower end of Braddan graveyard down to the Jubilee Oak at Braddan Bridge in order to make that area easier for buses and other large vehicles to negotiate in order to get to and from Nobles Hospital. Strang Road was signed ‘Local Access Only’, a weight restriction was imposed upon it, speed cushions were laid and the route to the hospital was indicated to be via the Jubilee Oak. What was right by your predecessors is now considered wrong by you, and no doubt when you move on your successors will come up with another scheme - all at the expense of ratepayers and the inconvenience of residents.

cc. J. Robinson, Director of Highway Services; P. Gawne, DOI Minister; H. Quayle, Middle MHK
You refer to your new no-parking scheme benefitting access into and out of their driveways for residents on the south side of Strang Road. If you look at your plan carefully this can only be at four properties: ‘The Sycamores’, ‘Angler’s Walk’, ‘Forest Lodge’ and ‘Ravensdale’. You therefore dis-benefit residents and their visitors from parking outside nine houses on the north side: ‘Tymescot’, ‘Avondale’, ‘Lynwood’, ‘Sedbergh’, ‘Thie Ooylahg’, ‘Knotty Ash’, ‘Glentraugh’ (which if you look carefully at your plan you will see that it has no off-street parking), ‘Clovelly’ and ‘Thumper Cottage’. Your argument therefore satisfies the needs of a minority of four over the needs of a majority of nine. Hardly fair whichever way you look at it.

What started out as means of traffic calming and slowing down speeding vehicles has now been completely changed into a scheme to accommodate buses which will consequently encourage other motorists to speed along the clearways you wish to create. Indeed, yesterday evening I was driving along the straight middle part of the road at the 20mph maximum speed. I noticed a motorcycle behind me whose rider was not happy with my legal speed, so he accelerated past and disappeared up the centre of the road at a speed which must have been very near to 50mph. Not one of your planters is going to discourage this sort behaviour, but speed bumps/humps/cushions would.

I encourage you to look again and come up with a scheme which benefits everyone.

Yours sincerely,

cc. J. Robinson, Director of Highway Services; P. Gawne, DOI Minister; H. Quayle, Middle MHK
Mr K. Almond
Traffic and Transportation Manager
Department of Infrastructure
Sea Terminal Building
Douglas
IM1 2RF

20 July 2016

Dear Mr Almond

Strang Road traffic calming measures

I refer to your letter attached to your email, both dated 20 July 2016. You appear to be intent on dealing with a problem by using a sledgehammer to break a nut.

Your absence from work should not have resulted in a late reply to my letter of 2 July. Mr Robinson or another officer could easily have replied in your absence. It means that a fait accompli has been achieved with the scheme due to start on Monday 25 July. No wonder the general public are suspicious and despair.

Your responses to my points do not bear scrutiny:

1. I suggested speed bumps at four areas, but you consider the road would need them at seven. I bow to you professional judgement. So, why cannot there be suitably engineered speed bumps, the preferred solution of the residents, reinstated at regular intervals?

2. You accept that parked vehicles do have an effect on vehicle speeds. But you have failed, for whatever reason, to answer my simple question, just how does removing any number of parked cars along a road help in any way to slow down passing traffic?

3. Linked in with number 2 above, I fail to understand your conclusion that ‘The proposed scheme has therefore, been designed to overcome factors”. In what way does clearing 1 to 24 parked vehicles (no matter what types of vehicle or durations of stay) from large areas along Strang Road help slow down passing vehicles?

4. Are Minister Phil Gawne and Middle MHK Howard Quayle happy with your scheme?

Again, I look forward to your early but considered reply to these questions. A speedy email attachment addressing my continued concerns would suffice.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Mr Almond,

I live at 25, Strang Road, Union Mills.

I returned from holiday last night to find your letter and the new plans for Strang Road. Your plan shows one blue arrow indicating vehicular access. All other properties have an arrow which indicates their driveways. However, I believe that my property should have a wider blue arrow or two blue arrows to indicate the difference in my property.

I have cause for concern over the positioning of the planters as they are positioned at the edge of my property. If the planters remain in this position it could cause us difficulty. It is already difficult on occasions now, as I wait for the road to clear behind me and in front, however some drivers travel so fast, they try to push you back too quickly. If the planters remain as indicated on your plans we may not be able due to speed of traffic on the road and the fact that previous vehicles owned by me had wing mirrors broken off or were scraped a number of times.

I did leave a recorded message on your answerphone this morning. I would be happy to discuss this with you either on the phone or in person. My phone number is 25.

Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely,
Good morning Kevin,

This is a slightly tardy email to say thank you so much for listening to the residents of the Strang and for the revised plans for calming the traffic on Strang Road. It looks good to me.

As I said at the public meeting, I am quite happy to "adopt" the planters outside our property and keep them fed and watered. (I'm sure Jeff promised to be a judge in the annual best planter competition!)

With many thanks and kind regards

Sent from my iPad
Kevin
I will need your help to reply to this!
Regards
Tim

-----Original Message-----
From: Cowin, Tim (DOI)
Sent: 16 January 2017 00:55
To: Cowin, Tim (DOI)
Cc: Harmer, Ray (MHK); Chief Minister
Subject: Re: Strang Road

Mr Cowin,

Thank you very much for your reply, it is heartwarming to actually receive a considered response at last. As you say surveys from 2014 identified the problem, we are now at the end of 2016. It is not unreasonable therefore that residents are totally fed up and angry, firstly with being totally ignored for the majority of that time, and secondly that it has taken this long to even address the problem.

Unfortunately, no matter what plan you put in place for this road, it will never be what you would like it to be, and that is a major thoroughfare, it is too narrow, and there is no scope or space for you to significantly improve and transform it.

Maybe the traffic calming schemes you refer to in the U.K. are effective in purely residential areas, I can see this working in say Governors Hill. The public have been educated because of the speed bumps not to abuse the speed there. However you would not introduce this scheme on the road through Crosby to control speeds, would you? No because that would not be a very good placement of this type of scheme, and that what it feels like here.

The trouble is, this road is neither one thing or the other, it is a confusion, a mix up of what your department would like it to be, a major artery to the hospital and Douglas, and a residential area with an understandable aversion to speeding traffic.

But I do not disagree with you, this type of calming may be working in the U.K. in areas where currently speed bumps serve to control speed.

This road unfortunately, because of Government inaction over the past two years is not one of them. You cannot just dump a load of planters and expect that to solve the problem.

This road cannot serve two purposes, it's either zoned as a major route, a job it is not really up to, or it is a residential area which warrants proper controls to deter heavy traffic flow.

Currently it is a major route for peak times, and trying to control the speed of those cars with a bunch of unattractive planters.

It is a residential road, with cars pulling in and out of many driveways, and the pavements in places, since resurfacing are virtually at road level and already a safety issue for pedestrians.

So to suggest that your department could have made things a lot worse for us by taking away all parking places and increasing the speed limit would have been a decision to totally dismiss your responsibility for road safety, and create an even worse situation.

It would have been nice to have seen plans which involved the use of those strategically placed speed bumps, and the effect on parking for residents, before it was just dismissed by your department as annoying, damaging, and a pollution creator.

Integral road bumps could have been introduced when the road was resurfaced. But that was rushed, an additional top layer of tarmac laid, and all that produced was a race track surface, lower dangerous pavements, increased flooding for residents on the river side, and a permanent 10' x 2' puddle outside Grove Villa.
As I said this road cannot perform miracles, and although it can act as an overflow for heavy traffic flow, at the end of the day we all end up at the Jubilee Oak, Quarterbridge, Tromode or St Ninians. How far out of Douglas are you going to extend the attempt to ease traffic flow into Douglas?

Perhaps rather than Government applying plasters to problems they have created, and expect your department to jump through hoops. They should be addressing the problem of concentrating all business and employment in Douglas, and offer some sort of incentives to employers to base their businesses in Peel, Ramsey or south of the Island, taking the strain off the road network.

Because at the end of the day, you are trying to improve the 'new estates' quality of life, their journey to work, at the expense of our.

So don't tell me that speed bumps have an impact on pollution, when actually all you are doing by trying to improve routes for car usage is increasing pollution!

Where is the bigger picture, the diversity of employment throughout the island, and a more environmentally conscious public transport service.

I hope your survey equipment has now given you the picture of speed you wanted. I would suggest that it has helped at peak times, by creating traffic jams and stopping cars between pots (not a pollution problem?).

Giving way to oncoming traffic will always slow down cars. However I would be interested in the speed of cars using the road at other times of the day, because I have seen evidence of many cars and vans still speeding up and down this road when nothing presents itself in the other direction.

Again I will say that there is nothing ambiguous about a set of speed bumps which are effective at all times because as you quite rightly point out drivers do not want to damage their cars, and are forced to control their speeds. The road then, with the correct warning signage becomes a choice to the driver whether to use the road or not.

A bypass road through Camlork was a proper solution to increased traffic flow to the hospital, something this household did not oppose.

You are also correct that traffic calming measures are never popular, like the horse trams it is impossible to please everyone.

However I will say again that almost to a man the residents on this road did not want this scheme. It has devalued the value of our properties because it is total overkill and looks ridiculous, and who would want to buy a nice house on a stupid looking road?

There must be a point in law for the deliberate deterioration in value of a residential area by the actions of local government.

Whilst we are acutely aware that the priority plan for this road considers the buses and hospital workers before any consideration for its residents, the unrest will not go away.

We did want something done about the abuse of the speed limit, but to be honest your solution is almost as aggravating, and it's now a difficult choice between the two evils.

I look forward to seeing the results of the survey, assuming it will be for public perusal.

Again many thanks for your response.

> On 20 Dec 2016, at 16:07, Cowin, Tim (DOI) <tim.cowin@gov.im> wrote:
> >
> > Thank you for your email below, addressed to my Minister, who is on leave until after Christmas. I am therefore responding on his behalf.
> >
> > There has been considerable interest and debate about this scheme since it was installed a week ago. I believe at we are in agreement that the speed of traffic needs to be managed on Strang Road; however, we seem to disagree on the method of controlling the speed, and I have provided below for you the Department's position and rationale behind selecting the current scheme as the most appropriate in the circumstances:
The traffic calming measures on Strang Road have been installed to reduce the speed of vehicles using this route.

There has been virtually no compliance with the 20mph speed limit on Strang Road and traffic surveys carried out in 2014 and in 2015 demonstrated that more than 13,000 drivers per week were exceeding the limit. The Department are responsible for road safety and have taken action.

As the size of Peel has grown and development has continued around the area of Noble’s Hospital, this route has become increasingly important. It is needed to take the pressure away from the Jubilee Oak Tree roundabout at peak times of the day.

The Department of Infrastructure considered many options to reduce the speed of traffic while maintaining the importance the road as a through route to the hospital area.

The speed bumps previously in place had only a limited effect on speeds. To install bus-friendly humps to the correct standard to reduce the speed appropriately would mean that much of the parking on the road would be lost.

In addition, speed bumps are not ideal for bus routes, causing damage to vehicles and making life uncomfortable for passengers. They also damage the road and lead to increased pollution.

The alternative route into the area along Eyreton Road through Mount Rule has a poor safety record, with many recorded road traffic collisions. It cannot be substantially improved easily, although some safety improvements are planned for the New Year.

Another alternative was to remove most of the parking from Strang Road and increase the speed limit, but this was considered inappropriate at this time.

The Department understands that traffic calming measures are never popular. However, they are important. Its Highways Team has sought to make a balanced decision based on a wide range of factors, while retaining the overall objective of maintaining an increasingly important distribution route for traffic.

Initial feedback and observations suggest that traffic speeds have reduced significantly since the introduction of the planters. The Department continues to monitor the road and is making minor adjustments to optimise the scheme.

When the exact positions of the planters are finalised the Department will paint the required parking restrictions on the road and remove the police cones. This will both enhance the overall look of the scheme and improve traffic movements.

The introduction of planters is viewed as a more innovative approach to traffic calming and has proven successful elsewhere. Indeed, in many parts of the UK speed bumps are being removed and replaced with schemes similar to this one.

In time, the Department hopes that the plants in the planters will grow and become established, creating a softer look more suited to a residential environment.

As stated above, the planters have been in place for a little over one week and, as you are aware, the appropriate lining is still to be applied to the road to finalise the scheme.

I hope the foregoing helps to explain the Department's position.

Regards

Tim Cowin BEng. CEng. CEnv. FIMechE

Highway and Asset Management
Highway Services Division
Department of Infrastructure
Sea Terminal
Douglas
Mr Harmer,

As suggested in my previous email, traffic speed has not been significantly reduced on Strang Road, although it is intermittently reduced as and when there are oncoming vehicles to give way to. As in fact was always the case with parked vehicles on the road.

So it's a partial result and you might want to congratulate your CEO's on a job partially well done.

The fact that it's a complete eyesore, and we still have cars bombing through the chicanes when presented with no oncoming traffic is perhaps acceptable?

Mr Almond who is now cowardly trying to blame the residents of Strang Road in his recent radio broadcast, for 'forcing' the DOI to do something about speeding traffic.

Were we mistaken in thinking that road safety was the responsibility of the DOI, and therefore the responsibility of their decision to place plant pots along this road does lie with them?

Has he conveniently forgotten that at the residents meeting we almost to a man said we did not want 'overkill' on the road, therefore we did not want the ridiculous plans put forward, the general feeling was the reinstatement of the sleeping policemen was all that was needed. Those had worked for the previous 8 years, there were no complaints (apart from the buses of course), and they definitely cut out over 90% of the speeding.

I would add at this point, sleeping policemen were introduced at the request of the residents back then because of the increased traffic using the road for the hospital, so job done and it was successful.

So maybe your CEO's should not to bother in future asking for the publics opinion if they don't want to hear the results, it's a waste of time, and makes people even more angry as they know they've been completely ignored.

The job lot of available planters and the arrogance of the DOI made sure their plan was what we were going to get.

I hope you have been up or down Strang Road and can honestly see the complete eyesore you are confronted with, and please look for that 'sense of place' I was promised by the DOI, because I am failing to find it.

The road is a mess, and now the parking rather than what the DOI have done, is being targeted as the obstruction. None of this parking was a problem before, the speed was not a problem (with speed bumps) before, and the residents were happy, before. The general public (again apart from the buses) using the road knew they had to stick to the speed limit because of the sleeping policemen, so made a decision to use the road or not, before.

The DOI, through being 'forced' to address the speeding problem, has gone completely overboard, p...s...d off the residents, p...s...d off general road users, and the fire services are also not happy with the road now.

I look towards TT week if God forbid these things are still here, when cars and bikes are parked bumper to bumper along this road. There will be no respect for access, gaps too small to allow an ambulance, or fire engine through will not be left. So fingers crossed there's no serious incident or fire in a house along this road then.

Plus the fact it actually isn't fit for purpose anyway. Any obstacle, parked car, plant pot or pile of manure will force a car to stop and slow down to let an oncoming vehicle through, but that is far short of 100% of the time as this road does not have constant traffic flow in both directions. Therefore an open road will be abused, and is still being abused. So it has basically failed to do what we asked the DOI to do, address the speeding issue.
It's difficult in a position of power to please everyone, the most you can hope to achieve with honesty and fairness, is respect. I think you may struggle to even achieve that whilst a bunch of ridiculous people behave so arrogantly as if they are the most important people, and ignore the people they are supposed to be civil servants to.

Decisions have to be made, not everyone will get what they want, it's a tough job, of course that's understood. But in this case nobody got a good result, your department is being lambasted, questioned and ridiculed, because let's face it, it does look stupid.

We are still frustrated by speeding traffic, and now complaints that our cars are in the way. General road users are asking 'who the hell devised this?'

But joy of joy I witnessed two face to face buses on the hill on Wednesday with nowhere to go, hilarious!

Sent from my iPad

Isle of Man. Giving you freedom to flourish

WARNING: This email message and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may be subject to legal privilege. You must not copy or deliver it to any other person or use the contents in any unauthorised manner without the express permission of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee of this e-mail, please delete it and notify the sender as soon as possible.

No employee or agent is authorised to conclude any binding agreement on behalf of any of the Departments or Statutory Boards of the Isle of Man Government with any party by e-mail without express written confirmation by a Manager of the relevant Department or Statutory Board.

RAAUE: S’preevaadjagh yn ãchgetheraghjt post-l shoh chammah’s coadanyt erbee currit marish as ta shoh coadit ec y leigh. Cha nhegin diu coipal ny cur eh da peiagh erbee elley ny ymmoney dey ny choid t’ayn er aght erbee dyn kied leayr veih’n choyrtagh. Mannagh nee shiu yn enmyssagh kiariit jeh’n phost-l shoh, doll-shiu magh eh, my sailliu, as cur-shiu fys da´n choyrtagh cha leah as oddys shiu.

Cha nel kied currit da failleydagh ny jantagh erbee conaant y yannoo rish peiagh ny possan erbee lesh post-l er son Rheynn ny Boayrd Slattysagagh erbee jeh Reiltys Ellan Vannin dyn co-niartaghey scrutin leayr veih Reireyder y Rheynn ny Boayrd Slattysagagh t’eh bentyn rish.
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Almond, Kevin" <Kevin.Almond@gov.im>
Date: 18 February 2016 at 15:38:16 GMT
To: "Gawne, Phil (MHK)" <Phil.Gawne@gov.im>
Subject: RE: Strang Road Traffic Calming

Dear [Name],

Thank you for your comments and observation on both the proposed traffic calming and pedestrian/vehicular traffic behaviour on Strang Rd; these have been noted.

With regards to speed cushions, though speed cushions generally cause bus passengers low levels of discomfort, this occurs only when the bus can properly align with the cushion on its approach so it straddles the cushion correctly. Where kerbside parking occurs in or around speed cushions, the correct angle of approach may not always be available to the bus driver.

Thank for attaching a copy of your letter to Mr Davidson. Are you proposing to undertake further vehicular speed surveys when the proposed scheme is implemented? If you are, I would be interested in the data; therefore, it would be useful to liaise with you to discuss your survey methodology. Regarding 'Table 1.1 Summary of measures and their relative performance' (Local Transport Note 1/07) – this table indicates the general performance of individual measures. However, most if not all traffic calming schemes will include several types of measure which will be integrated into a design to achieve the particular aims of the scheme within constraints imposed by users and/or the location.

The Department is now in a position to send the scheme plan and an accompanying information letter to the residents of Strang Road. It is expected this will be completed by the end of this week.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Kevin Almond
Subject: Strang Road Traffic Calming

Dear Mr Almond,

We received a copy of your email to regarding the traffic calming measures to be installed on Strang Road, i.e., road-narrowing and build-outs in the section from Peel Road to Ballanawin.

While composing this email to you we were advised by a fellow resident that it is the DOI’s aim to change the speed limit from Ballanawin to Strang Crossroads from 20mph to 30mph. This dramatically changes our understanding of the sorry saga of traffic calming on Strang Road. Nevertheless, we are directing our comments to you in good faith, largely unchanged, as a marker for future reference.

Without knowing details of the degree of the road narrowing, the extension of build-outs, and the precise positioning of each, we can’t comment on what effect they may have on traffic speed and volume. We are surprised, from our own findings on the ineffectiveness of the previous temporary build-outs and the difficulties they caused for some residents of Strang Road, to find that they are considered to be the measures of choice by the Department of Infrastructure despite the Department’s own evidence against them.

The speed cushions/speed tables previously installed were 75mm high and were narrow enough to be straddled by a bus. Your contention that their design had an adverse impact on the ride quality experienced by drivers and passengers in modern low-floor buses is nonsense. They were, for practical purposes, invisible to buses. Buses straddled them as per design, so there was no deflection of bus wheels. With a vertical height of 75mm, there was no danger of contacting the chassis of a bus travelling over them. Buses are daily negotiating such traffic calming measures elsewhere on the island without incident, for example, at Ballaughton Manor Hill off Saddle Road, Birch Hill Onchan, Governors Hill, Tromode Park, and Willaston Primary School. Your statement regarding the effect of the previous traffic calming measures on ride quality is therefore spurious. Your reference specifically to low-floor buses is misleading because, as you know, such buses are equipped with variable suspension and are only low when passengers are boarding or alighting, after which the bus returns to its normal ride height at the push of a button.

An often overlooked consequence of poor traffic calming, which has not been considered by the DOI, is the question of traffic noise. Although present throughout the day, late at night and early in the morning the noise level from vehicles apparently travelling at well over the speed limit on Strang Road has forced residents, including us, to move from a bedroom at the front of the house to one at the rear in order to have any chance of undisturbed sleep.

It is important to note that there is a footway on only one side of Strang Road. It is narrow and in places is no higher than the carriageway. Vehicles have made use of this to gain more space in heavy traffic conditions by mounting it, on one occasion narrowly missing a few of us standing talking at a gateway. The section from Ballanawin to Strang Crossroads is particularly hazardous, and will become even worse if the speed limit is raised as proposed from 20 mph to 30 mph, because vehicles already accelerate both ways between Ballanawin and Strang Crossroads, often passing extremely close to the footway, intimidating pedestrians and cyclists.
and making it difficult for vehicles to enter this section of the road from residents’ driveways. For anyone on foot, crossing from the footway to Ballanawin, especially if elderly or with a pram, is even more hazardous because Strang Road curves to the left coming uphill towards Ballanawin. Pedestrians can therefore easily find themselves on the carriageway, with previously unseen vehicles travelling at high speed round the curve and bearing down on them. At this location, as indeed all along Strang Road, when pedestrians approach each other on the footway, one or the other has to give way by stepping onto the carriageway, exposing them to danger from approaching vehicles.

To increase the speed limit from 20 mph to 30 mph between Ballanawin and Strang Crossroads would encourage higher speeds in the 20 mph limit existing elsewhere on the road and would encourage motorists to use Strang Road as a shortcut rather than dissuade them. Such a change in speed limit would be highly irresponsible, and will be strongly opposed by Strang Road residents.

Speed cushions/speed tables are recognised to be the most effective of traffic calming measures. This is clearly indicated on page 9, ‘Local Transport Note 1/07’ from the UK Department of Transport as observed in our letter of 16 November 2015, to Jim Davidson (copy attached). As noted in his email to you of 6 February 2016, the largest group of residents responding to the DOI’s questionnaire of 17 June 2015 preferred the most effective of traffic calming measures, i.e., speed cushions/humps. For these reasons, there is no justification for imposing on us an inferior alternative.

Your comments would be appreciated.
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Almond, Kevin" <Kevin.Almond@gov.im>
Date: 18 February 2016 at 15:38:16 GMT
To: 
Cc: "Gawne, Phil (MHK)" <Phil.Gawne@gov.im>
Subject: RE: Strang Road Traffic Calming

Dear 

Thank you for your comments and observation on both the proposed traffic calming and pedestrian/vehicular traffic behaviour on Strang Rd; these have been noted. With regards to speed cushions, though speed cushions generally cause bus passengers low levels of discomfort, this occurs only when the bus can properly align with the cushion on its approach so it straddles the cushion correctly. Where kerbside parking occurs in or around speed cushions, the correct angle of approach may not always be available to the bus driver.

Thank for attaching a copy of your letter to Mr Davidson. Are you proposing to undertake further vehicular speed surveys when the proposed scheme is implemented? If you are, I would be interested in the data; therefore, it would be useful to liaise with you to discuss your survey methodology. Regarding ‘Table 1.1 Summary of measures and their relative performance’ (Local Transport Note 1/07) – this table indicates the general performance of individual measures. However, most if not all traffic calming schemes will include several types of measure which will be integrated into a design to achieve the particular aims of the scheme within constraints imposed by users and/or the location.

The Department is now in a position to send the scheme plan and an accompanying information letter to the residents of Strang Road. It is expected this will be completed by the end of this week.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Kevin Almond

---

Subject: Strang Road Traffic Calming

Dear Mr Almond,

We received a copy of your email regarding the traffic calming measures to be installed on Strang Road, i.e., road-narrowing and build-outs in the section from Peel Road to Ballanawin.

While composing this email to you we were advised by a fellow resident that it is the
DOI’s aim to change the speed limit from Ballanawin to Strang Crossroads from 20mph to 30mph. This dramatically changes our understanding of the sorry saga of traffic calming on Strang Road. Nevertheless, we are directing our comments to you in good faith, largely unchanged, as a marker for future reference. Without knowing details of the degree of the road narrowing, the extension of build-outs, and the precise positioning of each, we can’t comment on what effect they may have on traffic speed and volume. We are surprised, from our own findings on the ineffectiveness of the previous temporary build-outs and the difficulties they caused for some residents of Strang Road, to find that they are considered to be the measures of choice by the Department of Infrastructure despite the Department’s own evidence against them.

The speed cushions/speed tables previously installed were 75mm high and were narrow enough to be straddled by a bus. Your contention that their design had an adverse impact on the ride quality experienced by drivers and passengers in modern low-floor buses is nonsense. They were, for practical purposes, invisible to buses. Buses straddled them as per design, so there was no deflection of bus wheels. With a vertical height of 75mm, there was no danger of contacting the chassis of a bus travelling over them. Buses are daily negotiating such traffic calming measures elsewhere on the island without incident, for example, at Ballaughton Manor Hill off Saddle Road, Birch Hill Onchan, Governors Hill, Tromode Park, and Willaston Primary School. Your statement regarding the effect of the previous traffic calming measures on ride quality is therefore spurious. Your reference specifically to low-floor buses is misleading because, as you know, such buses are equipped with variable suspension and are only low when passengers are boarding or alighting, after which the bus returns to its normal ride height at the push of a button.

An often overlooked consequence of poor traffic calming, which has not been considered by the DOI, is the question of traffic noise. Although present throughout the day, late at night and early in the morning the noise level from vehicles apparently travelling at well over the speed limit on Strang Road has forced residents, including us, to move from a bedroom at the front of the house to one at the rear in order to have any chance of undisturbed sleep.

It is important to note that there is a footway on only one side of Strang Road. It is narrow and in places is no higher than the carriageway. Vehicles have made use of this to gain more space in heavy traffic conditions by mounting it, on one occasion narrowly missing a few of us standing talking at a gateway. The section from Ballanawin to Strang Crossroads is particularly hazardous, and will become even worse if the speed limit is raised as proposed from 20 mph to 30 mph, because vehicles already accelerate both ways between Ballanawin and Strang Crossroads, often passing extremely close to the footway, intimidating pedestrians and cyclists, and making it difficult for vehicles to enter this section of the road from residents’ driveways. For anyone on foot, crossing from the footway to Ballanawin, especially if elderly or with a pram, is even more hazardous because Strang Road curves to the left coming uphill towards Ballanawin. Pedestrians can therefore easily find themselves on the carriageway, with previously unseen vehicles travelling at high speed round the curve and bearing down on them. At this location, as indeed all along Strang Road, when pedestrians approach each other on the footway, one or the other has to give way by stepping onto the carriageway, exposing them to danger from approaching vehicles.

To increase the speed limit from 20 mph to 30 mph between Ballanawin and Strang Crossroads would encourage higher speeds in the 20 mph limit existing elsewhere on the road and would encourage motorists to use Strang Road as a shortcut rather than dissuade them. Such a change in speed limit would be highly irresponsible, and will be strongly opposed by Strang Road residents.

Speed cushions/speed tables are recognised to be the most effective of traffic calming measures. This is clearly indicated on page 9, ‘Local Transport Note 1/07’ from the UK
Department of Transport as observed in our letter of 16 November 2015, to Jim Davidson (copy attached). As noted in his email to you of 6 February 2016, the largest group of residents responding to the DOI’s questionnaire of 17 June 2015 preferred the most effective of traffic calming measures, i.e., speed cushions/humps. For these reasons, there is no justification for imposing on us an inferior alternative. Your comments would be appreciated.
Dear Mr Almond,

I am writing in response to your letter received on Friday 19 February 2016 relating to Strang Road.

Firstly, thank you for informing us and other residents of the Department's intentions. We have waited a considerable amount of time to find out how the Department intends to resolve the issues of traffic speed and vehicle volumes using Strang Road since its decision not to reinstall the speed cushions that had provided a perfectly adequate method of slowing traffic and discouraging people that are not residents of the area from using the road as a cut-through.

By way of background, we moved to our home in Strang Road. One of the factors that attracted us to Strang Road was the quietness of the area and the fact that traffic calming measures were in place, something we assumed would remain as who in their right mind would choose to remove something that was required (both in terms of actual need and as a condition of the planning application for the hospital)? We also enjoy the strong community spirit on Strang Road and we were confident that we would stay here for many years.

It was with great disappointment that we learned that the Department was minded not to reinstall the speed cushions that had proven to be so effective. Not surprisingly, their removal resulted in significant increases in traffic speed and volume. It is now common to witness cars travelling at speeds in excess of 60mph along the road which is outrageous in itself but also a direct result of the Department's actions. We would be happy for representatives of the Department to stand in our front garden to witness for themselves the situation as it now stands - I'm sure it would demonstrate just how serious the situation has become.

In August last year we sadly lost one of our cats which was hit by a car on Strang Road. It is difficult not to conclude that the likelihood of this happening was increased by the fact that far more vehicles are using Strang Road and are traveling at faster speeds. The dramatic increase in speeds and numbers of vehicles has resulted in us reluctantly putting our home on the market. We were in the process of having plans drawn up to extend but given the situation and the Department's refusal to reinstate the only method of traffic calming that will work on a straight section of road we feel we have little choice.

Turning to the latest proposals which accompanied your letter, we have several concerns.

1. Why has the Department ruled out speed cushions when they have proven to be successful both on Strang Road and in other locations throughout the Island? If the only reason is the comfort of bus passengers then we would challenge the logic of this. Speed cushions are designed to allow buses to pass them without causing discomfort to passengers. That is the whole idea of using them. If a bus is travelling below 20mph there should be absolutely no discomfort caused to passengers. So this reasoning is entirely flawed. Furthermore, even if discomfort of bus passengers was considered to be an issue, why should this outweigh the dramatic negative impact that the speeding and volume of
traffic is having on residents who live on Strang Road?

2. Given the failure of the trial of build outs undertaken last year, we highly doubt that the proposals will provide a satisfactory resolution to the issues. Why is more money being spent on a flawed proposal when speed cushions have been demonstrated to be the appropriate method of traffic calming whilst discouraging people from using Strang Road. Furthermore, the proposed planters will not provide the required screening to cause drivers to slow down, instead drivers will be able to see beyond them and if the road ahead is clear they will accelerate past them.

3. From the plans, we are concerned that access and egress onto our driveway will be more difficult than at present given that vehicles will be approaching from both directions on the side of the road nearest to our access.

We are at the point of despair with this whole situation which has rumbled on unnecessarily for over a year. I cannot believe that the refusal of the Department to reinstall the speed cushions is based on professional advice and if challenged would fail to stand up to appropriate scrutiny.

To conclude, we, like many other residents would respectfully ask that the Department reinstall speed cushions as a matter of urgency.

Regards,
Good Morning Gentlemen -

Nothing Changes. The only reason the parking places are being removed is to make life easier for the buses. The original scheme involved the creation of parking spaces as a traffic calming measure.

The subsequent trials of build-outs with various layouts using plastic barriers have been unsatisfactory because they were not placed on the ground according to the original plan. The spacing of these blocks were left more open as the personnel working on the ground told me: "there was not enough room to allow for the passage of the buses" hence the more open layout than was drawn on the plan originally. It follows therefore that all subsequent placing of similar build outs were more open than had been originally envisaged.

This brings me to the conclusion that build-outs of themselves are not going to have the desired effect. I am therefore at a loss to understand the thinking behind doing away with parking spaces which were part of your original traffic calming proposals, and would require road users to drive more carefully which surely is the object of the exercise!.

Other road users have not been deterred by build-outs, but any cars using the parking spaces would have a calming effect.

This brings me to the question of cost.

At the time that it was decided to resurface the highway, the areas at the access to the various property drives was resurfaced with kerbs and tarmac. The remaining stretches were left. The explanation I was given was that the Department did not have the finance to do the job at the time. I am told that this work is to be started next week. I am sure that this will involve disturbing the edges of the newly laid road if the broken kerbs are to receive attention.. This way of working can hardly be cost effective.

Add this to the ongoing tinkering with build-outs and planters I dread to imagine the wasteful use of manpower and resources involved to date!

I understand the dilemma of the Department.

With the passage of time there are ever more vehicles on the road especially those from the West of the Island following completed developments and further proposals for housing development in these areas. This is aggravating the problems at Quarterbridge and Braddan Bridge hence the desire to reduce pressure on the Peel to Douglas route by routing the hospital traffic via Strang Road. However this should not take precedence over the Residents who live here, over the road users and public transport who use this highway as a convenient shortcut.

Yours sincerely,
Dear [Name],

As Head of Highway and Asset Management at the Department of Infrastructure I have been asked to respond to your email by the Chief Minister.

My colleagues have continued to monitor Strang Road since the maintenance works undertaken during December 2014 and January 2015, and reports have shown that driver compliance with the 20 mph speed limit has been poor during this period. The speed survey results (see below) show that drivers are not adapting their speed to the street environment to reduce risk to other road users and residents. This evidence adds weight to the Department’s view that driver choice of speed, and thus compliance with a speed limit, is based upon a complex set of cognitive factors. On their own, 20mph speed limit signs do not create the conditions for compliance without a high level of visible enforcement and police surveillance to increase the motivation of drivers to comply with speed limits in general on the Island. Therefore, the Department’s policy to introduce a change in the road environment through traffic calming measures was necessary to encourage drivers to comply with the speed limit.

I appreciate that a number of people have strong opinions on the scheme. Various types of traffic calming measures were considered. Each type of traffic calming, be it horizontal (e.g. road narrowing) or vertical (e.g. speed cushions), changes the geometry of the carriageway and therefore influences a driver’s choice of speed. Each type of feature has various advantages and disadvantages. As part of the design and assessment process the benefits and drawbacks of each of these types were fully considered. The Department then had to make a balanced decision on which types of traffic calming to use, taking account of the aims and objectives of the scheme, impact on road users and on local residents.

- Average vehicle speeds - 26mph (August 2016). The Department uses the 85th percentile speed to set speed limits. The recorded 85th percentile speed was 31mph.
- The highest recorded vehicular speed recorded was 99mph in February 2015. The maximum vehicle speed recorded in August 2016 was 67mph.

I acknowledge that the work that has been undertaken will have slowed down vehicular progress through Strang Road, which was the intention of the scheme, but I hope that drivers appreciate that we this Department is trying to be innovative in its approach to balancing the needs of the various people who live on and travel along Strang Road. There will be a period of adjustment for users of the road and the Department will be monitoring traffic flows and adjusting the layout where necessary over the coming days. Now that the New Year is with us the Department will undertake further data collection and will review the performance of the scheme against its expectations.

In the interim, I can advise you that Braddan Commissioners undertook a traffic survey for the 5 days from Thursday 15th to Monday 19th December 2016. Results indicate an average speed of 21mph and an 85th percentile speed of 26mph, which reflect a reduction of 5mph in both cases. The maximum recorded speed was 50mph compared to 67mph recorded in August 2016.
As mentioned above, the ongoing data collection will inform the Department of any changes required to
the scheme. Your e-mail of objection will be taken into account in the Department’s review of the scheme’s
performance.

Best regards

Tim Cowin BEng. CEng. CEnv. FI MechE

Highway and Asset Management
Highway Services Division
Department of Infrastructure
Sea Terminal
Douglas
Isle of Man
IM1 2RF

Tel: 01624 720930
Mob: 07624 398439
Tim.cowin@gov.im

---

From: [redacted]
Sent: 14 December 2016 17:26
To: Chief Minister
Subject: FW: Obstructions in Strang Road

Forwarding, as your email address as listed on does not appear to exist

---

From: [redacted]
Sent: 14 December 2016 17:23
To: 'Quayle, Howard (MHK)'; Shimmins, Bill (MHK); Harmer, Ray (MHK)
Subject: Obstructions in Strang Road

Dear Sirs

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the ludicrous obstructions which have been placed
in Strang Road, Union Mills this week.

These are clearly designed to deter as many people as possible from using this road, which is
unacceptable. As well as being a bus route, Strang Road is a critical route for those of us who live in Strang
and the Baldwins to access our local Braddan amenities, such as our local post office, supermarket, petrol
station, commissioners’ offices, children’s playground, churches, etc. I cannot believe that the businesses
in Union Mills are happy with potentially losing the custom of a large part of their local catchment area.

It is not even clear to me why Strang Road needs to have a 20mph restriction, as it is not a road used by
pedestrians, has no children playing, no schools or other public buildings, no shops, and all the houses are
set well back from the road behind hedges etc. There are many other roads on the Island which would be
much higher up the priority list for 20mph restrictions. However if Strang Road is to be a 20mph road, for
whatever reason, the appropriate solution would be for the police to enforce the limit, preferably via
speed cameras. Barricading the road with ugly structures and denying local residents access to their
community is completely unacceptable. The obstructions at the top end are particularly ludicrous given
the almost complete absence of houses, and the obstructions at the bottom end are unnecessary, given
that residents park their cars along the road and narrow it to less than two cars’ width anyway.
Please confirm what avenues are open to Braddan residents who are not residents of Strang Road to object to and preferably overturn this decision.

Yours faithfully
From: Cowin, Tim (DOI)  
Sent: 04 January 2017 09:53  
To:  
Subject: FW: Obstructions in Strang Road  
Categories: Consultation  

Dear  

As Head of Highway and Asset Management at the Department of Infrastructure I have been asked to respond to your email by the Chief Minister.

My colleagues have continued to monitor Strang Road since the maintenance works undertaken during December 2014 and January 2015, and reports have shown that driver compliance with the 20 mph speed limit has been poor during this period. The speed survey results (see below) show that drivers are not adapting their speed to the street environment to reduce risk to other road users and residents. This evidence adds weight to the Department’s view that driver choice of speed, and thus compliance with a speed limit, is based upon a complex set of cognitive factors. On their own, 20mph speed limit signs do not create the conditions for compliance without a high level of visible enforcement and police surveillance to increase the motivation of drivers to comply with speed limits in general on the Island. Therefore, the Department’s policy to introduce a change in the road environment through traffic calming measures was necessary to encourage drivers to comply with the speed limit.

I appreciate that a number of people have strong opinions on the scheme. Various types of traffic calming measures were considered. Each type of traffic calming, be it horizontal (e.g. road narrowing) or vertical (e.g. speed cushions), changes the geometry of the carriageway and therefore influences a driver’s choice of speed. Each type of feature has various advantages and disadvantages. As part of the design and assessment process the benefits and drawbacks of each of these types were fully considered. The Department then had to make a balanced decision on which types of traffic calming to use, taking account of the aims and objectives of the scheme, impact on road users and on local residents.

* Average vehicle speeds - 26mph (August 2016). The Department uses the 85th percentile speed to set speed limits. The recorded 85th percentile speed was 31mph.  
* The highest recorded vehicular speed recorded was 99mph in February 2015. The maximum vehicle speed recorded in August 2016 was 67mph.

I acknowledge that the work that has been undertaken will have slowed down vehicular progress through Strang Road, which was the intention of the scheme, but I hope that drivers appreciate that we this Department is trying to be innovative in its approach to balancing the needs of the various people who live on and travel along Strang Road. There will be a period of adjustment for users of the road and the Department will be monitoring traffic flows and adjusting the layout where necessary over the coming days. Now that the New Year is with us the Department will undertake further data collection and will review the performance of the scheme against its expectations.

In the interim, I can advise you that Braddan Commissioners undertook a traffic survey for the 5 days from Thursday 15th to Monday 19th December 2016. Results indicate an average speed of 21mph and an 85th percentile speed of 26mph, which reflect a reduction of 5mph in both cases. The maximum recorded speed was 50mph compared to 67mph recorded in August 2016.
As mentioned above, the ongoing data collection will inform the Department of any changes required to the scheme. Your e-mail of objection will be taken into account in the Department’s review of the scheme’s performance.

Best regards

Tim Cowin BEng. CEng. CEnv. FI MechE

Highway and Asset Management
Highway Services Division
Department of Infrastructure
Sea Terminal
Douglas
Isle of Man
IM1 2RF

Tel: 01624 720930
Mob: 07624 398439
Tim.cowin@gov.im

From:  
Sent: 14 December 2016 17:26
To: Chief Minister
Subject: FW: Obstructions in Strang Road

Forwarding, as your email address as listed on does not appear to exist

From:  
Sent: 14 December 2016 17:23
To: 'Quayle, Howard (MHK)'; Shimmins, Bill (MHK); Harmer, Ray (MHK)
Subject: Obstructions in Strang Road

Dear Sirs

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the ludicrous obstructions which have been placed in Strang Road, Union Mills this week.

These are clearly designed to deter as many people as possible from using this road, which is unacceptable. As well as being a bus route, Strang Road is a critical route for those of us who live in Strang and the Baldwins to access our local Braddan amenities, such as our local post office, supermarket, petrol station, commissioners’ offices, children’s playground, churches, etc. I cannot believe that the businesses in Union Mills are happy with potentially losing the custom of a large part of their local catchment area.

It is not even clear to me why Strang Road needs to have a 20mph restriction, as it is not a road used by pedestrians, has no children playing, no schools or other public buildings, no shops, and all the houses are set well back from the road behind hedges etc. There are many other roads on the Island which would be much higher up the priority list for 20mph restrictions. However if Strang Road is to be a 20mph road, for whatever reason, the appropriate solution would be for the police to enforce the limit, preferably via speed cameras. Barricading the road with ugly structures and denying local residents access to their community is completely unacceptable. The obstructions at the top end are particularly ludicrous given the almost complete absence of houses, and the obstructions at the bottom end are unnecessary, given that residents park their cars along the road and narrow it to less than two cars’ width anyway.
Please confirm what avenues are open to Braddan residents who are not residents of Strang Road to object to and preferably overturn this decision.

Yours faithfully
APPENDIX 3
From: Almond, Kevin
Sent: 02 February 2016 14:36
To: Quayle, Howard (MHK); Gawne, Phil (MHK)
Cc: Quayle, Howard (MHK); Gawne, Phil (MHK)
Subject: Strang Road traffic calming
Categories: Consultation

Dear [Name]

Thank you for your email of 22nd January 2016 enquiring about the progress of the Departments review of the traffic management scheme on Strang Road.

The Department has considered the changes in the most recent scheme against the aims of the earlier traffic management scheme introduced by the Department in response to the 1996 Nobles Hospital Planning Inquiry. The aims of the pre 2015 traffic management scheme were to deter unnecessary through traffic from using Strang Rd to access the hospital site; and to improve pedestrian safety at the junction of Strang Rd and the A1.

The pre 2015 traffic management scheme used a series of speed cushions and speed tables to deter through traffic and this coupled with the deteriorating ride quality of the carriageway influenced drive route choice to and from the hospital. However the design of the speed cushions and speed tables had an adverse impact on the ride quality experienced by drivers and passengers in modern low floor busses.

The Department envisaged that the deterrent effect of the revised traffic management scheme would continue to discourage unnecessary through traffic but at the same time improve bus passenger ride quality.

Before and after monitoring by the Department of vehicular traffic flows on Strang Road has shown that there has been a 13% increase in daily through traffic after completion of the revised traffic management scheme. This data, as well as observations from officers, residents and the public indicates that additional measures are required to mitigate the enhanced attractiveness of the route caused, in part, by the improvement in the ride quality of the carriageway.

To improve the deterrent effect of the scheme in the short term the Department installed a chicane, however monitoring of traffic data showed the chosen design did not result in the desired reduction in vehicular flows.

In the meantime the Department has considered two alternative modifications to the scheme to deter unnecessary through traffic a) installation of road narrowing measures and build outs on Strang Road between its junction with the A1 and its junction with Ballanawin; b) Installation of speed cushions on Strang Road between its junction with the A1 and its junction with Ballanawin.

The Department has chosen to implement scheme a). The combination of road narrowing’s and build outs placed on the south east side of Strang Road is considered on balance to have a better deterrent effect on through traffic than speed cushions especially on southeasterly bound traffic. Whilst build outs and road narrowings will minimise, as far as possible, impacts on bus ride quality.

The detail design of the scheme is currently being finalised and the installation works is
expected to take place in 4-5 weeks’ time.

Regards,

Kevin Almond

Kevin Almond BSc(Hon) MSc MBA CMILT FIHE
Planning & Coordination Manager
Highway Services
Department of Infrastructure
Sea Terminal Building
Douglas
Isle of Man
IM1 2RF

Telephone: 01624 686672
Good Morning Mr Almond -

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 25th July advising the rescheduling of the installation of a traffic calming scheme in Strang Road, which will now involve temporary road closure. To date I have not received any response to my email dated 3rd July in response to the suggested build outs involving planters and the removal of parking spaces.

In view of the proposed temporary road closure, can we look forward to a rethink on the question of the installation of some form of raised objects which will deter vehicles travelling in excess of 20mph? It has been established build outs have not provided the solution, and the recent proposal to remove parking spaces to accommodate planters is counter productive - since the parking spaces were first introduced after the road was resurfaced as "a traffic calming measure".

I await the courtesy of your response addressing these points.

Regards

Sent from my iPad
Dear Strang Road traffic calming measures

Thank you for your emails of the 3rd July and 25th July 2016 regarding the proposed Strang Road traffic calming scheme.

Your views set out within your email of the 3rd July 2016 have been noted. In answer to your question raised in your email of 25th July 2016.

The benefits and dis-benefits of a given traffic calming scheme design are considered during the design and assessment stage. The final design balancing the aims and objectives of the scheme with the impact on road users and local residents. With regards to ‘raised objects’, as buses must use Strang Road, the vertical traffic restraint features which have the least impact on passenger discomfort are speed cushions. However, this occurs only when the bus can properly align with the speed cushion on its approach so it straddles the cushion correctly. Where kerbside parking occurs in or around speed cushions, the correct angle of approach may not always be available to the bus driver. If parked vehicles are likely to be present it may be appropriate to consider introducing waiting restrictions where speed cushions are used, in order to ensure that buses can be aligned to straddle the cushions evenly. To allow sufficient room for a bus to align itself and straddle the cushion correctly, approximately 16-18m of unobstructed kerbside needs to available on both the approach to and exit from the speed cushion. Therefore, a traffic calming scheme using speed cushions would remove a greater number of parking spaces than the proposed scheme but would have the same expected speed reduction outcome as the proposed scheme.

If you require any further assistance please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Please note that I will be on leave until the 22nd August.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Almond

Kevin Almond BSc(Hon) MSc MBA CMILT FIHE
Planning & Coordination Manager
Highway Services
Department of Infrastructure
Sea Terminal Building
Douglas
Isle of Man
IM1 2RF

Telephone: 01624 686672
APPENDIX 4
Dear [Name]

Strang Road traffic calming measures

Thank you for your letter of the 1st August 2016.

I have noted your comments and observations on the proposed scheme.

Regarding buses on Strang Road, a public transport system must accommodate a very large number of individual trips; however, it is not possible to provide direct bus routes to meet all requirements. But by providing a network of routes, passengers can make complex journeys making it possible for buses to provide the transport needs of individual users. Therefore, preserving bus routes that provide accessible and sustainable transport to the population of the Island is an important consideration in the design of traffic management schemes.

If you require any further assistance please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Please note that I will be on leave until the 22nd August.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Almond

Network Planning Manager

Department of Infrastructure
Sea Terminal Building, Douglas, Isle of Man, IM1 2RF
APPENDIX 5
Dear Sir,

**Strang Road traffic calming measures**

Thank you for your letter of the 20\textsuperscript{th} July 2016 and follow up email of the 25\textsuperscript{th} July 2016 regarding ‘speed bumps’ and kerbside parking on Strang road.

In answer to your queries:

1. The benefits and dis-benefits of a given traffic calming scheme design are considered during the design and assessment stage. The final design balancing the aims and objectives of the scheme with the impact on road users and local residents. With regards to ‘speed bumps’, as buses must use Strang Road, the vertical traffic restraint features which have the least impact on passenger discomfort are speed cushions. However, this occurs only when the bus can properly align with the speed cushion on its approach so it straddles the cushion correctly. Where kerbside parking occurs in or around speed cushions, the correct angle of approach may not always be available to the bus driver. If parked vehicles are likely to be present it may be appropriate to consider introducing waiting restrictions where speed cushions are used, in order to ensure that buses can be aligned to straddle the cushions evenly. To allow sufficient room for a bus to align itself and straddle the cushion correctly, approximately 16-18m of unobstructed kerbside needs to available on both the approach to and exit from the speed cushion. Therefore, a traffic calming scheme using speed cushions would remove a greater number of parking spaces than the proposed scheme.

2. Though parked vehicles do have an observed effect on vehicle speeds the effect is reliant on number factors: road geometry; distribution of vehicles along the kerbside; type of vehicle parked; duration of stay; and, the balance of traffic flows. Other than road geometry these factors are temporary in nature, resulting in the traffic calming effect of kerbside parking being inconsistent from hour to hour and day to day. Observation shows that the number of parked
vehicles at certain times of the day can both be sparse and widely dispersed and as such has little effect on vehicle speeds. When greater numbers of parked vehicles are present they do have an observed effect on vehicles travelling towards Strang, but they have less impact on vehicles travelling towards Union Mills. The proposed traffic calming scheme provides permanent features that will not rely on happenstance to reduce vehicle speeds.

3. Please refer to my comments above. Though the current kerbside parking can be seen to contribute to speed reduction in certain circumstances, it also causes a number dis-benefits to road users and residents. It has been commented upon by the Bus Vannin that the existing kerbside parking arrangements can at times obstruct the movement of buses along Strang Road. In addition from the consultation process a number of residents with driveways on the south east side of Strang Road have commented that vehicles parked within the marked parking bays opposite their drive ways obstruct their movements in/out of their drives. The proposed scheme provides a more consistent environment for bus operations and reduces the inconvenience and risk to residents using their driveways on the south east side of Strang Road.

4. I cannot speak for Minister Gawne or Minister Quayle, however the Department continues to support the traffic calming of Strang Road.

5. Though the marked kerbside parking spaces will be reduced by approximately 16 spaces for the reasons outlined above, site observations show that the almost all properties on the north west side of Strang Road have sufficient driveway space excluding garages to accommodate at least three or more vehicles. Similarly, almost all properties on the south east side of Strang Road have sufficient driveway to accommodate at least two vehicles, with properties accessed from the private roads being able to accommodate more. Only 3 properties out of more than 50 do not have in curtilage parking, their parking needs can still be accommodated on Strang Road.

If you require any further assistance please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Almond
Network Planning Manager
# TRAFFIC SUMMARY

**Strang Rd 1 (Jan 17)**

00:00 30 December 2016 to 00:00 06 January 2017 (7 days)

## Total Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>14852</td>
<td>11606</td>
<td>3046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>7540</td>
<td>6029</td>
<td>1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>7112</td>
<td>5577</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>mph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max (Hr) speed</td>
<td>42.2 (23)</td>
<td>49.5 (00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Speed</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean speed</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% speed</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number speeding</td>
<td>4341</td>
<td>6047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent speeding</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Speeding Hour</td>
<td>56 (08)</td>
<td>79 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Posted speed limit = 20 mph*

## Peak Hour Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Days</th>
<th>Weekdays</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak - Volume</td>
<td>1282 (0800)</td>
<td>1215 (0800)</td>
<td>227 (1100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak - Percent</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak - Volume</td>
<td>1333 (1500)</td>
<td>1048 (1500)</td>
<td>311 (1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak - Percent</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>% volume</td>
<td>Mean speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - SV</td>
<td>13299</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - SVT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - TB2</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - TB3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - T4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - ART3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - ART4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - ART5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - ART6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - BD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - DRT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - TRT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - M/C</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - CYCLE</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class scheme = VRX

Report created 14:51 17 January 2017 using MTE version 4.0.6.0
## Traffic Summary

**Strang Rd 2 (Jan 17)**

00:00 30 December 2016 to 00:00 06 January 2017 (7 days)

### Total Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>14359</td>
<td>11385</td>
<td>2974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>7390</td>
<td>5919</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>6969</td>
<td>5466</td>
<td>1503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max (Hr) speed</td>
<td>49.2 (07)</td>
<td>51.4 (00)</td>
<td>mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Speed</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean speed</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% speed</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number speeding</td>
<td>4428</td>
<td>4641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent speeding</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Speeding Hour</td>
<td>65 (08)</td>
<td>61 (15)</td>
<td>mph (HOUR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Posted speed limit = 20 mph*

### Peak Hour Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Days</th>
<th>Weekdays</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak - Volume</td>
<td>1279 (0800)</td>
<td>1216 (0800)</td>
<td>222 (1100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak - Percent</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak - Volume</td>
<td>1324 (1500)</td>
<td>1041 (1500)</td>
<td>299 (1400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak - Percent</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>% Volume</td>
<td>Mean Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - SV</td>
<td>10715</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - SVT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - TB2</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - TB3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - T4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - ART3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - ART4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - ART5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - ART6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - BD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - DRT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - TRT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - M/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - CYCLE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class scheme = VRX*
# TRAFFIC SUMMARY

Strang Rd 3 (Jan 17)
00:00 30 December 2016 to 00:00 06 January 2017 (7 days)

## Total Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>11513</td>
<td>9141</td>
<td>2372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>6069</td>
<td>4889</td>
<td>1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>5444</td>
<td>4252</td>
<td>1192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max (Hr) speed</td>
<td>75.9 (16) mph</td>
<td>75.9 (16) mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Speed</td>
<td>21.9 mph</td>
<td>21.9 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean speed</td>
<td>22.1 mph</td>
<td>22.2 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% speed</td>
<td>26.4 mph</td>
<td>26.6 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number speeding</td>
<td>4115</td>
<td>3725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent speeding</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Speeding Hour</td>
<td>62 (08) mph</td>
<td>48 (15) mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Posted speed limit = 20 mph*

## Peak Hour Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Days</th>
<th>Weekdays</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak - Volume</td>
<td>997 (0800)</td>
<td>948 (0800)</td>
<td>174 (1100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak - Percent</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak - Volume</td>
<td>1078 (1500)</td>
<td>846 (1500)</td>
<td>258 (1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak - Percent</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>% Volume</td>
<td>Mean Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - SV</td>
<td>13229</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - SVT</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - TB2</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - TB3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - T4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - ART3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - ART4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - ART5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - ART6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - BD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - DRT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - TRT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - M/C</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - CYCLE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class scheme = VRX*
# TRAFFIC SUMMARY
**Strang Rd 4 (Jan 17)**
00:00 30 December 2016 to 00:00 06 January 2017 (7 days)

## Total Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>15440</td>
<td>12142</td>
<td>3298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>7777</td>
<td>6171</td>
<td>1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>7663</td>
<td>5971</td>
<td>1692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max (Hr) speed</td>
<td>84.6 (18)</td>
<td>84.6 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Speed</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean speed</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% speed</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number speeding</td>
<td>6317</td>
<td>6055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent speeding</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Speeding Hour</td>
<td>100 (08)</td>
<td>79 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Posted speed limit = 20 mph**

## Peak Hour Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Days</th>
<th>Weekdays</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak - Volume</td>
<td>1373 (0800)</td>
<td>1301 (0800)</td>
<td>240 (1100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak - Percent</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak - Volume</td>
<td>1401 (1500)</td>
<td>1081 (1500)</td>
<td>333 (1200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak - Percent</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>% volume</td>
<td>Mean speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - SV</td>
<td>14307</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - SVT</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - TB2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - TB3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - T4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - ART3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - ART4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - ART5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - ART6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - BD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - DRT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - TRT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - M/C</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - CYCLE</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class scheme = VRX

Report created 14:58 17 January 2017 using MTE version 4.0.6.0
**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT**

**HIGHWAYS DIVISION**

**TRAFFIC SURVEY SUMMARY**

Survey Location: Strang Road 4, Douglas, February 15

Survey Duration: 16th February to 23rd February

Originator: Kevin

Reason for Survey: General

### Volume Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Vehicles</td>
<td>7787</td>
<td>8054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Per Day</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>5-6 pm</td>
<td>8-9 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. During Peak</td>
<td>117(98)</td>
<td>155(82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speed Summary:

#### Speed Limit 20 mph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% tile</td>
<td>34 mph</td>
<td>34 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Speeding</td>
<td>7306</td>
<td>7138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Speeding</td>
<td>93.82 %</td>
<td>88.63 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Speed</td>
<td>29 mph</td>
<td>28 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speed</td>
<td>66 mph</td>
<td>66 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Max Speed</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>10 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class &gt; 10 mph of Limit</td>
<td>1.2.4</td>
<td>1.2.3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classification Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Vehicles</td>
<td>7233</td>
<td>7463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Vehicle With Trailer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or Truck (2 Axle rigid)</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or Truck (3 Axle Rigid)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Axle Rigid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artic 2 Axle + 2/3 Axle Trailer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action To Be Taken:

- Police Issue
- TMLG Meeting
- Road Safety
- None

### Comments: .................................................................

Date of Report: 24/2/15
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

TRAFFIC SURVEY SUMMARY

Survey Location: Strang Road 3, Douglas, February 15
Survey Duration: 16th February to 23rd February
Originator: Kevin
Reason for Survey: General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume Summary:</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Vehicles</td>
<td>7615</td>
<td>7432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Per Day</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>5-6 pm</td>
<td>8-9 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. During Peak</td>
<td>101(95)</td>
<td>138(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Summary:</th>
<th>Speed Limit 20 mph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% tte</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 mph</td>
<td>85% Speeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.74%</td>
<td>Mean Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 mph</td>
<td>Maximum Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pm</td>
<td>Time of Max Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class &gt; 10 mph of Limit</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Summary:</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Vehicles</td>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>6939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Vehicle With Trailer</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or Truck (2 Axle Rigid)</td>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or Truck (3 Axle Rigid)</td>
<td>Class 5</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Axle Rigid</td>
<td>Class 6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artic 2 Axle + 2/3 Axle Trailer</td>
<td>Class 7,8,9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action To Be Taken:

- Police Issue
- TMLG Meeting
- Road Safety
- None

Comments: .................................................................

Date of Report: 24/2/15
**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT**

**HIGHWAYS DIVISION**

**TRAFFIC SURVEY SUMMARY**

Survey Location: Strang Road 2, Douglas, February 15

Survey Duration: 16th February to 23rd February

Originator: Kevin

Reason for Survey: General

---

### Volume Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Vehicles</td>
<td>6969</td>
<td>7333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Per Day</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>5-6 pm</td>
<td>8-9 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. During Peak</td>
<td>91(95)</td>
<td>132(85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Speed Summary:

**Speed Limit 20 mph**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% tile</td>
<td>31 mph</td>
<td>30 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Speeding</td>
<td>6219</td>
<td>5584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Speeding</td>
<td>89.24 %</td>
<td>76.15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Speed</td>
<td>26 mph</td>
<td>24 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speed</td>
<td>61 mph</td>
<td>61 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Max Speed</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Multi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class &gt; 10mph of Limit</td>
<td>1.2.4</td>
<td>1.2.3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Classification Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles Class 1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Vehicles Class 2</td>
<td>6395</td>
<td>6727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Vehicle With Trailer Class 3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or Truck (2 Axle rigid) Class 4</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or Truck (3 Axle Rigid) Class 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Axle Rigid Class 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artic 2 Axle + 2/3 Axle Trailer Class 7,8 &amp;9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Action To Be Taken:

- Police Issue
- TMLG Meeting
- Road Safety
- None

---

Comments: .................................................................

Date of Report: 24/2/15
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT  
HIGHWAYS DIVISION  
TRAFFIC SURVEY SUMMARY 

Survey Location: Strang Road 1, Douglas, February 15  
Survey Duration: 16th February to 23rd February  
Originator: Kevin  
Reason for Survey: General 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume Summary:</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Vehicles</td>
<td>7262</td>
<td>7532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Per Day</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>5-6 pm</td>
<td>8-9 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. During Peak</td>
<td>94(102)</td>
<td>130(93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Summary:</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit 20 mph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% tile</td>
<td>30 mph</td>
<td>26 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Speeding</td>
<td>6396</td>
<td>4891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Speeding</td>
<td>88.07 %</td>
<td>64.94 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Speed</td>
<td>26 mph</td>
<td>22 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speed</td>
<td>55 mph</td>
<td>43 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Max Speed</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Multi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class &gt; 10 mph of Limit</td>
<td>1.2.3.4</td>
<td>1.2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Summary:</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles Class 1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Vehicles Class 2</td>
<td>6715</td>
<td>6978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Vehicle With Trailer Class 3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or Truck (2 Axle rigid) Class 4</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or Truck (3 Axle Rigid) Class 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Axle Rigid Class 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artic 2 Axle + 2/3 Axle Trailer Class 7,8,9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action To Be Taken:</th>
<th>Police Issue</th>
<th>TMLG Meeting</th>
<th>Road Safety</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Comments: | .......................................................... |

Date of Report: 24/2/15
### Speed Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>&gt;110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00-06:00</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00-09:00</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-19:00</td>
<td>3690</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00-22:00</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4207</td>
<td>6471</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00-24:00</td>
<td>12597</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>4369</td>
<td>6998</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speed Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vmin</th>
<th>Vavg</th>
<th>Vmax</th>
<th>V15</th>
<th>V50</th>
<th>V85</th>
<th>Vexc %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DSD SAFETY Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vin</th>
<th>Vout</th>
<th>Vred</th>
<th>Vred %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptions**
- **Vmin**: Minimal velocity
- **Vavg**: Average velocity
- **Vmax**: Maximal velocity
- **V15**: Critical velocity for the first 15% of vehicles
- **V50**: Critical velocity for the first 50% of vehicles
- **V85**: Critical velocity for the first 85% of vehicles
- **Vexc %**: Speeding in %
- **Vin**: Average inlet velocity
- **Vout**: Average velocity of exit
- **Vred**: Average speed reduction between inlet velocity and velocity of exit
Traffic Evaluation

**Site**
- Name: STRANG03.DSD
- Dir. Oncoming (name): 20
- Dir. Outgoing (name): 20
- Posted Speed Limit: 20
- Comment: DSD
- Device type: DSD

**Time Range**
- Start Date: 19/12/2016 14:00
- End Date: 30/12/2016 08:59
- Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
- Time Interval: 60 minutes
- Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Time Variation Curve

---

www.datacollect.com
Traffic Evaluation

Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im

Built with DataCollect Webreporter version 1.0 at 09/01/2017 14:53:39

Site
Name: STRANG03.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name):
Dir. Outgoing (name):
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment:
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 19/12/2016 14:00
End Date: 30/12/2016 08:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Speed Diagram

Danger Zone
Safety Zone

Minimal Inlet velocity
Maximal Inlet velocity
Average Inlet velocity
Traffic Evaluation

Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im

Site
Name: STRANG03.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name): 
Dir. Outgoing (name): □
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment: 
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 19/12/2016 14:00
End Date: 30/12/2016 08:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Speed Histogram

www.datacollect.com
### Site Details
- **Name:** STRANG02.DSD
- **Dir. Oncoming (name):**
- **Dir. Outgoing (name):**
- **Posted Speed Limit:** 20
- **Comment:**
- **Device type:** DSD

### Time Range
- **Start Date:** 15/12/2016 09:00
- **End Date:** 19/12/2016 14:59
- **Days:** Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
- **Time Interval:** 60 minutes
- **Time Frame / Day:** 00:00 - 23:59

### Speed Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00-06:00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00-09:00</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-19:00</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00-22:00</td>
<td>5326</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>2832</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00-24:00</td>
<td>5742</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speed Figures

| Vmin | Vavg | Vmax | V15 | V50 | V85 | Vexc |%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DSD SAFETY Success
- **Vig:** 21
- **Vout:**
- **Vred:**
- **Vred %:**

**Descriptions:**
- **Vmin:** Minimal velocity
- **Vavg:** Average velocity
- **Vmax:** Maximum velocity
- **V15:** Critical velocity for the first 15% of vehicles
- **V50:** Critical velocity for the first 50% of vehicles
- **V85:** Critical velocity for the first 85% of vehicles
- **Vexc %:** Speeding In %
- **Vig:** Average inlet velocity
- **Vout:** Average velocity of exit
- **Vred:** Average speed reduction between inlet velocity and velocity of exit
Traffic Evaluation

Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im

Site
Name: STRANG02.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name): [Blank]
Dir. Outgoing (name): [Blank]
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment: [Blank]
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 15/12/2016 09:00
End Date: 19/12/2016 14:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Time Variation Curve

[Graph showing time variation curve over a period from 15 Dec 06:00 to 19 Dec 18:00]
Traffic Evaluation

Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im

Site
Name: STRANG02.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name): 
Dir. Outgoing (name): 
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment: 
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 15/12/2016 09:00
End Date: 19/12/2016 14:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Speed Diagram

- Minimal Inlet velocity
- Maximal Inlet velocity
- Average Inlet velocity

Danger Zone
Safety Zone

www.datacollect.com
Traffic Evaluation

Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im

Built with DataCollect Webreporter version 1.0 at 19/12/2016 15:54:14

Site
Name: STRANG02.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name): [Diagram]
Dir. Outgoing (name): [Diagram]
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment: [Diagram]
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 15/12/2016 09:00
End Date: 19/12/2016 14:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Speed Histogram

[Graph showing speed distribution with bars for inlet velocity and velocity of exit]
### Site
- **Name**: STRANG01.DSD
- **Dir. Oncoming (name)**: 
- **Dir. Outgoing (name)**: 
- **Posted Speed Limit**: 20
- **Comment**: 
- **Device type**: DSD

### Time Range
- **Start Date**: 17/10/2016 12:00
- **End Date**: 05/12/2016 23:59
- **Days**: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
- **Time Interval**: 60 minutes
- **Time Frame / Day**: 00:00 - 23:59

### Speed Classes [V in mph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Σ</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>&gt;110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00-06:00</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00-09:00</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-19:00</td>
<td>7579</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>4815</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00-22:00</td>
<td>21876</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>13511</td>
<td>4897</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00-24:00</td>
<td>23401</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3188</td>
<td>14248</td>
<td>5398</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speed Figures [V in mph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vmin</th>
<th>Vavg</th>
<th>Vmax</th>
<th>V15</th>
<th>V50</th>
<th>V85</th>
<th>Vexc %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DSD SAFETY Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vin</th>
<th>Vout</th>
<th>Vred</th>
<th>Vred %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Descriptions
- **Vmin**: Minimal velocity
- **Vavg**: Average velocity
- **Vmax**: Maximal velocity
- **V15**: Critical velocity for the first 15% of vehicles
- **V50**: Critical velocity for the first 50% of vehicles
- **V85**: Critical velocity for the first 85% of vehicles
- **Vexc %**: Speeding in %
- **Vin**: Average Inlet velocity
- **Vout**: Average velocity of exit
- **Vred**: Average speed reduction between inlet velocity and velocity of exit
Traffic Evaluation

**Site**

- **Name**: STRANG01.DSD
- **Dir. Oncoming (name)**
- **Dir. Outgoing (name)**
- **Posted Speed Limit**: 20
- **Comment**
- **Device type**: DSD

**Time Range**

- **Start Date**: 17/10/2016 12:00
- **End Date**: 05/12/2016 23:59
- **Days**: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
- **Time Interval**: 60 minutes
- **Time Frame / Day**: 00:00 - 23:59

**Time Variation Curve**

[Graph showing time variation curve]
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Traffic Evaluation

Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im
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Site
Name: STRANG01.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name):
Dir. Outgoing (name):
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment:
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 17/10/2016 12:00
End Date: 05/12/2016 23:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Speed Diagram

Danger Zone
Safety Zone

- Minimal inlet velocity
- Maximal inlet velocity
- Average inlet velocity
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Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im
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Site
Name: STRANG01.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name)
Dir. Outgoing (name)
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 17/10/2016 12:00
End Date: 05/12/2016 23:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Speed Histogram
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Traffic Evaluation

**Author**
- **Institution**: Braddan Parish Commissioners
- **Department**: Community Warden
- **Street**: Union Mills
- **Postal Code**: IM4 4LZ
- **City**: Isle of Man
- **Country**: United Kingdom
- **Contact**: Paul Parker
- **Phone**: +441624852808
- **E-Mail**: paul@braddan.im

Built with DataCollect Webreporter version 1.0 at 17/10/2016 13:55:34

### Site
- **Name**: STRANG00.DSD
- **Dir. Oncoming (name)**: 20
- **Dir. Outgoing (name)**: 
- **Posted Speed Limit**: 20
- **Comment**: 
- **Device type**: DSD

### Time Range
- **Start Date**: 06/10/2016 16:00
- **End Date**: 17/10/2016 12:59
- **Days**: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
- **Time Interval**: 60 minutes
- **Time Frame / Day**: 00:00 - 23:59

### Speed Classes [V in mph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>00:00-06:00</th>
<th>06:00-09:00</th>
<th>09:00-12:00</th>
<th>12:00-15:00</th>
<th>15:00-18:00</th>
<th>18:00-21:00</th>
<th>21:00-24:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>00:00-06:00</td>
<td>06:00-09:00</td>
<td>09:00-12:00</td>
<td>12:00-15:00</td>
<td>15:00-18:00</td>
<td>18:00-21:00</td>
<td>21:00-24:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00-06:00</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>3562</td>
<td>11576</td>
<td>12180</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00-09:00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-12:00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6893</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-15:00</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>6599</td>
<td>6874</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-18:00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>3118</td>
<td>3297</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00-21:00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00-24:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speed Figures [V in mph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vmin</th>
<th>Vavg</th>
<th>Vmax</th>
<th>V15</th>
<th>V50</th>
<th>V85</th>
<th>Vexc %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DSD SAFETY Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vin</th>
<th>Vout</th>
<th>Vred</th>
<th>Vred %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptions**
- **Vmin**: Minimal velocity
- **Vavg**: Average velocity
- **Vmax**: Maximal velocity
- **V15**: Critical velocity for the first 15% of vehicles
- **V50**: Critical velocity for the first 50% of vehicles
- **V85**: Critical velocity for the first 85% of vehicles
- **Vexc %**: Speeding in %
- **Vin**: Average inlet velocity
- **Vout**: Average velocity of exit
- **Vred**: Average speed reduction between inlet velocity and velocity of exit
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Traffic Evaluation

Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im
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Site
Name: STRANG00.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name): 
Dir. Outgoing (name): 
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment: 
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 06/10/2016 16:00
End Date: 17/10/2016 12:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Time Variation Curve
Traffic Evaluation

Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im

Site
Name: STRANG00.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name):
Dir. Outgoing (name):
20
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment:
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 06/10/2016 16:00
End Date: 17/10/2016 12:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Speed Diagram
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Site
Name: STRANG00.DSD
Dir. Oncoming (name):
Dir. Outgoing (name): 
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment: 
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 06/10/2016 16:00
End Date: 17/10/2016 12:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Speed Histogram
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Traffic Evaluation

Author
Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
Department: Community Warden
Street: Union Mills
Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
City: Isle of Man
Country: United Kingdom
Contact: Paul Parker
Phone: +441624852808
E-Mail: paul@braddan.im
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Site
Name: Strang Road
Dir. Oncoming (name): 
Dir. Outgoing (name):
Posted Speed Limit: 20
Comment: 
Device type: DSD

Time Range
Start Date: 04/08/2016 10:00
End Date: 16/08/2016 13:59
Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
Time Interval: 60 minutes
Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

Speed Classes
[V in mph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Σ</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>&gt;110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00-06:00</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00-09:00</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-15:00</td>
<td>4841</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-19:00</td>
<td>17924</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>9214</td>
<td>6041</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00-24:00</td>
<td>20154</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>10125</td>
<td>6989</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speed Figures
[V in mph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vmin</th>
<th>Vavg</th>
<th>Vmax</th>
<th>V15</th>
<th>V50</th>
<th>V85</th>
<th>Vexc %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DSD SAFETY Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vin</th>
<th>Vout</th>
<th>Vred</th>
<th>Vred %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions
Vmin: Minimal velocity
Vavg: Average velocity
Vmax: Maximal velocity
V15: Critical velocity for the first 15% of vehicles
V50: Critical velocity for the first 50% of vehicles
V85: Critical velocity for the first 85% of vehicles
Vexc %: Speeding in %
Vin: Average inlet velocity
Vout: Average velocity of exit
Vred: Average speed reduction between inlet velocity and velocity of exit
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# Traffic Evaluation

**Author**
- **Institution**: Braddan Parish Commissioners  
- **Department**: Community Warden  
- **Street**: Union Mills  
- **Postal Code**: IM4 4LZ  
- **City**: Isle of Man  
- **Country**: United Kingdom  
- **Contact**: Paul Parker  
- **Phone**: +441624852808  
- **E-Mail**: paul@braddan.im

Built with DataCollect Webreporter version 1.0 at 30/09/2016 10:48:36

## Site
- **Name**: Strang Road  
- **Dir. Oncoming (name)**:  
- **Dir. Outgoing (name)**:  
- **Posted Speed Limit**: 20  
- **Comment**:  
- **Device type**: DSD

## Time Range
- **Start Date**: 04/08/2016 10:00  
- **End Date**: 16/08/2016 13:59  
- **Days**: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su  
- **Time Interval**: 60 minutes  
- **Time Frame / Day**: 00:00 - 23:59

## Time Variation Curve

![Time Variation Curve](https://via.placeholder.com/150)
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Traffic Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Braddan Parish Commissioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Community Warden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Union Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>IM4 4LZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Isle of Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Paul Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>+441624852808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul@braddan.im">paul@braddan.im</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Time Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>20 Strang Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Oncoming (name)</td>
<td>04/08/2016 10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Outgoing (name)</td>
<td>16/08/2016 13:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Interval</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame / Day</td>
<td>00:00 - 23:59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speed Diagram

- **Minimal Inlet Velocity**
- **Maximal Inlet Velocity**
- **Average Inlet Velocity**
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## Traffic Evaluation

**Author**
- Institution: Braddan Parish Commissioners
- Department: Community Warden
- Street: Union Mills
- Postal Code: IM4 4LZ
- City: Isle of Man
- Country: United Kingdom
- Contact: Paul Parker
- Phone: +441624852808
- E-Mail: paul@braddan.im
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### Site

- Name: Strang Road
- Dir. Oncoming (name): 20
- Dir. Outgoing (name): 20
- Posted Speed Limit: 20
- Comment: DSD

### Time Range

- Start Date: 04/08/2016 10:00
- End Date: 16/08/2016 13:59
- Days: Mo, Tu, We, Th, Fr, Sa, Su
- Time Interval: 60 minutes
- Time Frame / Day: 00:00 - 23:59

### Speed Histogram

[Graph showing speed distribution with bars for inlet velocity and velocity of exit]