



Fw: May 1 2025 Hearing: State grant for Orange Street improvement plan

From Public Testimony <PublicTestimony@newhavenct.gov>

Date Wed 5/7/2025 3:07 PM

From: Zach Wendling <zach.wendling@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 1, 2025 4:21 PM
To: Public Testimony <PublicTestimony@newhavenct.gov>
Subject: May 1 2025 Hearing: State grant for Orange Street improvement plan

You don't often get email from zach.wendling@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Please be cautious

This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thursday, May 1, 2025 6:00 PM

City Services and Environmental Policy

Resolution LM-2025-0152

Dear Members of the City Services and Environmental Policy Committee:

I am writing in **opposition** to the City's proposal to accept \$1.67 million in state funds to implement the current, proposed redesign of Orange Street between Cold Spring and Humphrey. I've lived in East Rock for nine years and am a survivor of traffic violence – struck by a motor vehicle while riding my bike on Orange Street in 2022, resulting in multiple broken bones and months of painful recovery. The City's plan, as proposed, is not only *personally insulting*, it is **wasteful, dangerous, and in violation** of New Haven's own policies and values.

This plan **does not follow** NACTO guidelines for street improvements. It **contradicts** the City's Complete Streets law. It **ignores** years of resident input. And it **prioritizes on-street parking** over the safety and lives of cyclists, pedestrians, and transit users. It's hard to overstate how egregiously this plan fails.

The proposed "bike boulevard" model **does not belong** on a busy arterial like Orange Street. The traffic volume, at 2800–3800 vehicles per day, plus buses from CT Transit and Yale, makes a shared-lane design **functionally flawed**. According to transportation experts, this kind of design only works on calm, local streets where drivers are resigned to slow speeds – not on a major connector through one of the City's most densely populated neighborhoods. Cyclists will be shoved into traffic, honked at, harassed, and endangered. *This is not a safety improvement. It's a disaster in the making.*

And what's worse, **none of this was discussed with the public**. At the two community meetings, we were shown options focused on parking trade-offs to allow for protected bike lanes. Not once was this "bike boulevard" concept raised. Yet the Mayor abandoned all of that public input and unveiled a completely different plan.

Let me remind you what the public *did* say:

- Over 300 residents signed a petition in favor of protected bike lanes.
- Canvassing on this stretch of Orange found that 95% of residents supported parking removal to make space for safer cycling.
- The City's own parking study found that removing one side of parking would **not** create a hardship for motorists.

Despite all of this, you are now being asked to **spend over \$1.6 million** to make the street worse: By narrowing travel lanes and **forcing cyclists to act as traffic-calming devices**. By placing them in direct conflict with cars and buses. By stripping away already inadequate bike lanes and replacing them with a vague promise of "shared space" that **puts all responsibility for safety on the most vulnerable users**.

This is more than bad planning. It's a betrayal. A betrayal of residents who gave thoughtful input in good faith. A betrayal of the principles of sustainability, equity, and safety that you, the Board of Alders, have publicly championed. And a betrayal of the very

laws this City passed fifteen years ago when it adopted the Complete Streets Ordinance, which *clearly* states that street design must prioritize non-motorized users, especially those who are most vulnerable.

So I ask you directly: **Are you comfortable voting to fund a plan that will make Orange Street less safe, that violates City law, that contradicts expert design guidance, and that residents overwhelmingly oppose?** Are you willing to accept the inevitable injuries – and possibly worse – that this flawed design will produce? And, if so, **why?**

I urge you: *do not reward this failure of planning and process.* Demand a redesign that uses best practices, follows the law, and reflects what residents actually asked for. We deserve better.

Respectfully,

Zach Wendling
79 Avon Street