

From: [Nicholas Davies](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Cc: tom.mohr@cityofmadison.com; [Martinez-Rutherford, Dina Nina](#); [Mayor](#); info@votedinanina.com
Subject: Support the bike lanes + one-sided parking option (92491)
Date: Sunday, May 10, 2026 10:43:15 PM
Attachments: [Regent Street existing off-street parking - Sheet1.pdf](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Transportation Commission,

Regent Street property owners built their parking already

94% of the properties on Regent Street already have parking available off of Regent Street. An astounding 76% already have a surface lot on their property already.

See attachment for reference, or check a satellite view of the street for yourself. This is not opinion, this is verifiable fact.

For instance, Sam Brown failed to mention to you all that he has a 16-spot parking lot on his property. If he cleared some patio furniture, he'd find 3 more underneath. Current designs include 1 car's worth of street parking out front; eliminating that would be a 5% reduction. It's also a corner lot.

With so much off-street parking already available, Regent Street does not need street parking on both sides. In fact, on-street parking could be eliminated entirely from the 1000, 1100, and 1300 blocks, and no property would be left without parking.

A design that includes one-sided parking and bike lanes is a compromise that has not yet been explored.

Bike lanes are flex space, parking is not

I was in Paris last week, where the mode share of cycling has increased *a lot* in a very short time. And pretty much 100% of their network is on-street, in pretty constrained right-of-way. Even there, with a lot of bikes going by per minute, there were often three delivery trucks in a block, all pulled over in the bike lane. Cyclists (myself included) went around them momentarily, and moved on.

On Regent Street, a loading/delivery driver would be able to pull into the bike lane for that 20 minutes per week. You could even sign that section of curb as "bike / loading". Whereas that driver would not be able to pull over into a parking space that's already occupied.

These on-street parking spots are being pitched as customer front-door parking *and* loading *and* whatever else, but in reality, each spot can only serve one purpose at one time, for one vehicle, with possibly only one occupant. And that driver might not be going to the business they're parked in front of.

Bike lanes also improve emergency response, giving drivers somewhere to pull over into (which an occupied parking space does not allow). And they count towards the 28 feet of clear width that the Fire Department wants, whereas parking does not. This would allow for

narrowing the adjacent travel lane from 14 feet to 11 feet.

Current designs are non-compliant with city policy

This prioritization of vehicle storage over sustainable, active transportation goes against Vision Zero, which we are not yet on track to reach. Without a bike facility, cyclists will have to ride in the travel lane, and that travel lane is too fast and high-volume for the city to even paint a sharrow on it.

The current design is also non-compliant with Complete Green Streets which says verbatim:

"Bike lanes should be included and may require consideration of parking options on side streets or in structured parking."

That could not address the situation on Regent Street more clearly. It also says this:

"Loading zones, if needed, should be provided around the corner on intersecting minor streets."

The premise seems to be that delivery drivers to *other* Community Main Streets have things like feet and dollies to work with. Maybe CGS needs a "no-feet-no-dollies" overlay map?

Regarding the AAA network, at BPW, Tom Mohr made an absurd argument that only streets on the AAA network need bike facilities. However, that creative "interpretation" is explicitly not supported by the guide itself:

"The baseline goal for all City streets is to provide All Ages and Abilities Bike accommodations. When constraints or other modal priorities limit the ability to provide an All Ages and Abilities bike facility, streets will be built to the lowest stress level possible"

(If we're going to have stupid arguments about verbs, note that this says "will".)

Regent Street cyclists deserve basic inclusion

Regent Street is already being redeveloped, bringing more and more residents who will live directly on Regent, and if they're trying to get around by bike, every trip will start and end on Regent--not the Southwest Path. If the city completely reconstructs Regent, and completely excludes cycling from the reconstructed street, that sends a clear message. Plus all the people who will work, shop, or sustain themselves on Regent Street.

I urge you to direct staff to pursue an alternative for Regent Street that is consistent with Complete Green Streets and Vision Zero, including (but not limited to) the 900 block. The one-sided-parking + bike lanes option would be one example of that. Better that we get it right this time, rather than decades from now.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St