to the peddlers' noisy cries, intrusions, and failure to keep the Christian sabbath. Businessmen objected to the messiness of wholesale trading on Main Street, while city officials noted the obstructions to traffic.

Complaints about public order, in the case of the street trades as in other aspects of street life, were influenced by a desire to make the streets conform to higher, feminine standards of decorum. The filth and foul language at the express stands were said to be particularly troubling to ladies. This distinction between men's and women's responses was more than just a sexist fiction; women had to keep their skirts from being soiled by horse manure, and they also had to deal with the possibility of sexual harassment as they passed the uncouth expressmen. Yet the distinction also presumed that women, particularly middle-class women, were more sensitive to disorder and needed to be protected from it. For example, the Times declared that the relatively privileged housewives in Hartford's outlying neighborhoods were the people most in need of relief from produce peddlers, although these women probably saw and heard fewer peddlers in the course of their day than anyone else in the city.

The produce peddlers' retreat to the East Side, however, allowed them to escape the hostility of middle-class people who might have been inclined to purge the streets of pushcarts. In this way the peddlers avoided the fate of lunch wagon owners and expressmen, whose desire for central locations had brought them into conflict with middle-class shoppers, office workers, and motorists. On the slum streets the peddlers found themselves comfortably isolated from such conflicts. Even the shopkeepers eventually accepted their presence. If the peddlers' standards of behavior were offensive to outsiders, the outsiders could simply stay away.

The segregation of produce peddling was thus a solution acceptable both to the peddlers and to members of the middle class, who were offended by public disorder. It was not a measure that was pushed in any organized way by a reform group, but rather a compromise solution that developed over many years as city officials tried to balance conflicting pressures. That this solution was achieved without being the major focus of reform activity is indicative of one important feature of the larger trend toward the segregation of public space: segregation was far easier than purification.

Creating a Traffic System

Though its western end cut through the heart of the bustling, smoky factory district, the eastern end of Capitol Avenue was still peaceful at the turn of the century. From its origin at Main Street, it was a residential backwater—a narrow street lined with dignified brownstone row houses and low wrought-iron fences. Climbing the gentle hill westward toward the capitol, the tree-lined avenue passed fine old brick homes divided into respectable lodgings for clerks, machinists, and salesmen. Early every morning, a thin stream of workingmen walked up the avenue from the poorer neighborhoods east and south of Main, the stragglers hurrying to avoid being docked a half-hour's pay for arriving at the factories after the seven o'clock opening. Trolleys served both Main Street and the factory district, but not eastern Capitol Avenue. Their routes looped north through the downtown, causing delays that made a brisk walk up Capitol the best way to work for those running late.

In 1906 an alderman suggested saving workers the walk by laying new trolley tracks to link the lines on Main Street with those on the western section of Capitol Avenue near the factories. The proposal marked the
beginning of a decade-long fight over whether the avenue properly belonged to those who lived on it or to those who used it to get across town. In petitions and public hearings through 1914, residents strongly opposed proposals for trolley lines, street widening, and asphalt paving. Trolleys, they argued, "would be a serious detriment to the comfort of residents of said street." They noted that many trees would have to be cut to widen the street enough to accommodate trolley lines and insisted that the beauty of their neighborhood should not be sacrificed for the convenience of people who did not live there. They urged the city to support an alternative plan favored by the trolley company: to improve service in the area by installing an additional set of tracks along Park Street, a parallel street several blocks south. "Park Street is already a trolley street and a business street and Capitol Avenue is not. There is not a store or place of business on this street [Capitol] between Main Street and Washington Street and I think putting the trolley lines here would change the status of the street," argued one neighbor, Anson T. McCook, in 1914.3

McCook was right. Trolley lines had already changed the character of many Hartford streets, and asphalt paving was having the same effect. As the city grew rapidly in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, vastly increased amounts of traffic were moving through the streets. Trolley lines and asphalt paving concentrated this traffic along a handful of routes while leaving nearby streets relatively undisturbed. Heavy traffic annoyed some homeowners and encouraged their departure, but the proximity of many potential customers made these streets more attractive for commercial development, and convenient trolley transportation encouraged the building of large apartment houses. With the growth of the suburban periphery and the widespread use of streetcar and automobile, the densely developed thoroughfares were increasingly those radiating outward from the business and industrial centers of Hartford. Decisions taken by city government shaped this differentiated pattern of streets by determining which would be overwhelmed by vehicles and which would remain quiet and residential. These decisions served the function of later zoning regulations, namely, creating a coherent pattern of land use. Starting just after the turn of the century, more and more of these decisions were made consciously. Encouraged first by local reformers and then by city-planning experts, the city government eagerly made physical improvements in the streets, modified traffic regulations, and compelled changes in pedestrian behavior in order to turn the streets into a system for rapid circulation. The eastern section of Capitol Avenue never became a major part of the new system because of a combination of trolley company foot-dragging, neighborhood opposition, and municipal stinginess.4 Still, the fears of its residents became the realities of many other people who lived along Hartford's streets.

Making Most Excellent Thoroughfares

Hartford's street plan in the late nineteenth century resembled a web spun by a drunken spider. Radiating from the center of the downtown were avenues that had originally been created as colonial-era links with neighboring villages or as turnpikes after independence. As the city's population grew in the nineteenth century, streetcar lines along the avenues allowed the growth of residential neighborhoods outside the original urban core. Developers filled in the spaces between the avenues with haphazard grids of residential streets, most of which were short, narrow, and suitable only for local traffic.5

Improvements in street surfaces in the 1860s and 1870s enabled Hartford's streets to handle the traffic of a small industrial city adequately. Because of unusually troublesome soil conditions, Hartford moved more quickly than other cities to cover its dirt streets with water-bound macadam, a semipermanent pavement that consisted of packed layers of small stones. Without such pavement, the thick clayey soil would soften in the spring and become almost like quicksand. After a heavy rain, wheels would sink into deep mud, and pedestrians crossing the street without a stone crosswalk underfoot risked losing a boot. The city at first spread macadam on all kinds of streets alike. By 1885 there were about fifty-five miles of macadamized streets and forty-seven miles of dirt.6 But this primitive paving, though adequate for quiet side streets, soon became unsatisfactory on certain well-traveled routes in and around the center of the growing city, where heavy wagons tore the macadam apart. People who had to travel such major streets as Asylum Street, State Street, and Farmington Avenue in the 1880s and early 1890s found badly worn surfaces and seasonal dust and mud puddles. Street commissioners spoke of the mud with philosophical resignation: "Commissioners cannot control
the elements, and mud and dust will follow rain and heat as surely as night follows day,” they reported in 1889.7

Such attitudes soon changed. One of Hartford’s leading industrialists, Col. Albert A. Pope of Boston, was already taking a great interest in bettering road conditions. Pope, whose Pope Manufacturing Company made Hartford the center of American bicycle production and, briefly, a center for automobile manufacture, led a nationwide “Good Roads” movement in the 1890s. He lectured, wrote articles, supported trade magazines, and lobbied for road improvements. Speaking to a sympathetic audience of Hartford’s leading businessmen in 1890, he urged them to work at both the state and local level to “inaugurate a system of streets and highways in this fair town, which shall speedily become a model for every one of your American sister cities.” 9 By 1894 Mayor Leverett Brainard noted, “Our citizens are quite generally calling for some improved method [of paving].” Even the street commissioners had to admit that the streets were not good enough. They reported, “Macadam does very well for resident streets, but the city has outgrown it for business streets.” 9

At this time the city had just laid the legal groundwork for better paving. Until the 1890s Hartford had avoided other cities’ common practice of leaving decisions about paving—and the cost of doing the work—in the hands of the abutting property owners. Officials usually claimed that paving caused property values to rise along the newly paved streets, primarily benefiting abutters. But in Hartford the practice had been successfully opposed by those who argued that streets were a general benefit to public travel and should be paved at public expense; these opponents complained that local assessments constituted an undue burden on working-class property owners. 10 The city government finally adopted the controversial system of local control and local assessments in 1893. Anticipating the installation of costly durable pavements like asphalt, city officials decided that it would be unfair to make all taxpayers pay for improvements that would affect only a few streets. They obtained a charter revision from the state legislature that permitted the city to assess abutting property owners for two-thirds of the cost of installing pavement other than macadam. Such work could be undertaken only if the owners of two-thirds of the affected frontage petitioned for it.11

City officials eagerly inspected pavements in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York and returned to Hartford with great enthusiasm for asphalt, which members claimed was durable, attractive, sanitary, relatively inexpensive, and ideal for travel. To their disappointment, they found their enthusiasm was not shared by those who would have to bear most of the cost. It was very difficult to get abutting property owners to sign petitions for asphalt paving. Rather than resuming the old practice of having the city pay for street work, officials decided to attack the other side of the problem: the onerous requirement of obtaining abutters’ approval. They secured legislation in 1895 that allowed the city to install durable pavement without any petition from the abutters who would pay for it, in addition to any paving done at the abutters’ request. In effect the city declared a general public need for well-paved thoroughfares while forcing neighboring property owners to foot the bill. Following the adoption of this law, the city installed asphalt blocks on State Street and Central Row in 1895–96 and laid sheet asphalt on Main and Athenaeum streets in 1896–97.12

Changing transportation technology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries made better streets a matter of both prestige and necessity. In the first half of the century, the rise of intercity railroad travel had limited the importance of the radial avenues as traffic carriers. By the turn of the century, however, patterns of travel were changing, as George Parker explained in 1904:

 Streets are becoming of ever increasing importance in the functions of a city. A century ago streets and roads were the avenues of long distant [sic] travel as well as for local use, and the age of the stage coach and the wayside inn and the turnpikes brought them to their greatest glory and importance. But with the advent of [the] railway making the railroad station practically the gateway of the city, streets and roads fell into disuse, except for local travel, and the roads degenerated and became impassable, except in a burdensome way. But with the advent of the bicycle, the trolley car and the motor carriage, roads and streets are again regaining their old time prestige, and the good roads movements are making most excellent thoroughfares and they are fast rivaling the railroad stations as the gateways and forecourts of our cities.13

The growing popularity of bicycles also made better pavement a necessity, as bicycles required a smooth, hard street surface. And of course
the growing number of automobiles, whose high speeds caused macadam streets to deteriorate rapidly, was even more important. From the late 1890s through the 1920s, city and state officials scrambled to adapt Hartford’s ancient roads to what one of them called “the stupendous increases in the traffic they are called upon to bear.” Their efforts to pave, widen, and maintain a handful of major thoroughfares encouraged further growth in the volume of traffic and resulted in striking differences in the ways streets were used.

Paving proceeded slowly at first. By 1909 only 8.4 percent of Hartford’s streets were paved with “durable pavements,” meaning asphalt, concrete, granite, brick, or anything else superior to macadam. Hartford may have been slower than some other American cities in paving its streets, but it was not unique. In most moderate-sized urban areas, the majority of streets lacked durable paving before automobile use became common. Amounts of durable paving varied widely: in the largest cities it typically covered a third or more of the streets. “Hartford is far behind other progressive cities in mileage of improved pavement,” complained the city engineer, Roscoe N. Clark.

Streets initially selected for paving were those with the heaviest freight traffic, mainly the major streets in the downtown and factory district. But easing travel was not the only benefit city officials saw in paving. Asphalt streets were easier to clean, a major consideration at a time when large numbers of horses were on the streets. For this reason, the Board of Health in 1903 and 1904 urged paving the East Side streets even though most of them handled little traffic. To show the potential health risks of unpaved streets, the board noted the large amount of time that tenement dwellers spent outside their tenements—and also what it considered to be their filthy habits. The board succeeded in getting improved pavement on some of the worst streets and alleys by 1909 and made more progress in the early 1910s.

Whether intended to ease traffic or improve sanitation, paving projects were usually unpopular with the neighbors. Only business owners seemed to welcome them. Homeowners and landlords alike balked at the prospect of assessments that usually exceeded a hundred dollars even for properties with a modest amount of frontage. “The cost of a new pavement would be an excessive tax on the property for which not one cent additional rent could be obtained,” complained one landlord. Landlords and residents of Hopkins Street protested a plan that would lay asphalt on what was becoming a route for heavy teams between the factory district and downtown. Two women argued that the asphalt would make the working-class street swelteringly hot and would annoy neighbors with the loud clopping of horses’ hoofs. Other opponents emphasized that it would “inflict a great pecuniary hardship upon the people owning property on said street.” Homeowners along the avenues soon faced the same prospect of financing paving improvements that would draw more unwanted traffic past their houses. By about 1910 the stress of automobile traffic was crumbling the macadam on the radial avenues—just as the weight of heavy teams and wagons had earlier crumbled it on the commercial streets—and city officials were replacing macadam with asphalt despite neighborhood opposition. Meanwhile, the city continued to maintain macadam surfaces on residential streets.

In maintaining different pavements according to the function of a street, Hartford was following the universal practice of the period. Motorists in every city encountered striking differences in street surfaces at least until the 1920s. Despite a flood of asphalt paving on the main thoroughfares in the 1910s, water-bound macadam, gravel, and dirt surfaces remained common on urban side streets. As late as 1923, small cities often had many more miles of dirt streets than of pavement, and a number of larger cities admitted that most of their pavement was water-bound macadam or gravel. The differences in pavement quality in every American city concentrated traffic on certain streets. “It has been found invariably true that wherever a road is improved, it is quickly sought by motor traffic,” noted an article published by American City Magazine. Experts like Frank S. Besson of the Army Corps of Engineers urged that cities plan the paving and width of each street to match its specific function. Noting the need for economy in street improvements, Besson recommended paving residential streets with asphalt only as increased traffic made maintenance of the inferior surface prohibitively expensive. The recommended practice was thus both to respond reactively to a developing traffic pattern and to try actively to shape that pattern through improving the pavement on certain streets.

Theoretically, automobile traffic could have dispersed evenly through the streets of the city, unlike trolley traffic, which had to follow fixed tracks, but some streets were more attractive than others for automobile
traffic even before they had improved pavement. In Hartford these streets were straighter, broader, and longer, or headed more directly to important destinations—the downtown or the factory district. By no coincidence, they tended to be the same streets that the trolley companies had chosen as the most advantageous for track construction. Furthermore, the availability of trolley transportation had encouraged disproportionate residential development along the tracks while simultaneously encouraging the concentration of business and industry at points that were well served by converging lines. As a result, Hartford's land use patterns had been formed and reinforced in such a way that early automobile travel in the city necessarily followed the trolley routes, particularly on the radial avenues from the downtown to the rapidly growing residential and suburban areas. The radial avenues were used for long-distance as well as local travel. They were the routes recommended in the widely used motor guides, publications that included maps and directions for travelers.

The state highway department encouraged and aided the paving of Hartford's radial avenues. The department contributed modest amounts of aid to local road-building projects in the late 1890s, and by 1900 it had begun planning a system of state highways. The department increased its funding of improvements to roads that could serve as either trunk lines or as tributaries in this system. Included as trunk lines were some of Hartford's major radial avenues—Wethersfield, Maple, Farmington, Albany, Bloomfield, and Windsor avenues. New Britain and Asylum avenues were designated connectors. The state funded and later supervised improvements to Newington, Blue Hills, and Asylum avenues, as well as the installation of concrete or asphalt paving on Albany, Bloomfield, and Maple avenues. The Automobile Club of Hartford also encouraged the paving of the major avenues. In 1919, for example, the club petitioned the Common Council to pave Wethersfield Avenue, saying that its crumbling macadam surface damaged automobiles. In the following year the club decried a decision to postpone the paving of Maple Avenue, the main connecting link between downtown and the Berlin Turnpike. "Every other main artery leading into Hartford has been taken care of," and Maple Avenue should as well, the club's monthly bulletin argued.

But even though every major radial avenue in Hartford had durable paving by the time of the Depression, most side streets did not. Deterred by the cost, the city had covered only forty-three miles of all streets with such paving by early 1929. Another 117 miles of side streets were macadam, and there were even a few dirt streets left. At the end of a decade of tremendous expansion in automobile use, downtown streets and the radial avenues were well paved, but most other streets still lacked surfaces designed for rapid transportation.

In the 1910s and 1920s the city widened some downtown streets and radial avenues, further encouraging the concentration of traffic on certain routes. Pearl Street was widened at a narrow spot in 1911 despite strong opposition from neighboring property owners. Jewell and Wells streets, beside Bushnell Park, were widened in 1913 and 1914. City officials hoped not only that the project would ease traffic flow but also that "the entire moral tone of the city will be lifted" by the destruction of nearby tenement houses. Other major projects widened all or parts of Church, Asylum, Park, Morgan, and Main streets, and Maple and
Asylum avenues, among others. But opposition succeeded in blocking proposed widenings of another part of Park Street and delayed plans to widen Church and High streets. Opponents of street-widening projects usually objected on the grounds that their buildings would be razed, but some, like the Capitol Avenue residents, opposed having the road in front of their homes turned into a busy thoroughfare.26

As winter driving increased in the late 1910s and the 1920s, snowplowing patterns further confined traffic to a few major streets. At the turn of the century the city had removed snow from streets only during unusually heavy snowstorms. This practice did not become controversial until 1905, when a major fire, following a storm that had clogged the streets with deep snow, delayed the steam-powered fire engines. Issuing a radical proposal with defiant emphasis, the fire board president Charles E. Parker, declared, "Yes sir, I'm in favor of every bit of snow being removed, down to the hardpan, the pavement," in the center of the city. Other prominent local men dismissed this proposal as ridiculously expensive, unnecessary, and disruptive to sleighing, but the idea eventually prevailed.27

At this time, most snowplowing was done by the street railroad company, which ran trolleys equipped with plows. The plows pushed the snow off the tracks but left it piled deeply in the street. Property owners dumped more snow in the street while shoveling their sidewalks. The street department would try to clear out the worst of the piles by hiring large numbers of day laborers to shovel the snow into wagons and dump it into the Park River. Crosswalks were also shoveled. The city did only limited clearing with horse-drawn snowplows.28 Snow removal efforts in the 1900s and 1910s focused mainly on paved streets in the central business district. Motorists driving in other parts of the city after a heavy snowfall tended to follow in the trolley tracks, often causing delays for trolleys. After a 1920 blizzard, for instance, many motorists traveling on trolley lines stalled out in the trackside drifts as they attempted to turn into side streets. As pavement spread outward on the radial avenues, the city increased its amount of snow clearance, particularly after it mounted plows on trucks in 1921. Still, side streets continued to be neglected. "The majority of Hartford's side streets haven't seen a plow of any sort all winter," complained the Automobilist, the magazine of the Automobile Club of Hartford, in 1923. "The snow has been packed down and there are now masses of bumps, ruts and holes." The neglect of macadamized side streets continued at least through the rest of the decade. In winter 1928–29, the city spent barely seven thousand dollars on clearing snow from the 115 miles of macadam streets, but more than three times that amount on the far smaller mileage of streets with improved paving.29

The funneling of traffic into major thoroughfares—encouraged by paving, widening, and snowplowing policies—was especially significant because the total volume of traffic continued to grow astronomically with the increase in private automobile ownership and the sudden appearance of jitneys. According to traffic counts by the street department, the number of motor vehicles on Hartford's streets quadrupled between 1914 and 1919, only to triple again by 1929.30

The Broad, Straight Streets

The increasing traffic had striking effects on the character of the neighborhoods along the major thoroughfares. Two of the most radically transformed streets had once been among the most prestigious addresses in the city: Washington Street and Farmington Avenue. Industrialists, insurance executives, political leaders, and other prominent and wealthy men had been building opulent homes along these semi-suburban streets since the mid-nineteenth century. Samuel Clemens, visiting the city in 1868 at the start of his literary success, was so impressed that he decided to settle in Hartford. Generalizing from his impressions of the wealthy areas he visited, particularly the Nook Farm enclave at Farmington Avenue and Forest Street, he described Hartford as a city composed almost entirely of dwelling houses—not shingle-shaped affairs, stood on end and packed together like a "deck" of cards, but massive private hotels, scattered along the broad straight streets, from fifty all the way up to two hundred yards apart. Each house sits in the midst of about an acre of green grass, or flower beds, or ornamental shrubbery, guarded on all sides by the trimmed hedges of arbor-vitae, and by files of huge forest trees that cast a shadow like a thunder-
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cloud... Everywhere the eye turns it is blessed with a vision of refreshing green. You do not know what beauty is if you have not been here.30

Hartford was but one of many American cities in which the late nineteenth-century elite had chosen grand, tree-lined avenues as the ideal showplaces for mansions. Such avenues were in many cases the main traveled roads from the city's center into the hinterland, and as such were served by streetcar and utility lines. Wealthy residents did not often ride trolleys themselves, but they chose to build their homes on the streets with the highest property values and most modern improvements. The avenues underwent rapid change in the early twentieth century, as most of the elite fled. Greatly increased traffic had combined with commercial and apartment development to make the avenues less desirable as elite residential addresses, and more secluded suburban locations had afforded an attractive alternative.31 Like Cleveland's Euclid Avenue or Detroit's Woodward Avenue, Hartford's premier residential avenues experienced the same dramatic rise and fall.

Hartford residents initially saw breadth and straightness as desirable qualities in residential avenues, though by attracting traffic these features ultimately contributed to the avenues' decline. Petitioners advocating the straightening of a minor crook in Farmington Avenue in 1864 predicted that the project would help the street attain its destiny as "the finest and most popular avenue leading out of the city... thickly studded to West Hartford, with elegant dwellings." The petitioners said that wide, straight streets laid out at right angles would make a pleasant change from the "wild deformity" of the colonial street pattern in the neighborhood near the Connecticut River. "We require spacious streets and avenues to invite men of wealth and influence to make pleasant homes with us." As they had requested, the city straightened Farmington Avenue at its approach to the Park River around 1870, and Clemens soon built his ostentatious mansion at that very site.32

Though neighbors lost a battle to prevent the extension of horsecar lines there, Farmington Avenue and the surrounding Asylum Hill neighborhood continued to attract men of wealth and influence through the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Farmington Avenue residents were heavily represented in the social register. Of all the streets in the city, only nearby Asylum Avenue counted more listings in 1897. Farmington Avenue, however, had bigger homes and broader lawns.33

Unfortunately for the residents of the avenue, it was also the major link between the downtown and the rapidly developing affluent suburban areas in the West End and West Hartford. The city laid asphalt on the avenue in 1899 as far west as Woodland Avenue, by the Park River. The asphalt was extended to Tremont Street in 1910 despite neighborhood opposition, because city officials believed that "no suitable pavement except asphalt could be laid on Farmington Avenue which would stand the vast amount of traffic, both horse drawn and motor driven, over this trunk line thoroughfare." By 1911 the asphalt ran all the way to the city line. Traffic increased so much that, by 1920, the Automobile Club of Hartford urged relieving the congestion by widening Asylum Avenue so that it could serve as an alternate route.34

Developers built scattered apartment buildings along Farmington Avenue in the 1910s and added many more in the 1920s. Old homes were torn down or divided into lodging houses. Businesses also sprang up in the 1920s, including pharmacies, service stations, groceries, butchers, clothing stores, tailors, doctors' offices, barbershops, automobile dealerships and a movie theater. By 1928 Farmington Avenue was "practically a business thoroughfare," complained a woman who recalled its best beauty. Still to come was the single most radical change: the construction in 1929-31 of the massive new headquarters of the Aetna Life Insurance Company.35

An even swifter transformation was seen on Washington Street, which ran along a low ridge stretching south from the capitol, with the factory district a short distance to the northwest and the downtown to the northeast. In the late nineteenth century, a carriage or two might be seen gliding down the street under overarching elms, but the clang of trolleys was never heard except at the far southern end. The owners of the Italianate and Classical Revival mansions were heavily represented in the blue book, and the street included so many prominent political figures that it was referred to as "Governors' Row."36

A long, wide, straight street without trolleys may have been an impressive setting for mansions; it was also attractive to automobile traffic. Early motorists' guidebooks recommended Washington Street as a north-south connector within Hartford, and as part of an alternate route to Meriden.
and New Haven. Signs (probably posted by the Automobile Club) also directed New Haven-bound motorists that way. 87

Businesses alert to the flow of traffic began locating on Washington Street in the 1910s. By 1920 three car dealerships and an automotive supply store had been built. Homeowners were beginning to move out of the remaining houses, and formerly private homes were occupied by the Connecticut Humane Society and the Hebrew Old People's Home. Apartment buildings had been constructed just north of Retreat Avenue where the trolley line from downtown entered the street. City officials decided in 1920 that Washington Street could go no longer without asphalt. "None could have foreseen the rapid deterioration of the macadam on Washington Street. It is without a doubt the worst in the city and is called on to carry a heavy traffic. An emergency has arisen," according to one report. Despite residents' opposition and an attempted veto by the mayor, the city laid asphalt there in 1921. After that, houses rapidly gave way to auto repair shops, apartment buildings, state offices, filling stations, the new county courthouse, and a supermarket. "Washington Street, the pride of Hartford, was desecrated by the inroads of trade," according to one 1928 observer. 88 Most of the elite had fled. Only twelve Washington Street addresses were listed in the blue book for 1929, compared with forty-seven in 1913 and sixty-four in 1909. The numerous listings in the 1929 blue book for addresses on West Hartford side streets clearly indicated the elite's preference for more secluded locations. 89

Automobile versus Pedestrian

Paving, widening, and plowing policies helped turn a century-old road network into a modern traffic system and contributed toward some striking changes in land use patterns. But the creation of this traffic system depended on more than just physical improvements in the streets. In the early twentieth century, automobile owners, legislators, city officials, police and educators worked together to extend the customary and legal privileges of Hartford motorists. They cleared the way for high-speed travel by relaxing the speed limits, adopting regulations to ease traffic flow, and undertaking educational and legal efforts to control pedestrian behavior. Motorists' power continued to grow as their numbers exploded and as pedestrians learned to be wary of the increasingly dangerous streets. By the mid-1920s the major thoroughfares of the city were reserved almost exclusively for motor vehicles, and walkers who stepped off the curb did so at their own peril.

Until the early years of the new century, pedestrians, bicycles, trolleys, carriages, and wagons had mingles relatively easily on Hartford's streets. The congestion that had plagued Boston and New York for decades was virtually nonexistent in the smaller provincial capital. People commonly crossed the street without bothering to look both ways, and they crossed wherever they wanted to except when muddy seasons made it worth using the stone crosswalk at the corner. Even the major intersections at City Hall Square were quiet enough that pedestrians could stand in the street conversing or waiting for trolleys without danger from the passing traffic. 90 Traffic accidents did occur from time to time and could even result in serious injuries or fatalities. Though horse-drawn vehicles generally moved slowly—Hartford's speed limit in the late nineteenth century was six miles per hour—heedless children and elderly people were sometimes run over anyway. The greatest danger came from panicked horses, who would gallop through the streets as their terrified drivers pulled helplessly at the reins. After electric streetcars were introduced in 1888, trolleys sometimes collided with carriages and wagons. Nevertheless, such accidents were newsworthy aberrations in the era before widespread automobile use. 91

The automobile first entered Hartford's streets as a novelty that barely disturbed the mixture of other street uses. When the inventor Hiram Percy Maxim took what he claimed was the "historic first horseless carriage ride in Hartford" in 1895, he drew a crowd of pedestrians into the roadway. Several dozen men and boys ran out into Park Street to follow the smell machine as it clattered and coughed its way up the slope from the factory district. Maxim's early experimental drives always drew a flock of onlookers, some of whom would follow him on bicycle into the countryside. Even after Maxim's employer, Albert A. Pope, began manufacturing them commercially in 1897, cars remained a curiosity. When motoring enthusiasts met to form the Automobile Club of Hartford in 1902, there were only about eighty automobile owners in the area. Later that year, throngs of admiring spectators turned out to watch the arrival at the Allyn House of seventy dust-covered motorists on an endurance run from New York to Boston. So many people packed
This change was intended only to benefit bicyclists, but it applied to all vehicles.\(^{49}\)

The primary goal of traffic regulation changed radically as the automobile gained popularity among the classes who made the laws. By the mid-1920s, when over more than twenty thousand automobiles were registered in Hartford, the laws clearly favored vehicular speed over pedestrian safety. The strict local speed limit came to an end in 1901, when the state legislature took away local authority to regulate the speed of motor vehicles and set a statewide limit of 12 mph within city limits and 15 mph elsewhere. (Police officers with stopwatches calculated motorists' speed by timing their travel along certain measured sections of roadway.)\(^{46}\) Automobile manufacturers lobbied to have speed limits further increased in 1905 and tried to impress legislators by having them chauffeured through country roads in West Hartford at the breathtaking rate of 40 mph. The legislators were reportedly "astonished to find out how slow the legal speed limit of fifteen miles an hour seemed," and promptly raised it to 20 mph outside the city limits, annoying farmers, whose horses were panicked by speeding cars. The legislature raised speed limits again in 1909 and in 1917.\(^{47}\) In 1927 speed limits were abolished altogether in Connecticut, and drivers were forbidden only to drive recklessly, dangerously, or "at a rate of speed greater than is reasonable."\(^{48}\)

While the state was raising the speed limit, the city was adopting increasingly detailed traffic regulations to ease traffic flow. Under rules passed in 1911, Hartford began requiring slow-moving vehicles to keep to the right to allow faster ones to pass; it set rules for who had the right of way at intersections; it required signaling for turning, stopping, slowing, or backing; it banned stopping in the roadway; and it set a forty-minute parking limit in the heart of downtown. By 1921 the rules mandated one-way traffic on several major streets, banned certain left turns, and further restricted parking. The Automobile Club of Hartford supported most of these changes, explaining that it "is always in favor of any measure that will be beneficial to the motoring public."\(^{49}\)

As the speed and number of automobiles increased, so did the number of pedestrians in the growing city, particularly in the dense commercial downtown. In 1917 an advertisement apparently placed by a real estate concern boasted that 10,800 people had passed through one downtown...
intersection in the space of a single hour. The crowded conditions in working-class neighborhoods also meant that there were many children and other people on foot in the streets, playing, shopping, or talking.

The growth of two increasingly incompatible forms of street use resulted in alarmingly frequent collisions. Traffic accidents suddenly began to kill dozens of Hartford residents in the 1910s. The Hartford Board of Health had reported that nobody was killed by vehicles or horses in 1902 and only one person in 1903. In contrast, the police department reported twenty-six people killed by automobiles in a twelve-month period in 1916 and 1917. The department’s reports for the 1910s and early 1920s left it unclear whether any of these victims were themselves in automobiles, but a later statewide study by the Connecticut Department of Motor Vehicles indicated that the overwhelming majority were on foot. The department reported that thirty of the thirty-one people killed in automobile accidents in Hartford in 1925 were pedestrians. Police department figures show that, in addition to those killed, several hundred people every year were struck and injured by automobiles. In spring 1926, for instance, the police reported 573 such injuries in the preceding twelve months; another 132 people had been struck but not injured.11

Hartford pedestrians noticed the growing conflict with motorists as early as 1907, when several of them wrote letters of protest to the Hartford Evening Post. “Not a day goes by but lives are jeopardized by speeding fiends,” wrote one anonymous correspondent. Another urged “the city fathers . . . take some steps to check the reckless speed that autoists drive their cars through the streets of this city. . . . When an auto dashes by a policeman at top speed he seems to be helpless to halt or check it, and stares in open-mouthed wonder at the fleeting car. I have witnessed a number of narrow escapes from running down pedestrians.” Particularly frightening were the electric cars, which ran almost silently. Another writer reported, “Walking across Main Street, near Asylum, a noiseless machine came whistling by me about a half an inch from my nose, rushing through the streets on [its] way to a kill.” Some motorists, noted the Post, “recognize no rights on the part of pedestrians, or even horse drivers, that they are in any way bound to respect.”12

Other writers said that pedestrians were equally to blame. “Might we not walk in comparative safety if, before leaving the boundary of the curb for the street, we should glance to right and left? The simplest precaution surely, but one sadly neglected,” wrote one pedestrian. “Again, the middle of the street is not the proper place to stand while waiting for a trolley car, yet this is a fixed habit with some. They stand absorbed in conversation, or their wits wandering in vacancy, only to be collected with a spasmodic jerk, which sends a possible ‘victim’ in the path of the anxiously advancing automobile.”13

The Automobile Club of Hartford in 1911 printed a “Diary of a Hartford Motorist,” intended humorously, in which an exasperated driver constantly encountered pedestrians intent on throwing themselves under his wheels. He narrowly missed a woman rushing out into traffic to catch a trolley, a child who “jumped out from ambush behind a trolley car,” an Italian trying to learn to ride a bicycle, boys playing in traffic, and parochial school children running across the street to hear an organ-grinder. His biggest shock came when a five-year-old fell in his path but lay safely between the wheels as the car passed over. “No matter how you drive, the pedestrian will get you,” concluded the motorist. “While you are figuring out what he is going to do another vehicle rams you. If people would only cross on the regular crossings and nowhere else it would be simply great.”14

As the references to Italian bicyclists and Catholic students suggest, the conflict between motorists and pedestrians had ethnic and class overtones. Automobile ownership in the early twentieth century was limited primarily to members of the elite and of the upper middle class, and was sometimes derided as a “fad of the very rich.” In Hartford, the Automobile Club initially attempted to maintain this elite image by screening out undesirable members. The club later recalled with amazement “the widespread feeling which existed against automobiles and motorists . . . Those who owned them were looked upon as snobs, as baby killers.”15 The growing use of the automobile produced greater class polarization than ever in the conflict over street use. Previous conflicts had sometimes seen spokesmen for the working class advocating traffic improvements against more affluent opposition, as in the examples of the Lathrop Street extension through Pope Park and the proposed widening of Capitol Avenue. But by the 1910s, the advocates of traffic flow tended to be those who could afford automobiles.

The losers in this conflict were the poor and the young. Nationally, the typical motor vehicle accident at this time was an encounter between
a wealthier motorist and a poorer pedestrian, with the pedestrian receiving most of the injuries. Lower-class resentment was fueled by the fact that many of the victims were children. In Connecticut cities, most of the children killed by automobiles were “of foreign extraction,” reported the motor vehicle commissioner, Robbins Stoeckel, in 1920. Stoeckel feared that the public was becoming hardened to frequent deaths and injuries among pedestrians. “There was a time, not so many years ago, when an automobile-pedestrian accident was a novelty,” he wrote in 1926. “It attracted a large crowd, was talked about, was fully reported in newspapers and was discussed as to its causes and consequences... But now it has become commonplace. Nobody, except the actual participant, pays much attention to it.”

Stoeckel was exaggerating to make a point. Actually, the slaughter in the streets roused considerable alarm in the 1910s and 1920s and provoked a number of responses. The building of more playgrounds to give children alternative places in which to play was one response. Another kind of alternative space being built at this time was the “isle of safety,” intended primarily to protect adult pedestrians. The isle of safety, which was common in other cities as well, was a raised concrete platform in a major intersection that served as a refuge for walkers who found themselves caught in the middle of traffic while attempting to cross the street. The island also forced traffic to follow well-defined paths. The first isle of safety in Hartford was built in 1910 at the downtown intersection of Trumbull and Pearl streets, where city officials and local reformers feared that people would be killed by speeding automobiles. The largest and most impressive isle was the one in the middle of State Street near its intersection with Main. It was designed as a waiting area for streetcar passengers who had previously annoyed motorists by standing in State Street next to the tracks or by rushing from the sidewalk across traffic as the trolley approached. “People have no sort of right to stand all over the street from Main to the post office—straggling like a flock of geese without a leader,” one observer had fumed in 1911. “Shoo’ them on to the sidewalks, where they belong.” The city accomplished this by building the safety isle, complete with a sixty-foot-long shelter, in 1913. The shelter, which was open to breezes in warm weather and glassed in during the winter, could hold up to two hundred people. People could board or dismount safely from trolleys there even while torrents of automobile traffic rushed by.

But some other isles of safety were so small that they were not particularly safe; they were little more than bumps in the street with a single lamppost and a place for a few people to stand. City officials considered removing one such isle in 1917 after automobiles smashed into its lamppost six times, twice at such speeds that the post was completely demolished. Some “safety zones” for trolley passengers had no raised curb, but were separated from the rest of the roadway only by ropes or white lines painted on the pavement. At most intersections and trolley stops there were no safety isles at all, and pedestrians had to take their chances.

“Crossing pedestrians may be frequently observed hugging the flashing beacon at Trumbull and Jewell streets, as they are overtaken by autos in crossing the street intersection,” reported one observer in 1926. Of
necessity, trolley passengers seeking to board or dismount at places without isles of safety continued to walk across traffic to the trolleys or stand waiting in the street.58

Clearly there was a limit to what a few isles of safety could accomplish. A more effective response to traffic accidents was the effort to teach both adults and children that the street was a place of dangerous high-speed traffic. Educational campaigns taught that pedestrians could cross safely only if they remained alert and followed special procedures.59 Early traffic-safety lessons for adults took the form of traffic police yelling at jaywalkers. By 1918, reported Police Chief Garrett J. Farrell, “People [were] becoming more and more familiar in regard to the proper method of crossing the streets and obedience to the signals given by the Traffic Officers.”60 Other efforts included a 1918 advertising campaign, in which local businesses paid for the publication of full-page advertisements in the Post admonishing adults about the perils of traffic. One ad urged: “Take Care on the Streets! Think only of safely reaching the other side. . . . Leave off all conversations when you step off the curb. Don’t look back—look where you’re going! Keep your eyes open if you don’t want them closed. And if you don’t want to break a careful driver’s heart, for Heaven’s sake be careful!” Another ad urged parents to teach their children never to cross streets except at the corners. In 1919 the Automobile Club further emphasized the importance of crossing at the corners by posting signs to that effect at major intersections.61

State officials and police chiefs throughout Connecticut organized a larger pedestrian safety campaign in 1921, employing propaganda techniques developed during World War I. Campaign leaders gave presentations at schools and “four minute” speeches at civic organizations. Ministers were asked to read the governor’s proclamation about traffic safety from the pulpit. Automobile clubs distributed pamphlets and posters. To reach the immigrant working class, the state hired a director with experience in making wartime propaganda films to produce a movie entitled “Where Are Your Children?” This film, which was shown in a heavily attended open-air screening on the East Side, graphically showed the dangers of letting children play in the streets, as well as the dangers of jaywalking. The Hartford Times cooperated by printing a front-page picture of a policeman with a stop sign, bearing the caption, “The guardian of your lives. Do as he signals.”62

To ensure that pedestrians paid attention, the 1921 campaign was timed to coincide with the effective date of a new state law against jaywalking. This law, which had been strongly advocated by the Automobile Club of Hartford, levied a twenty-five-dollar fine on any pedestrian who ignored the directions of a traffic officer or who used the street “recklessly.” As one police official put it, “The purpose of the law is to protect the automobilists against the careless pedestrian.” The club had argued that without such a law, pedestrians would continue to cross the street wherever they wanted, ignoring the officers and the painted crossing lines that had cost the city good money.63

Even before the passage of the law, police had been trying with mixed success to force pedestrians to stay on the sidewalks until given permission to cross. The automobile club condescendingly reported “many amusing incidents” in which chastened jaywalkers were forced to return to the sidewalk.64 Once the law took effect, jaywalkers were treated more harshly, as police would grab them and force them to retrace their steps. A pedestrian complained to the Hartford Courant about a policeman who was “laying violent hands upon different persons.” One jaywalker, who had been ordered back to the curb at a time when the street was virtually empty of traffic, was arrested for objecting, “I looked up and down Pearl Street and Central Row and there wasn’t a vehicle in sight,” the man told the Courant. “I said to the policeman, in what I believe was a polite manner, ‘You have no right to stop traffic when there are no vehicles in sight.’ He stepped over to me and said ‘You’ll have a chance to talk that over in the police station—and you’re going to ride there in the wagon.’” Most pedestrians were more compliant. Obeying policemen at the corner of Asylum and Main, “Herds of people in either direction gathered every few minutes on either corner—fifty to seventy-five in each group. When the embargo was removed for a moment they hurried across in both directions like a flock of sheep,” according to the Courant letter writer. “What I want to know is whether we are coming to be a lot of imbeciles, not knowing enough to take reasonable care of ourselves.”65

Public opinion turned against pedestrians, blaming them for their own carelessness if they were struck by cars. “Many people, the other day on North Main Street, saw an amusing incident between a motorist and careless pedestrian,” reported the Courant, describing how the “sleepwalker” was hit and then dragged along the street, spilling the sack of
sugar he was carrying. A 1929 report by the state Department of Motor Vehicles told of a “determined lady violator” who attempted to cross the street against the signal but was seized by a police officer and dragged back to the curb. “Judging by the laughter, the spectators were with the officer.” Many drivers came to expect pedestrians to get out of the way and developed the habit of honking instead of slowing down when people walked in front of them, the Automobile Club admitted.

Pedestrians seem to have learned their lesson and stayed out of the way. The annual death toll of automobile victims stabilized through the 1920s and 1930s at about twenty to twenty-five, despite continued increases in the number and speed of cars and in the population of the city. Some pedestrians continued to jaywalk even on busy downtown streets, but jaywalking never became more than an act of individual defiance. Only a few isolated voices complained about the loss of pedestrian rights. “How much longer must a patient public submit to the tyranny of the automobile?” asked an anonymous writer in a letter printed in the Courant in 1930. “Is not the man or woman on foot as valuable to the community as those who whiz through the streets in their own cars?... Why should the humble pedestrian be under a constant fear for his life, like a hunted animal?” Unlike motorists, pedestrians had no advocacy groups to defend their interests. Accepting the primacy of the automobile on major streets, herds of downtown pedestrians obediently waited on the corners and crossed on the crosswalks under the direction of policemen.

The pedestrian safety campaigns, combined with the new traffic laws and the increased danger posed by high-speed automobiles, introduced sharper distinctions in the use of major thoroughfares. Such streets were now more exclusively the property of the automobile, and the confinement of pedestrians to the sidewalks was constantly reinforced. The change amounted to the monopolization of public space by a new form of transportation technology, but also, more subtly, by a social class. Automobilists’ disregard for other street uses and their thinly concealed mockery of pedestrians reflected wealthier Hartford residents’ attitude of superiority toward the poorer majority. Pedestrians might complain about reckless drivers, but their complaints neither slowed the pace of traffic nor prevented the adoption of new traffic laws encouraging even greater speeds. Less influential as individuals, and unorganized as a political force, walkers found their use of the major streets severely restricted by laws made in the interests of the more prominent and organized motorists.

Swan’s Way

Regulation of street use proved a successful way to increase the efficiency of the evolving traffic system. City officials and planners seeking to ease congestion relied increasingly on regulation in the 1920s, as public opposition and prohibitively high costs blocked the taking of land for more street space.

By the late 1910s, it was obvious that physical improvements to the streets could not keep pace with the phenomenal increase in traffic. Mayor Frank A. Hagarty made a determined but limited attempt to widen and extend certain major streets in 1916 and 1917. Taking office in 1916, Hagarty argued that the streets were arteries for Hartford’s lifeblood. “I am firmly convinced that our traffic problem is the most pressing of any which we have upon our hands at the present time, and that the prosperity of Hartford’s future depends upon an early and wise solution of that problem,” he declared. Hagarty attempted to act on a few of the ambitious street designs proposed in 1912 by the architectural firm of Carrère and Hastings, advisors to the Commission on the City Plan, but he was constrained by concerns about cost and by the need to secure voters’ approval for major projects. With the backing of the commission and the Chamber of Commerce, Hagarty secured voters’ approval in 1917 for a few street-widening and extension projects affecting Prospect and Church streets and part of Capitol Avenue, among others. But in 1918 his street projects were voted down—and he was voted out of office.

Hagarty’s accomplishments fell far short of what Carrère and Hastings had recommended, and downtown traffic jams continued to worsen in the 1920s despite some modest street improvements. As early as 1919, old-timers warned that the problem was becoming “unendurable” and that the city must take drastic measures, such as an enormously expensive widening of Asylum Street starting at Main. The Asylum Street widening plan, which was strongly opposed by merchants, went nowhere, while the assembly lines of Detroit continued to pour automobiles into downtown Hartford. By 1929 there were more than thirty thousand cars registered
in the city, not including those belonging to suburban commuters. The Chamber of Commerce and the Automobile Club of Hartford continued to advocate ambitious street projects while recognizing the difficulty of overcoming the obstacles to them. During the 1920s, these organizations, as well as city officials, increasingly turned their attention to other ways to ease traffic flow. Among these alternatives were putting more policemen to work directing traffic, installing traffic signals, and adopting stricter parking regulations for downtown streets.

Police in the late 1910s and 1920s devoted increasing amounts of time to enforcing traffic laws and directing traffic. By 1915 twelve officers were stationed at downtown intersections on every day but Sunday, whistling one stream of traffic to a halt and waving another on its way. By 1920, every police officer on duty during the morning and evening rush hours was assigned to direct traffic, supplementing the efforts of the continually growing traffic squad. The police chief persistently begged the city to let him hire even more officers, arguing that "the regulation of Traffic today is one of the most important functions of the Police Department," until the need for the more routine work was eased by the installation of mechanical traffic signals starting in the mid-1920s.

While traffic flow could be made more efficient through regulation, parking problems were harder to solve. Unlike regulatory measures that choreographed street motion or favored motorists at the expense of other street users, limits on parking addressed an irreconcilable conflict between different uses of the automobile. In an era when more and more street space was needed, parking increasingly blocked what little there was. No-parking zones in congested areas could clear the street for moving traffic, but they created inconveniences for motorists with destinations in those areas. The imposition of parking bans also drew strong opposition from merchants, who feared losing customers. The conflict was unavoidable by the 1920s, when parked cars lined the streets throughout the downtown and in nearby parts of the East Side. Motorists were frustrated both by the difficulty of finding empty parking spaces and by the snarling of traffic that parked cars caused. Seeking to resolve this quandary, the Automobile Club of Hartford urged the city to satisfy the car's voracious appetite for parking and street space at the expense of Bushnell Park. The club's secretary, Arthur Fifoot, called for extending Trumbull Street across the park and turning all the land east of the street into a parking lot, complete with corner filling stations. The proposal was never enacted, and parking problems continued to worsen. By the late 1920s, parked cars clogged downtown streets not only during working hours but through the evening theater hours as well. The problem had also spread to streets around the factory district.

Better regulation could not solve all of Hartford's traffic problems. Mayor Norman C. Stevens warned in 1926:

There is a limit to increasing the traffic capacity of the streets merely by changing the traffic regulations, no matter how desirable these regulations may be in themselves. The prohibition of left-hand turns, the establishment of one-way streets, the installation of flashing beacons and electric automatic signals are all very good in themselves, but there are some things that they will not cure. They will not remedy defects in the street plan itself. Traffic can never be properly routed through improperly planned streets until corrective measures have been applied to the streets themselves.

But regulation was far cheaper than changes in the street plan, so, despite its limitations, regulation drew considerable attention in the 1920s as a remedy for Hartford's congested traffic system. In 1926 a new consultant for the Commission on the City Plan issued a citywide traffic plan that emphasized regulation over physical improvements. The report, written by Herbert S. Swan of New York, did propose a number of major street expansion projects, but it seemed less than confident that the work would ever be done. "Because of the prohibitive expense of street improvements involving the taking of land in built-up sections, the remedy for congestion has to be found, as far as possible, in police regulations rather than in costly widenings and expansions." In contrast to Carrère and Hastings's grandiose plans for new parkways and boulevards, Swan wrote of Hartford's street system as a creaky old machine that could be tuned up using proper engineering principles. Swan included numerous charts, diagrams, and statistics to illustrate the turbulence problems in Hartford's traffic flow. Arguing that "promiscuously mixed traffic invariably results in congestion," he called for further separation of different forms of street use. Paint markings were needed to delineate travel lanes for faster and slower vehicles, and refuges for pedestrians in the middle of streets would also help to direct the routes of turning
automobiles. Parking should be banned on more downtown streets to make way for moving traffic; in particular, it should be banned near intersections in order to clear space for additional travel lanes. Private parking garages would eventually ease the parking problem. 79

Swan devoted considerable attention to the proper operation of a traffic signal system. Measuring travel times and delays to the tenth of a second, he proposed a configuration of synchronized traffic lights to ease travel through the downtown. He also called for an automatic traffic light system to speed the flow of automobiles down the major thoroughfares. He urged favoring the traffic flow on the major radial arteries, and forcing crossing traffic to stop. To avoid interrupting traffic flow, stoplights would be installed at only a few major intersections on each artery. Motorists could speed through the other intersections without having to yield the right of way. 76 "The automobile is in its very nature a high speed vehicle; to function properly it therefore should have a high speed thoroughfare," Swan explained. "A large part of the traffic problem in every city is to bring the automobile and the thoroughfare plan more nearly in tune with one another, to remove, to ameliorate or to control such obstructions in the thoroughfares as militate against the greatest usefulness of the automobile." 77

Swan was more successful than Carrere and Hastings in gaining acceptance for his ideas. The city, which had begun installing automatic traffic signals in late 1925, created a coordinated system of traffic lights in and around the downtown in 1929. In 1930 Hartford finally adopted the through-street plan, letting automobiles speed down major arteries without having to yield the right of way to traffic on cross streets. Vehicles attempting to cross now had to wait for a break in traffic. Neighbors and merchants complained that high-speed traffic made it hard for pedestrians to cross the street, but they met with little sympathy. 78 The through-street plan put the final seal of official approval on a forty-year trend toward vehicular traffic's primacy on major thoroughfares.

The various efforts to create a modern street system in Hartford produced striking differences in traffic on different streets. By making physical and regulatory changes, the city government transformed the use of the long