



## LAND USE DEPARTMENT

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Sean Laudati, P.E., BL Companies

FROM: Abby Y. Piersall, AICP, Town Planner

DATE: April 24, 2025

TITLE: 0027-0128 Waterside Lane Bridge Aesthetic/Geometry Options

The Town of Clinton hosted a community conversation on April 10, 2025 to discuss design options for the Waterside Lane Bridge. Approximately 25 people attended, most of whom reside in close proximity to the bridge. Public feedback on the typical sections and aesthetic options provided to the Town on March 20<sup>th</sup> was generally consistent from the attendees. Attendees broadly requested that the bridge maintain as much of the current aesthetic and scale as possible.

Comments included:

1. The current single lane configuration slows traffic in an area where people are prone to speeding. Widening the bridge may result in faster vehicle speeds. Seasonal speed bumps were discussed.
2. Since the bridge serves as a driveway into the beach parking lot, does it actually need to include two-way travel? Is there a way to classify it as an access way and not a road?
3. Would widening the bridge result in a wider drive into the beach since the existing pavement matches the width of the bridge pavement? What would the dimensions of any widening be?
4. Maintaining a physical barrier between the sidewalk(s) and the vehicle travel lane(s) is important. If the bridge will be widened, can it accommodate a physical barrier?
5. Is it possible to not stripe the pavement to maintain the current look, especially if the pedestrian access is separated by a physical barrier?
6. Can vehicle traffic be separated by a metal barrier, but the pedestrian rail be timber?
7. Small watercraft passing under the bridge already have a small area to use, and there are obstacles in the water. Can these be removed? Can the bridge be designed to better accommodate small craft?
8. What degree of erosion is anticipated during/after construction? Residents were concerned with existing scour/erosion.

9. Maintaining two pedestrian lanes is important, especially since sidewalks double as fishing platforms.
10. Several people referred to the bridge as the first colonial public works project in Connecticut. There was a long discussion on the historic nature of the bridge and its relationship to the character of the neighborhood and nearby historic district. The landscape view of the bridge from waterside lane was a priority. Residents would like to know from SHPO if there are any designations or design options that can be used to replicate the existing bridge. Preservation of the bridge as an historic resource was mentioned several times. A suggestion was made to incorporate an historic marker.
11. Is there a way to save the original stones and incorporate them in some way into the final design? Abutments should attempt to match the existing stonework.
12. Can the bridge design incorporate an easy-to-lock gate to deter people from accessing the beach after dark/when the park is closed?
13. Is there a modular construction option that would reduce the construction timeframe?
14. Generally, the lowest profile superstructure was preferred and hiding conduit to accommodate a larger water line and electrical was discussed.
15. Colors and materials should match existing stonework to the extent possible.
16. Metal elements should be painted.
17. Any lighting should be at a scale and style that reflect the historic nature of the bridge.
18. Bridge aesthetics need to be considered from the perspectives of driers, walkers, and boaters.