

Innerbelt Bridge Aesthetics Subcommittee

Goal Statement from 2006

“Aspire to a design that further defines and enhances the identity of Cleveland, reflects technology of our time and respects Cleveland’s history and culture in a fiscally responsible manner.”

Design Principles in 2009 *

The design should be inspired by Cleveland’s civic, industrial and bridge design history, and should be the next contribution to the rich bridge architectural history of the valley. It should respect the aesthetic history of this place.

The new bridge should reflect consistent design themes of existing bridges in the valley, and should strive for similar attention to form and detail, while not being imitative.

The new bridge should advance architecture and technology of our time, not be nostalgic.

The design of the approaches and main spans should be consistent and coherent across the entire valley, and speak with a single design vocabulary.

The design should maximize the possibility to create a visual image or statement. **

Bridge design should focus on principles of form, rhythm and scale. The scale of bridge elements should invoke and be in proper proportion with the dimensions of the overall valley.

Consideration of the people and environment adjacent to, and under, the bridge is important. Design should recognize the potential for future pedestrian use on the land under the bridge and consider lighting or other means to increase safety and user-friendliness.

The design should be sensitive to the scale and appearance of the neighborhoods where it touches down and should respect the special character of Tremont and Gateway.

The bridge and placement of its supports should be conducive to positive and beneficial future land use adjacent to the underside of the structure.

Treat side, under, and above deck views with comparable effort and attention as global views.

Design should incorporate opportunities for aesthetic lighting, including the underside of the structure, in keeping with the lighting schemes common to existing bridges in the valley.

The design should consider improvements to bicycle and pedestrian access around the new structure. ***

* The principle “Design for the rehabilitation of the existing bridge should be compatible with plans for the new bridge” was removed, since the existing bridge will be replaced rather than rehabilitated.

** The phrase “preferably with an above deck structure” was removed due to cost concerns.

*** The phrase “on either the new structure or the rehabilitated new structure” was revised since alternate routes are available, the provision of a bike lane on an interstate facility would present safety and maintenance challenges, and the cost to establish a separated bicycle facility on the bridges over the Cuyahoga River Valley would be disproportionate to the need.