



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 15, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

4. Kitchen Social at 6767 Longshore Street 21-037WR

Waiver Review

Proposal: Deviations to transparency and entrance requirements associated with exterior modifications for a tenant space within Bridge Park, Block D – Building D2 zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway.

Request: Review and approval of a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Phillip Schettler, Burge Architecture

Planning Contact: Zach Hounshell, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-037

MOTION 1: Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve one Administrative Departure:

- §153.062 – Materials (E)(1)(a) – Minimum Primary Façade Materials
Required: 80% of the materials must be comprised of either stone, brick, or glass.
Request: To allow no less than ±73 percent on the north elevation of Building D2.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Administrative Departure was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

MOTION 2: Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded, to approve two Waivers:

- §153.062(O)(5)(d)(3) — Street Facades: Number of Entrances
Requirement: 1 entrance per 75 feet of façade minimum
Request: No building entrances on the North Elevation of Building D2



**4. Kitchen Social at 6767 Longshore Street
21-037WR**

Waiver Review

2. §153.062(O)(5)(d)(1) — Ground Story Street Facing Transparency

Requirement: 60 percent

Request: Building D2: ±50 percent on the west elevation, ±40 percent on the north elevation, ±47 percent on the east elevation.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The two Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Zach Hounshell

B1050D11513A490

Zach Hounshell, Planner I





RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, April 15, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

5. Kitchen Social at 6767 Longshore Street 21-021MPR

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Exterior modifications to an existing tenant space located within Bridge Park. The site is zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Applicant: Phillip Schettler, Burge Architecture

Planning Contact: Zach Hounshell, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-021

MOTION: Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded, to approve a Minor Project with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant receive approval of furniture selections by the Administrative Review Team;
- 2) That the applicant work with Washington Township Fire Department to finalize a fire protection plan prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 3) That the applicant provide an exterior lighting package, subject to staff approval; and
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to enhance the entry design along Longshore Street.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

RESULT: The Minor Project was approved with modified conditions.

RECORDED VOTES:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Zach Hounshell

B1058D11513A490...

Zach Hounshell, Planner I



~~Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]~~

~~Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in.~~

Ms. Call noted that no cases are eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening; however, there is a request to amend the order of the agenda to hear Cases 4 and 5, Kitchen Social prior to Cases 1, 2 and 3, Bridge Park Block G. No member objected to amendment of the agenda order.

Ms. Call swore in individuals intending to address the Commission on tonight's cases.

4. Kitchen Social at 6767 Longshore Street, 1-037WR, Waiver Review

A request for approval of deviations to transparency and entrance requirements associated with exterior modifications for a tenant space within Bridge Park, Block D – Building D2 zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway.

5. Kitchen Social at 6767 Longshore Street, 21-021MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for approval of exterior modifications for a tenant space within Bridge Park, Block D – Building D2 zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Riverside Drive with John Shields Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review of a waiver and a Minor Project for Kitchen Social. The site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood and is located within the Bridge Park development. Block D, which is located at the intersection of John Shields Parkway and Riverside Drive, is the northernmost block within the Bridge Park development. This particular tenant space is located at 6767 Longshore Street, and is the northernmost, ground-story tenant space within Building D2. The east elevation of the tenant space is located along Longshore Street, and the north elevation, which the primary consideration, is located along the John Shields Parkway greenway. [Images shown of the John Shields Parkway streetscape.] Mrs. Martin stated that a significant, underground pedestrian walkway provides access to the future Riverside Crossing Park on the west side of Riverside Drive. The terrace area was approved with the base building. This is the primary area of consideration, although there are some minor tenant modifications to the primary entrance along Longshore Street, as well as minor modifications to the west elevation.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing façade/storefront modifications to the existing tenant space, which includes enclosing an existing 650-square-foot terrace located to the north of the tenant space. The proposed enclosure will create an indoor/outdoor dining space for the restaurant. The existing terrace was approved with the base building in 2018, as an open-air terrace, to allow for a transition between private space and the publically-accessible John Shields Parkway greenway to the north of the building. The primary modifications under consideration follow.

North Elevation:

The existing outdoor dining terrace would be permanently enclosed using three 10-foot tall C.H.I overhead glass garage doors, finished in a Powder Coat Gray finish. The garage doors will be located between the existing brick pilasters at the edge of the terrace, within the existing footprint of the building.

The overhead garage doors can be opened to take advantage of pleasant weather, and also allow for year-round use of the space. The applicant is proposing Nichiha Vintage Wood 1818 fiber cement panels around the garage doors in an Ash Gray finish. The applicant is also proposing a 36-inch wire railing system on the inside of the garage doors to retain a barrier when the garage doors are opened. Staff recommends a higher quality thin brick, in a color matching upper stories of the building (Glen-Gery Sioux City Ebonite), be used in lieu of the fiber cement board. The application of brick will provide a more, permanent appearance and ensure the quality and character meets the Bridge Street District requirements.

East Elevation:

On the Longshore Street, east elevation is the primary entrance to the tenant space. The applicant is proposing a new NanaWall window system on either side of the building entrance. Below the windows, Mos Metalica Pol Ret porcelain wall tiles in a blue/gray color, matching the brand aesthetics, are proposed.

West Elevation:

On the west elevation, the applicant will be adding approximately 90 square feet of storefront system to the total square footage of the west façade by expanding the façade north of the existing tenant space. The applicant is proposing to extend the existing storefront system to meet the existing brick pillar at the northwest corner of the building. A 50-square-foot louver system is proposed to be installed above a portion of the storefront system. The louvers are finished in a gray color to match the existing louvers on the building. Enclosing the space eliminates the stairway for the existing terrace, which will no longer be utilized.

Staff has reviewed the proposal against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of:

- 2 waivers: (1) permit elimination of the entrance on the north façade, and (2) to modify the percent of primary materials and transparency; and
- A Minor Project with three conditions.

Commission Questions for Staff

Ms. Call stated that in regard to quality of materials, Council has advised caution in approving the use of thin brick. Staff has recommended replacing the Nichiha product with thin brick, which would match the remainder of the building. Is the rest of the building finished in a thin brick?

Ms. Martin responded that she does not have that answer. However, the upper stories of many of the buildings in the District are clad in thin brick, due to the weight of full brick. Thin brick is recommended due to the limited amount of use, and because the depth of the thin brick would match that of the cementitious siding, the entire front of the storefront would not need to be redesigned.

Ms. Fox inquired if any other system was considered rather than garage doors.

Ms. Martin responded that the initial proposal did not include garage doors. It included a low wall enclosure with windows above. Staff suggested the garage door element to increase the transparency and retain the colonnade element to the extent possible.

Mr. Supelak stated that staff has recommended disapproval of the Administrative Departure in regard to meeting the 80% requirement of primary materials. Would the use of thin brick achieve the required 80%?

Ms. Martin responded that replacing the fibrous cement board, a secondary material, with thin brick would make the materials compliant with Code.

Applicant Presentation

Brian O'Malley, Kitchen Social, 6767 Longshore Street, Dublin, OH stated that they also have a Kitchen Social restaurant at Polaris. They proposed the use of fibrous cement board because it is more consistent with their Kitchen Social look, and it also would permit the restaurant to stand out on that side of the building. This would be consistent with other tenants within the development, who have individual looks, store fronts and curb appeal; it was for that purpose the secondary materials were chosen. Additionally, they initially proposed half walls with garage doors above. The Kitchen Social concept is indoor/outdoor; hence the patio. That concept is even more relevant today than when the first Kitchen Social restaurant was designed.

Commission Questions

Mr. Way requested the applicant to address the durability of the porcelain tile, which is proposed on the exterior by the entrance.

Mr. O'Malley responded that it is an indoor/outdoor porcelain tile. That material currently exists on the façade of their exterior bar at their Polaris location, which opened in November 2019.

Mr. Way stated that he noticed the elevations for the rest of the building have lights on the columns on all facades. What is the reason the applicant chose not to incorporate similar lights? He would suggest that some lighting on the columns related to this business would be beneficial.

Mr. O'Malley stated that he agrees. He believes that the lights on the columns on the rest of the building existed at the time those tenants occupied their sites. They chose not to change the existing exterior, but they would be happy to include some lights on the exterior, if possible.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the garage doors were a mutual agreement between the applicant and staff.

Mr. O'Malley responded that initially, he designed a half wall rather than metal railings; however, either railings or a wall is necessary due to Liquor Codes. They need to be able to stop people going or leaving, per Code. Staff suggested the full garage doors, which permits more light to enter the space. The existing wire railings on the building will be further extended. The garage doors are important. They can be open 75% of the year, but also permit an abundance of natural light during the winter months.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the garage doors. Is the applicant also satisfied with staff's recommendation for replacing the secondary material with thin brick?

Mr. O'Malley responded that he would prefer the secondary material, as it permits them to be more consistent with their existing storefronts. He would like the restaurant to stand out, because it has a front door in Bridge Park. However, he does not object to thin brick if it is necessary for approval of the project.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the railing is the same as what exists on the building.

Mr. O'Malley responded that it is the same railing.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the Commission was being asked to evaluate the project in context with the Kitchen Social tenant space or in context with the building.

Ms. Martin responded that the Code addresses it with two calculations, one for materials and another for transparency. For materials, the calculation is in regard to the entire north elevation, all six stories. The transparency is calculated differently for a ground story than it is for upper stories. When the base

building was approved, the transparency requirement for the ground floor was incorrectly calculated, so a waiver is requested to address the error and incorporate nominal changes based on the modifications. Mr. Supelak stated that he is unable to see a transparency shortage. Essentially, the entire building is brick. Whether it is Nichiha, thin brick or tile -- there is not much square footage involved, and it is difficult to see how that could be a 7% change on the entire north façade.

Ms. Martin responded that the nuance is that in the upper stories, windows are calculated as glass, which is a primary building material. On the ground story, they are calculated as storefronts, not as a primary building material. When the north elevation is modified to add this storefront, that deviation is seen.

Mr. Supelak responded that no credit is given for the glass, which otherwise would be considered a primary material. There are a few triggers that do not intuitively make sense. In his opinion, that deviation is an error, as glass is preferable to brick in these infill areas on this level.

Ms. Martin responded that there is some question as to whether the Administrative Departure should be approved. From a planning perspective, the intent was to ensure Code was met, ensuring the highest quality of materials on the ground floor where there is pedestrian interaction. However, there are a couple of calculations involved.

Ms. Call stated that the debate is not glass versus thin brick, but Nichiha versus thin brick. Nichiha is not a permitted primary material.

Mr. Supelak responded that the debate occurs only because the primary material calculation is not met because the glass on this floor is not counted.

Ms. Call responded that she would make the argument that glass in a garage door is not equivalent to mounted glass in a building. The spirit of the law is quality, so what is the higher quality material – thin brick and the glass garage door or Nichiha and the glass garage door? She believes the thin brick combination would be a higher quality.

Mr. O'Malley pointed out that Nichiha is used throughout the development, including across the street, over the YogaSix Studio and the apartments. Different secondary and/or primary materials are used throughout the development, allowing owners to differentiate their storefronts. Nichiha is a quality, exterior material.

Ms. Fox stated that she is struggling with the recommendation for the clear transparency of the glass rather than a knee wall. Was the more distinctive tiled knee wall eliminated to satisfy transparency requirements?

Ms. Martin responded that the purpose was to retain the appearance of the colonnade to the extent possible, as the colonnade serves as a transition between the public and the private realms. The knee wall solution would provide a division between the public and private realms. The intent is to achieve the transition but also accommodate the desires of this tenant. [Photo shown of a knee wall matching the building foundation, which was a manufactured stone.]

Ms. Fox inquired if tile were not used, would manufactured stone have been used.

Ms. Martin responded that it could have been that or a masonry unit.

Ms. Fox noted that the Kitchen Social Polaris location has a tile knee wall.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Administrative Departure

Ms. Call noted that staff has recommended disapproval of this item.

Mr. Supelak stated that he agrees with staff's recommendation to eliminate the knee wall and the garage doors to be extended all the way down, preserving the colonnade element. However, he would be willing to count the glass in the garage doors as a primary material; he sees no need to solve a primary material calculation by having a primary material wrap around that glass. He has no issue with Nichiha; it is a good product. Thin brick can just as easily prove to be problematic. He would have no objection to approving the Administrative Departure.

Ms. Fox expressed agreement with Mr. Supelak's view of the glass material. She is not in agreement with replacing Nichiha with thin brick; there is no architectural contrast or color that makes this facade distinctive. She would prefer to see even more architectural detail around the windows, as well as lights on the columns, so that the space stands out more. The dark gray Nichiha would be a nice contrast, rather than matching the red brick. The porcelain tile is nice, but she would like to see extra detail over the entranceway. This is a prime corner, across from the pedestrian tunnel and along John Shields Parkway. It deserves the extra impact that additional design elements would provide, such as contrasting color, lighting on the columns, and perhaps a canopy and additional lighting wherever it might fit.

Mr. Way stated that, ideally, the garage doors would fill the space; however, custom-built garage doors that would fit the openings perfectly are not an option. The challenge, then, is how to address the gap or infill to fit with the building. Staff believes the brick would look contiguous with the rest of the façade. He understands their perspective but also does not mind the contrast. If done correctly, it would not look like infill. He likes the simple and open elements of the plan and is supportive of what is proposed.

Alan Burge, Alan R. Burge Architecture, 43 E Market St # 200, Akron, OH 44308 stated that they are using a custom width, 18-foot garage door. The jams are as small as possible and still have the doors work.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the design as submitted. The garage doors are a great idea, even in this climate, providing a transition between the private to public realms, as well as an improved dining experience. He has no objection to either the Nichiha or thin brick materials, although perhaps the Nichiha element would stand out even more.

Mr. Fishman stated that he also has no objection to either building material; however, he is as interested in durability as in appearance. Thin brick attached to a stucco base can sometimes become loosened through pedestrian contact. Full brick, when possible, is more durable.

Mr. Grimes expressed agreement with the need for more lighting, color and interest, an important element in the entire development. Because it is north-facing, as much natural light as possible is needed. He likes the plan, but would encourage more architectural emphasis.

Ms. Call stated that she understands staff's perspective in retaining the intent of the building's architectural elements. However, the Commission is encouraging more details, such as lighting, topiaries at the base of the colonnades emphasizing the vertical element, and inviting exterior details at the entrance.

Ms. Fox requested confirmation that the Nichiha that was proposed was dark gray, which would have provided a contrast with the red brick.

Mr. O'Malley confirmed that was the proposal.

Ms. Fox stated that the BSD Code states that, "the principal entrances of all building types shall effectively address the street and be given prominence on the building façade." She would like to hear fellow Commission members' thoughts on the entranceway. She believes there is agreement that Kitchen Social should have the distinction that the architect and owner desire. What are the options for achieving that? Ms. Call invited the applicant's response.

Mr. O'Malley stated that, initially, they had included landscaping on the patio; however, Crawford Hoying informed them that they could not encroach into the adjacent City greenspace. If it were feasible, they would be willing to add two-three feet of landscaping to soften and add warmth to the north side of the patio.

Ms. Call requested clarification of improving City-owned, dedicated space, visually incorporating it into the site.

Ms. Martin responded that the John Shields Parkway greenway is different from all the other greenspaces within Bridge Park. All of the greenspaces and plazas within that development are owned by Bridge Park and accessible to the public. The greenway is a linear park owned by the City, which connects from Riverside Crossing Park to Village Parkway. A future Master Park Plan will be created for that greenway. Although the interim condition is not ideal, residents and private tenants are discouraged from making improvements to City parkland.

Ms. Fox inquired if pottery and topiary are permitted next to the façade of a building and along a sidewalk. Ms. Martin responded that they would not be permitted to encroach onto another property or into the right-of-way. It would be permitted within the bounds of the parcel; however, this building sits on the parcel line. Planning staff could discuss the options with Parks staff; however, it is desirable to avoid setting precedents.

Ms. Fox inquired if a planter against the colonnade, a trellis up the side of the building or another element within perhaps a foot of the right-of-way would be permitted – something that would enhance the building.

Ms. Martin responded that unfortunately, this is not a right-of-way; it is a lot owned by the City.

Mr. Boggs responded that the intent is to prohibit installation of private improvements within the right-of-way or in public parks, due to ownership maintenance and liability issues. A trellis against the side of a building with a base located within parkland would be a concern. In view of the future Parks Master Plan, the City does not want to account for private installations.

Ms. Call stated that lighting on the colonnades or exterior of the building would be an opportunity for creativity; there are some very artfully designed light fixtures that would complement the porcelain tile along the entranceway and soften the corner next to the greenspace. Creative lighting warming the exterior of the façade can be inviting.

Ms. Martin responded that a condition has been added that the applicant add lighting around the tenant space subject to staff approval.

Ms. Call inquired if the condition was acceptable to the applicant.

Mr. O'Malley responded that the condition is acceptable. His understanding was that they were not permitted to attach items, even a sign, to a certain column(s). Therefore, they avoided proposing any lighting. If they would be permitted, they would be very happy to work with staff to add lights.

Ms. Call inquired if attachments to columns would be a Crawford Hoying issue, not a City regulation.

Ms. Martin responded that the Master Sign Plan approved by the Commission approved conceptual sign locations, none of which were located on the greenway. However, the Master Sign Plan has been revised to allow Planning staff and Crawford Hoying some latitude to collaborate on the sign locations. However, there are no prohibitions on lighting being affixed to the building.

Ms. Fox stated that certainly a landscape plan should not include area within a public park. However, the intent in this District is to create an attractive street image. She believes there should be some opportunities to work with the tenant on how to achieve this streetscape presence. She encourages staff to find a balance that achieves that streetscape excitement within the parameters of the Code. We are looking for imagination in design and attractive lighting that will enhance the pedestrian experience. If the City is not going to be creating a park here in the near future, it should be possible to allow temporary planters until it is designed. It is essential that the desired street liveliness be achieved.

Mr. Supelak stated that the proposed sign is weak. A more substantial sign could improve the entry access. What is permitted here?

Ms. Martin responded that signs are not part of this application; however, the applicant will have the opportunity to revise their sign designs. She agrees that there is opportunity for creativity with the signs. The applicant is permitted three signs, because there is frontage on two public rights-of-way. Depending on the classification of the greenway, if there were frontage on three sides, four signs would be permitted. The applicant will need to provide a diversity in sign types. Preliminary sign designs are reviewed by a consultant, but minor revisions may be requested before approval.

Ms. Call stated that Bridge Park signage is intended to be a meeting of art and destination. There are two distinct types of signs within this District; some signs that are essentially art, while others are directional. Although, there are brand limitations, "out of the box" thinking is encouraged, such as the North Market signage. Applicants are encouraged to consider combinations of branding, usefulness and art.

Mr. O'Malley responded that they have already submitted a proposed sign package to Crawford Hoying and to the City for sign permits, which included three different types of signs.

Mr. Fishman stated that creative signs are encouraged, as long as they also meet Code. He inquired if there is a reason full brick cannot be used around the entrance.

Mr. Supelak responded that he assumes it would require a foundation to be added, which could be an issue here.

Mr. Burge stated that there would be constructional concerns; it would be necessary to break into the existing brick piers to provide support for the additional brick. There would be many technical challenges.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would be satisfied with either of the facades discussed.

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Fox seconded approval of the Administrative Departure permitting the percentage of primary materials on the north elevation to be approximately 73 percent where 80 percent is the required percentage of primary materials (stone, brick or glass), per Code.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.

[Motion approved 7-0.]

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the two waivers:

- 1) Waiver to Zoning Code Section:
153.062(O)(5)(d)(3) — Street Facades: Number of Entrances (No building entrances on the north elevation of Building D2).
- 2) Waiver to Zoning Code Section:
153.062(O)(5)(d)(1) — Ground Story Street Facing Transparency (Building D2: ±50 percent on the west elevation, ±40 percent on the north elevation, ±47 percent on the east elevation).

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed revised conditions. The applicant indicated he had no objection.

Mr. Way noted that the lighting package should not be limited to a lighting fixture, but should permit projecting lights and factor in the lighting in the overhang.

Ms. Call challenged staff to work with the applicant, encouraging their creativity to achieve differentiation for their building.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Minor Project with four conditions:

- 1) The applicant receive approval of furniture selections by the Administrative Review Team; and,
- 2) The applicant work with Washington Township Fire Department to finalize a fire protection plan prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 3) The applicant provide an exterior lighting package, subject to staff approval.
- 4) The applicant work with staff to enhance the entry design along Longshore Street.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion approved 7-0.]

[Cases 1, 2 and 3 related to the same project were heard together.]

~~1. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G, Conditional Use, 20-199CU~~

~~Conditional Use to permit Bridge Park, Block G, Building G2 (McCallum Garage) to be unlined along a public street, Mooney Street. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street.~~

~~2. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G, Final Development Plan, 20-045FDP~~

~~Construction of a 4-story residential building, a 4-story parking garage, and a 5-story mixed-use office building with .58-acres of open space within Bridge Park, Block G zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street.~~

~~3. Bridge Street District, Bridge Park, Block G, Final Plat, 16-044FP~~

~~Plat for ±2.28-acre site (Lot 9) establishing public access easements for open space zoned Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue with Mooney Street.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Ms. Martin stated that these requests seek review and approval of a Final Development Plan with Conditional Use and a recommendation for City Council approval of a Final Plat for Bridge Park, Block G. Block G is located north of Bridge Park Avenue, south of Tuller Ridge Drive, east of Mooney Street and west of Dale Drive, and zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood. The site is bounded by an existing street network. An additional area northeast of the site is also proposed for improvement with this application. The site is currently undeveloped, although it is surrounded by~~