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Summary of Issues

1. Building height
2. Density and transit-oriented development
3. Development program
4. Transportation capacity and connectivity
5. Site as catalyst
1. Building Height

- Council principle: “Differentiated economic niche”
- Committee objective: “Appropriate scale of development”
- In alternatives glossary, building heights do not exceed 6 story level
  - Wright Runstad suggests building heights in the 75 to 130 foot range
- Downtown districts (such as DTN-MU district) cap office development at 100 feet
- Crux issue: Is downtown competition issue focused on height, building intensity (FAR), or both?
2. Density and TOD

- Council principle: “Maximize HCT opportunities”
- Committee objective: “Land use takes advantage of HCT stations (mixed use nodes)”
- A “nodal” development pattern is assumed in all the alternatives
  - Range of assumptions about how much development will happen in each node
- Crux issue: How much development should happen in higher density, mixed use nodes, versus the rest of the planning area?
3. Development Program Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Lower End</th>
<th>Mid-Level</th>
<th>Higher End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Office, Retail)</td>
<td>2.5 million sf (2.3 million office, 200K retail)</td>
<td>3.5 million sf (3.2 million office, 300 K retail)</td>
<td>4.5 million sf (4 million office, 500 K retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2,000 units</td>
<td>3,500 units</td>
<td>5,000 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranges of Development in Alternatives:

- **Mid-Range:** 3.5 million square feet commercial, 3,500 housing units
- **Higher Housing, Lower Employment:** 2.5 million square feet commercial, 5,000 housing units
- **Higher Employment, Higher Housing:** 4.5 million square feet commercial, 5,000 housing units.
3. Development Program

- Each alternative has differing assumptions on the 2030 development program
  - Development program does not equal ultimate build-out
- Concentrating development in certain parts of the area raises questions about how much of the area will be “in play” in the long term
- Ability to use incentives for public benefit throughout the corridor will be largely dependent on this issue
- Crux issue: How much of the future development program should be focused within certain areas of the corridor?
4. Transportation Connectivity and Capacity

- Council principle: “Land use/transportation integration”
- Improving connectivity within, and to/from the area a key transportation goal
  - Site proposal improves internal network, but opportunities for additional, external connections?
- All alternatives assume ambitious set of transportation improvements
- Crux issues: Should plan vision assume a fully interconnected street system where possible? Can planned transportation system accommodate proposed level of development in one area, and in what timeframe?
5. Site as catalyst

- Safeway site represents major development opportunity (given size, location and readiness). Anticipated that all major developments would serve as catalyst for other redevelopment.

- Need to balance need to buffer future development from adjacent uses with need to think about possible transitions in the longer term.
  - Need to consider the entire planning area and how all development will ultimately fit together.

- Crux issue: How should site be planned so that it functions as a catalyst for other development, and works to help build a larger, integrated plan?
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