

The following table is a summary of points in common as well as points of difference and areas for further discussion across the three workshop teams. Please see the individual team notes for a more thorough account of the conversations held by each workshop team.

Points in Common	Points of difference; areas for further discussion
<b>1. General Mix, Composition and Character</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There should be a balance of affordable housing, affordable retail and community space on the sites</li> <li>▪ Vibrant retail on the ground floor is essential to activate street and/or plaza frontage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Should the sites have destination retail or only local serving retailers?</li> <li>▪ 24 hour/day activity versus 18 hour/day activity</li> </ul>
<b>2. Retail and/or Office – How Much / What Kind / Where?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retail will help activate the station plaza</li> <li>▪ If there is to be an anchor tenant, it should front Broadway</li> <li>▪ No retail presence on 10<sup>th</sup> Ave E</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Anchor/destination retailer vs. local retailer</li> </ul>
<b>3. Housing – How Much / What Kind / Where?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At a minimum, 50 % of the housing on the four sites should be affordable housing</li> <li>▪ 25% of the affordable housing provided should serve residents at 50% or less of the Average Median Income (AMI)</li> <li>▪ Affordable housing should serve seniors and families</li> <li>▪ Artist live/work units make sense on site B2, fronting onto Nagle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is housing serving 80% and above of AMI needed?</li> <li>▪ In absence of a Master Plan, can the goal of providing 50% of all housing at a defined affordable rate be met on each of the individual sites?</li> <li>▪ Can affordable housing be intermingled with market rate housing on an individual site?</li> </ul>

<b>4. Community Facilities &amp; Services</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Community Center must have a physical relationship to the station plaza – i.e. it should be located on Sites A2 or B2</li> <li>▪ Offices for nonprofit organizations can benefit from a connection to the community center through efficiencies of shared staff and resources</li> <li>▪ It is important that the community center space be flexible so as to meet the changing needs of the community over time</li> <li>▪ The community center is not a recreational center</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identity of the center – LGBT, arts, other?</li> </ul>
<b>5. Parking – Bikes and Cars</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide a lot of bike parking that serves a variety of cyclists from commuters to shoppers</li> <li>▪ A shared automobile parking strategy is desirable – pursue one location for all sites</li> <li>▪ Provide some automobile parking for retail uses</li> <li>▪ Provide less total parking than typical market rate developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How to decouple residential rent from car space. Look to precedents in neighborhood</li> <li>▪ Parking maximums</li> </ul>
<b>6. Master Planned or Individual Sites</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider all sites comprehensively through a Master Plan and potentially a master developer but ensure design differentiation with different architects</li> </ul>	
<b>Modifying the Envelope</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure any modification to the scale brings light into the station plaza</li> <li>▪ Majority report: modifying the height and scale across the sites is desirable if done well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Height increases</li> <li>▪ A higher than 65 feet tower on site A1</li> </ul>