MEMORANDUM

To: **GoTriangle**
From: **Brad Lonberger, GB Arrington, Scott Polikov, Tony Sease**
Re: **Station Area Recommendations Update**
Date: **4/10/17**

Preferred alternatives for station areas have been reviewed and concepts for various stations have been examined resulting in these recommendations for specific stations as follow-up to recommendations provided on January 25, 2017.

Alston Avenue – Assuming that the location is preferred to have tracks crossing the intersection of Grant and Pettigrew, the current location of the station being closer to the intersection is preferred. This allows a pedestrian plaza to be located at the intersection and, given the alignment, does not impose any additional loss of developable area than is already imposed by the track alignment.

Leigh Village – Considering the revised street network plan, currently being refined as part of the concept, the station for Leigh Village does not need to move. However, the location of the road network and parking is being moved and this recommended change is based on preservation of existing stream beds and reducing the need for multiple crossings of the natural flows.

Ninth Street – A desirable outcome in shifting the Ninth Street Station platform location to the east is to place the eastern access to the platform closer to Broad Street. A western access to the platform could still be located on Ninth Street/Erwin Road, but a new platform access would be located to the east improving pedestrian access to the Broad Street at-grade crossing of the NCRR, and placing it closer to the Broad Street/Swift Avenue bridge over Highway 147. This shift would effectively expand the pedestrian shed to the east without impacting the western portion.

Gateway – The development concept has been evaluated for the development impact assuming either station location. Assuming that the ideal location for detention/drainage and parking are maintained the development impact would be significant within the 1 block range of the station location. If the station remains the same, some updates will be required for the concept plan. It is clear from these numbers that the ability to move the station further north, into the site, will support greater development potential within a closer range of the station.

As a third option, we considered the potential for keeping the alignment of the current plans and moving the station further north. We do not see how a station can be integrated into this third option without being restricted by design protocol that was given to us by GoTriangle. Further evaluation is needed by GoTriangle and engineers in order to determine if this option is viable.

For the stations/alignment conditions for the first two considerations, the following lists correspond to the concept plans and the potential development based on station location.

Existing station within 400’ of Station (Square Feet):

No development (drainage/parking only)

Proposed station within 400’ of Station (Square Feet):

- 224,000 SF Urban Hotel
- 376,000 SF General Office
- 84,000 SF Ground Floor Retail
- 308,000 SF High Density Rental Multi-Family

Existing station within ¼ Mile of Station (Square Feet):

- 1,201,000 SF General Office
- 84,000 SF Ground Floor Retail
- 308,000 SF High Density Rental Multi-Family
- 144,000 SF Affordable Multi-Family
- 90,000 SF Medium Density Rental Multi-Family
- 20,000 SF Live/Work – Multi-Family
- 40 Units Attached Single Family
- 224,000 SF Urban Hotel

Proposed station within ¼ Mile of Station (Square Feet):

- 1,677,000 SF General Office
- 329,100 SF Ground Floor Retail
- 308,700 SF High Density Rental Multi-Family
- 260,000 SF Affordable Multi-Family
- 955,100 SF Medium Density Rental Multi-Family
- 20,000 SF Live/Work – Multi-Family
- 60 Units Attached Single Family
- 224,000 SF Urban Hotel
- 150,000 SF Medical Office
- 112,000 SF Laboratory Office
- 180,000 SF Medium Density Hotel