

Development Choice Matrix

| Residential | Type | Rate | Location |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Single Family Homes | Less / Same / More | Distributed / Concentrated |
| | Retirement Homes | Less / Same / More | Distributed / Concentrated |
| | Affordable Housing | Less / Same / More | Distributed / Concentrated |
| Commercial (small scale, local) | Type | Rate | Location |
| | Retail / Restaurants | Less / Same / More | Villages / Commercial Corridors |
| | Employment | Less / Same / More | Villages / Commercial Corridors |

The following is an attempt to fit the three options into the matrix of choices above. I may have misunderstood some parts of the options but I am concerned that other people would find them even harder to distinguish from each other...

Option 1: (Continue current development strategy).

(The current strategy, effectively, is to add affordable housing at a steady but slow rate. At this rate, we will not reach 10% but may get occasional relief from 40B if we make significant progress in any given year).

| Residential | Type | Rate | Location |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Single Family Homes | Same | Distributed |
| | Retirement Homes | Same | Distributed |
| | Affordable Housing | Same (smaller scale) | Distributed |
| Commercial (small scale, local) | Type | Rate | Location |
| | Retail / Restaurants | Same | Commercial Corridors |
| | Employment | Same | Commercial Corridors |

Handed by Paulina

Option 2: (Reduce residential growth, increase business growth)

(I believe that option 2 can only succeed if we have a strategy to reach 10% affordable housing. Unfortunately, the easiest way to reach 10% is large scale rental developments. This strategy also requires us to commit to aggressive strategies that discourage the development of existing open space (purchasing land and transferring development rights, etc).

| Residential | Type | Rate | Location |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | Single Family Homes | Less | Distributed |
| | Retirement Homes | Less | Distributed |
| | Affordable Housing | More (larger scale) | Distributed |
| Commercial (small scale, local) | Type | Rate | Location |
| | Retail / Restaurants | More | Commercial Corridors |
| | Employment | More | Commercial Corridors |

Option 3: (Concentrate growth in villages)

I also believe that option 3 can only succeed if we have a strategy to reach 10% affordable housing. However, if we are putting affordable housing in the villages, the scale must be smaller (IMHO). Unfortunately, this means we need more of them... This strategy also requires us to commit to aggressive strategies that discourage the development of existing open space (purchasing land and transferring development rights, etc).

| Residential | Type | Rate | Location |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| | Single Family Homes | Less | Concentrated in villages |
| | Retirement Homes | More | Concentrated in villages |
| | Affordable Housing | More (smaller scale) | Concentrated in villages |
| Commercial (small scale, local) | Type | Rate | Location |
| | Retail / Restaurants | More | Concentrated in villages |
| | Employment | More | Commercial Corridors (we didn't talk about this but larger scale businesses and high tech incubators, etc, won't end up in villages, IMHO). |