

A. Site Evaluation

The suitability of the land for the development of entertainment and cultural event facilities is an important consideration affecting the economic viability of a property and its ultimate marketability. Factors such as size, topography, accessibility, visibility, and the proximity to other amenities have a direct impact on the suitability of a site.

Site Evaluation Criteria

HVS developed evaluation criteria to assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of the various potential sites. The evaluation criteria include primary evaluation categories concerned with site considerations, transportation and parking, urban impact, and financial considerations. Each of these categories includes several specific evaluation criteria. The following figure lists the 22 evaluation criteria. The figure also indicates the importance of each evaluation criterion with a rank from one to five, with a rank of one indicating the least amount of importance and a rank of five indicating the greatest importance.

In order to assess the relative importance of the ratings, HVS assigned each site evaluation criterion an importance level of high, medium, or low. Combining the rating and the importance level for each criterion yields a weighted score for each site. The sum of these weighted scores represents the overall suitability for each site. HVS assigned each potential site a rank of one through three for each specific evaluation criterion. A score of one indicates that a site ranks poorly on the criterion and a score of three indicates that a site ranks favorably on the criterion.

The following series of figures present the evaluation criteria and the meaning of each individual score. The site matrix with final scores follows.

FIGURE 5-1
SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Site Considerations	3 = fully complies	2 = partially complies	1 = does not comply
Capacity for recommended building program	Site can accommodate full recommended program and support spaces to meet planner needs and operate efficiently	Site may require minor modification to building program that may minimally effect marketability and operation	Site requires major modifications to building program that may affect marketability and operation
Proximate to existing/planned lodging	Adjacent lodging has been developed or is in the planning stages	There is no adjacent lodging under development, but is part of future master plan	There is no adjacent lodging under development, planned, or part of future master plan
Proximate to retail/dining amenities	Site is within walking distance existing or future dining and shopping locations	Site is within short drive of retail and dining amenities	Site is greater than 5 miles from retail and dining amenities
Proximate to population	Site is adjacent to population bases likely to use venue	Site is within a short drive of population bases likely to use venue	Site is greater than 5 miles from population bases likely to use venue
Infrastructure in place or planned	Site has city infrastructure in place or planned	Site has some infrastructure improvements required	Site requires installation of all City infrastructure
Urban Impact	3	2	1
Potential for compatible development	Several surrounding sites could be developed for compatible hotel or visitor-related uses	Some surrounding sites could be developed for compatible hotel or visitor-related uses	No surrounding sites could be developed for compatible hotel or visitor-related uses
Displacement of existing uses	Site is currently vacant and has no planned development	Site is currently vacant but has planned development	Site is currently used for other purpose
Compatibility with neighboring land uses	Intended use of site would not cause conflict with owners of surrounding land	Intended use of site could occasionally cause conflict with owners of surrounding land	Intended use of site would regularly cause conflict with owners of surrounding land
Surrounding neighborhood safety	All adjacent neighborhoods offer a safe environment for pedestrians	Most adjacent neighborhoods offer a safe environment for pedestrians. Some areas should be avoided.	Adjacent neighborhoods do not offer a safe environment for pedestrians.
Compliance with existing zoning	Site has proper zoning for intended uses.	Site needs to be rezoned, but process should be relatively easy.	Site needs to be rezoned and process may be problematic.

FIGURE 5-2
SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (CONT.)

Access Considerations	3 = fully complies	2 = partially complies	1 = does not comply
Ease of access for drive-in	Site is conveniently located by major roadways for easy vehicle access	Site does not have direct access from major roadways. Attendees would use secondary streets to access site.	Site is in locations which is difficult to access by vehicle
Ease of access for service vehicles	Site is easily accessed by buses, trucks, and other vehicles necessary for event production	Site has moderately easily access for buses, trucks, and other vehicles necessary for event production	Site is difficult to access by buses, trucks, and other vehicles necessary for event production
Availability of existing/planned Parking	Existing and planned proximate parking is adequate to handle all event parking needs	Existing proximate parking is adequate to handle smaller events. Additional parking required for larger events	Existing proximate parking is minimal. Significant additional parking would be needed for all events
Potential for traffic congestion	Roads to site have no current traffic congestion issues	Roads to site have occasional traffic congestion issues	Roads to site have daily traffic congestion issues
Financial Considerations	3	2	1
Land assembly costs	Site is owned or otherwise available without purchase	Parcels for site can be purchased for a reasonable price	Parcels for site can be purchased for a higher price
Potential for public funding	Use of site has high potential for public investment	Use of site has moderate potential for public investment	Use of site has no potential for public investment
Potential for partner funding	Use of site has high potential for partner investment	Use of site has moderate potential for partner investment	Use of site has no potential for partner investment
Opportunity costs - alternative land uses	Intended use of site is the highest and best use of the land	Site has other potential uses which have similar returns as intended use	Site has other potential uses which have a higher return than intended use

**FIGURE 5-3
SITE EVALUATION MATRIX**

Criteria ¹		Weight ²	Menards	LCC	Ice and Events Center	Cheyenne Hills Church	Holdings	Event Center at Archer
Site	Capacity for recommended building program	5	2	3	1	2	3	3
	Proximate to existing/planned lodging	3	3	3	3	2	3	1
	Proximate to retail/dining amenities	3	3	1	2	1	1	1
	Proximate to population	3	3	2	2	2	1	1
	Infrastructure in place or planned	4	2	2	2	1	1	1
Sub-Total Site Considerations			17	17	13	10	12	11
Urban	Potential for compatible development	2	2	2	1	2	3	3
	Displacement of existing uses	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
	Compatibility with neighboring land uses	4	3	3	3	2	2	3
	Compliance with existing zoning	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sub-Total Urban Impact			13	15	15	12	15	16
Access	Ease of access for drive-in	4	2	2	2	2	3	2
	Ease of access for service vehicles	4	2	2	1	1	2	3
	Availability of existing/planned Parking	5	2	2	1	2	1	3
	Potential for traffic congestion	4	2	2	1	2	2	2
Sub-Total Access			12	14	14	12	15	17
Finance	Land assembly costs	3	2	3	1	1	2	3
	Potential for public funding	5	2	3	3	2	2	3
	Potential for partner funding	5	1	1	1	2	1	1
	Opportunity costs - alternative land uses	2	2	3	1	2	2	2
Sub-Total Financial Considerations			8	12	9	8	9	11
Total All Criteria			50	58	51	42	51	55

FIGURE 5-4
SUMMARY OF SITE EVALUATION

Weighted Scores³	MAX	Menards	LCC	Ice and Events Center	Cheyenne Hills Church	Holdings	Event Center at Archer
Site	54	45	41	34	29	34	28
Urban	39	23	30	31	23	32	32
Access	51	34	34	21	30	33	43
Finance	45	25	35	25	27	25	33
Total	189	127	140	111	109	124	136
Percent of Maximum		67%	74%	59%	58%	66%	72%

1) Each criteria scored on a 1 to 3 scale based on site evaluation criteria described in Figures 4-3 and 4-4.

2) Rank of the importance of the criteria on a scale of 1 to 5 with five being most important and 1 being least important.

3) The importance of the criteria (weight) X the conformance score = the weighted score.