

**CRITERIA # 1 (Official Plan Designation)**

**Weight: 2**

Assessment Definition: An official plan describes upper, lower or single-tier municipal council's policies on how land should be used. An official plan deals mainly with issues such as: where new housing, industry, offices, etc. should be located, what services are needed to support new development, and where the urban boundary is. The importance of the Official Plan Designation is whether the subject property's regulations permits a hospital. The Official Plan has specific policies surrounding institutional uses and the Vendor must demonstrate that the policies have been met. Should the land use not be an institutional designation within the Official Plan then an Official Plan Amendment would be required which would result in additional time and resources. It is also important to examine the compatibility of adjacent land uses (existing and future, if known) so one can be aware if the hospital will be adjacent to a compatible land use and that the majority of the land is in a designation that is not constrained by environmental features.

Scale Factors: Parcel is partially or wholly within lands designated to permit hospital development:

- "10": Wholly within designated lands
- "7": Not designated, but an amendment has a strong possibility of support
- "5": Not designated, but an amendment has a fair possibility of support
- "3": Not designated, but an amendment has minimal possibility of support
- "0": Not designated, but an amendment has a poor possibility of support (e.g. designated "greenland" or "environmental protection")

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 1	6.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	6.0	7.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	8.0	5.0
Weighted Score Criteria 1	12	6	10	10	10	6	12	14	4	6	4	14	14	14	4	14	0	10	10	4	16	10

**CRITERIA # 2 (Zoning)**

**Weight: 2**

**Assessment Definition:** A Zoning By-law provides specific provisions and regulations for all development. Zoning By-laws regulate the use of land, buildings and other structures. The zoning of a site regulates the uses that are allowed on a property as well as where buildings can be located on a site, the lot sizes, dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street. The importance of zoning is whether or not the proposed use is permitted within the Zoning By-Law as well as whether the proposed building footprint and site layout fits within the requirements of the By-Law. A Zoning By-Law Amendment can be applied for (e.g. if a use is not permitted or a building height exceeds the maximum requirement) if required, however, this also adds additional time and resources. In most cases, an amendment will be required; however, heavy industrial zones, prime agricultural lands, protected employment lands and environmental lands, may not be appropriate.

**Scale Factors:** It is assumed most sites will require site-specific zoning for a hospital and ancillary uses.  
 - "10": No zoning restrictions exist  
 - "7": Not zoned, but an amendment has a strong possibility of support  
 - "5": Not zoned, but an amendment has a fair possibility of support  
 - "3": Not zoned, but an amendment has a minimal possibility of support  
 - "0": Not zoned, but an amendment has a poor possibility of support (e.g. zoned "greenland" or "environmental protection")

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 2	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	6.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	10.0	6.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	6.0	5.0
Weighted Score Criteria 2	10	6	10	10	6	4	12	10	4	4	6	20	12	4	4	6	0	10	8	4	12	10

**CRITERIA # 3 (Impact of Restrictions (By-laws, Rights-of-Way, Easements, etc.))**  
**Weight: 4**

**Assessment Definition:** There should be no restrictions on the use of the property, including below grade services easements. In essence, the property should have clear title. Particular attention should also be paid to municipal drains.

**Scale Factors:** Potential for adverse impact on the development process which could require mitigating or removing restrictions:

- "10": No restrictions on the lands
- "7": Minor restrictions that will not impact developable areas
- "5": Some restrictions that can be moved or accommodated
- "3": Restrictions that impact a portion of the developable area
- "0": Restrictions that impact the majority of developable area

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 3	4.0	10.0	2.0	7.0	10.0	1.0	7.0	3.0	8.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	9.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	1.0	8.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	5.0
Weighted Score Criteria 3	16	40	8	28	40	4	28	12	32	8	8	12	36	16	16	20	4	32	12	28	36	20

**CRITERIA # 4 (Parcel (Shape and Geometry))**

**Weight: 3**

Assessment Definition: The parcel size must plan for potential physical and site needs of the Facility over a 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 year timeframe that ensures best use of significant and long term government commitment. It should provide flexibility to accommodate major changes in health care delivery and/or program requirements. The parcel shape should allow for a development pad that would accommodate a hospital. The pad should generally be rectangular and sized to allow maximum ground floor coverage. The shape and geometry should be such as to accommodate the hospital itself, ancillary buildings, along with parking.

- Scale Factors: Parcel has a regular shape and is of good proportion:
- "10": A rectangular shape that has a test area of 400m x 400 m
  - "7": A rectangular "test" area 300M x 400M fits within the parcel
  - "5": A rectangular "test" area 300M x 300M fits within the parcel
  - "3": A rectangular "test" area 300M x 200M fits within the parcel
  - "1": A rectangular "test" area 200M x 200M fits within the parcel
  - "0": Less than a rectangular "test" area 200M x 200M fits within the parcel

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 4	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	2.0
Weighted Score Criteria 4	3	30	30	30	21	6	30	30	21	30	9	30	30	30	18	30	3	30	30	0	21	6

**CRITERIA # 5 Parking potential**  
**Weight: 5**

**Assessment Definition:** Parking is generally defined by two criteria: the Municipal Zoning By-law and anticipated use. Hospital uses are often 1 space per bed. The second criterion is typical patient usage and need. A range of 1 space per 45 m<sup>2</sup> to 60 m<sup>2</sup> Gross Floor Area is suggested to be optimal for a long term build out scenario. Surface parking will be preferred. Parking is to be calculated on the basis of 139,354 m<sup>2</sup> GFA.

**Scale Factors:** The site achieves a parking ratio of:

- "10": Greater than 1 space per 45 m<sup>2</sup> (3096 spaces)
- "7": Greater than 1 space per 50 m<sup>2</sup> (2787 spaces)
- "5": Greater than 1 space per 60 m<sup>2</sup> (2322 spaces)
- "3": Greater than 1 space per 70 m<sup>2</sup> (1990 spaces)
- "1": Less than 1 space per 80 m<sup>2</sup> (1740 spaces)

Response #	Site																						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	
Consensus Criteria 5	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	6.0
Weighted Score Criteria 5	10	50	50	50	50	10	50	25	50	50	5	50	30	50	50	50	5	50	50	5	50	30	

**CRITERIA # 6 Flexible Site Development/Campus Planning Scenarios**  
**Weight: 3**

**Assessment Definition:** The site should be large enough to accommodate the proposed uses as well as future buildings, structures, parking, landscaped garden areas, etc., including allied services and potential research uses.

**Scale Factors:** Potential for multiple planning and design solutions:

- "10": is Excellent
- "7": is Good
- "5": is Fair
- "3": is Minimal
- "1": is Poor

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 6	3.0	4.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	4.0	9.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	6.0	9.0	1.0	10.0	9.0	1.0	9.0	6.0
Weighted Score Criteria 6	9	12	9	21	27	12	27	18	15	24	15	21	30	15	18	27	3	30	27	3	27	18

**CRITERIA # 7 Expansion Scenarios**  
**Weight: 4**

**Assessment Definition:** The site should be large enough that future expansions can occur within the property to accommodate future projected population growth. A full regeneration of the proposed hospital should be accommodated on the site by having enough land access.

**Scale Factors:** Potential for future expansion:

- "10": is Excellent
- "7": is Good
- "5": is Fair
- "3": is Minimal
- "1": is Poor

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 7	3.0	9.0	4.0	9.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	2.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	3.0
Weighted Score Criteria 7	12	36	16	36	40	12	40	32	32	36	8	40	36	40	36	40	4	40	40	0	40	12

**CRITERIA # 8 Parcel Size (including future growth)**

**Weight: 5**

**Assessment Definition:** The parcel size must plan for potential physical and site needs of the Facility over a 5,10, 20, 50 and 100 year timeframe that ensures best use of significant and long term government commitment. It should provide flexibility to accommodate major changes in health care delivery and/or program requirements. For future expansions to accommodate growth and future replacement/renewal, the Ministry favours a minimum area of 40 acres of developable land (i.e. not constrained with environmental features) with 50 acres being preferred. Nevertheless, property less than this favoured or preferred parcel size will be considered.

**Scale Factors:** The parcel size must plan for potential physical and site needs of the Facility over a 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 year timeframe that ensures best use of significant and long term government commitment.

- "10": 46 or more acres preferred
- "7": 41-45 acres of developable land
- "5": 36-40 acres of developable land
- "3": 30-35 acres of developable land
- "1": less than 30 acres of developable land

Response #	Site																						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	
Consensus Criteria 8	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	7.0
Weighted Score Criteria 8	50	50	50	50	50	35	50	50	50	50	50	20	50	50	50	50	50	5	50	50	0	50	35

**CRITERIA # 9 Service Catchment Area**

**Weight: 5**

**Assessment Definition:** Consideration should be given to the surrounding population (current and future) numbers as an area with a higher density would be more desirable for a variety of reasons (e.g. distance of travel, services a greater number of people within a smaller area). Future population within an area should be considered to ensure that proper services will be available.

**Scale Factors:** Centrally located to the population within a 5km drive (current and to 2031):

- "10": 80% of Region's population within a 10km radius
- "7": 70% of the Region's population within a 15km radius
- "5": 80% of the Region's population within a 20km radius
- "3": 70% of the Region's population within a 20km radius
- "1": less than 60% of the Region's population is within 20km

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 9	7.0	5.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	8.0	4.0
Weighted Score Criteria 9	35	25	35	10	35	20	35	35	15	10	20	35	35	35	25	35	0	10	15	20	40	20

**CRITERIA # 10 Provisions for any Allied Services -- on site or adjacent to site (e.g. Long Term Care, Pharmacy, Office)**

**Weight: 3**

**Assessment Definition:** Consideration should be given as to whether it would be desirable to bring allied facilities close to the Facility to form a campus arrangement. This may or may not involve reserves for a medical office building, long term care or smaller components within the Facility such as commercial pharmacy, restaurants or other retail outlets. These facilities should be accommodated on site, but may also spur similar development in the neighbourhood.

**Scale Factors:** Potential for multiple planning and design solutions for future allied services:

- "10": is Excellent
- "7": is Good
- "5": is Fair
- "3": is Minimal
- "1": is Poor

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 10	3.0	8.0	3.0	6.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	9.0	6.0
Weighted Score Criteria 10	9	24	9	18	21	9	21	18	18	18	18	21	21	21	21	21	6	21	21	6	27	18

**CRITERIA # 11 Relationship to other supportive Institutions (Research or Education)**  
**Weight: 3**

**Assessment Definition:** The Facility should locate in an area where other supporting institutions are within reasonable proximity, such as houses of worship, long term care facilities, hotels, medical, clinical and allied health education and research facilities, etc.

**Scale Factors:** Site is located within:

- "10": Within 5 km of other supportive institutions
- "7": Within 6-10 km of other supportive institutions
- "5": Within 11-15 km of other supportive institutions
- "3": Within 16-20 km of other supportive institutions
- "1": Further than 20 km away from other supportive institutions

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 11	7.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	3.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	3.0
Weighted Score Criteria 11	21	21	21	12	21	9	21	12	12	12	30	21	21	21	12	21	9	12	21	24	21	9

**CRITERIA # 12 Neighbourhood Compatibility**  
**Weight: 3**

**Assessment Definition:** The image of the hospital and the acceptance of the community are important parameters in acceptance of the hospital in the community. The Facility and location must present a welcoming public image from the point of health care access. The site must be located in an area where the hospital would be compatible with existing uses, now and within future policy directions.

**Scale Factors:** The Facility must be in an area that is compatible with hospital uses.

- "10": Highly compatible
- "7": Compatibility is good
- "5": Compatibility is fair
- "3": Compatibility is minimal
- "0": Non-compatible

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 12	7.0	5.0	7.0	6.0	3.0	1.0	7.0	6.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	6.0	9.0	6.0	2.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	9.0	3.0	7.0	2.0
Weighted Score Criteria 12	21	15	21	18	9	3	21	18	6	9	9	18	27	18	6	21	24	9	27	9	21	6

**CRITERIA # 13 Site Amenities (trails, parks, restaurants, shopping)**  
**Weight: 2**

**Assessment Definition:** Nearby amenities to the site can enhance a person's experience. The site should have trails and walkways within the site that connect to the bigger municipal system. Nearby commercial uses add to the location of a hospital for visitor and employee convenience.

**Scale Factors:** Potential for on site or adjacent site amenities:

- "10": is Excellent
- "7": is Good
- "5": is Fair
- "3": is Minimal
- "1": is Poor

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 13	3.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	5.0	2.0	6.0	4.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	7.0	4.0	9.0	2.0
Weighted Score Criteria 13	6	16	16	16	10	4	12	8	14	14	16	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	14	8	18	4

**CRITERIA # 14 Visibility**  
**Weight: 2**

**Assessment Definition:** The Facility must have good visibility from major thoroughfares.

**Scale Factors:** Potential for a significant portion of main hospital building to be visible from Highway

- "10": Excellent potential
- "7": Good potential
- "5": Fair potential
- "3": Minimal potential
- "1": Limited potential

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 14	5.0	5.0	8.0	4.0	6.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	8.0
Weighted Score Criteria 14	10	10	16	8	12	16	14	14	10	12	10	16	16	14	14	14	10	10	12	14	14	16

**CRITERIA # 15 Proximity to existing EMS/Police/Patient Transfer Sites/Disaster Preparedness**  
**Weight: 4**

**Assessment Definition:** Access to the Facility must be well delineated and acceptable to emergency service providers. The routes and the Facility location must be convenient to the geographic region, with alternative pathways identified should primary ones be obstructed. Travel time for existing and proposed emergency services sites to the hospital is a factor in the location of the hospital (i.e. EMS response times). Location should be in an area that would support disaster preparedness planning by EMS, Police and Fire services.

**Scale Factors:** Site has:

- "10": clear travel routes and travel time is less than current response times
- "7": clear travel routes and travel time meets response times
- "5": clear travel routes and travel time almost meets current response times
- "3": not ideal travel routes and travel time does not meet response times
- "1": not ideal travel routes and travel time is not acceptable

NOTE: Fire Response Time is 5 min., EMS response time for cardiac is 6 min. (most restrictive)

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 15	3.0	8.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	8.0	2.0
Weighted Score Criteria 15	12	32	20	16	4	8	12	28	12	16	28	32	32	12	8	12	16	12	12	4	32	8

**CRITERIA # 16 Roadway capacity**  
**Weight: 5**

**Assessment Definition:** The road network must be able to support or add capacity to support the existing average daily trips in addition to those anticipated as the population grows. Road networks currently operating at a level 'd' or greater may have long term congestion issues. If a roadway is planned for expansion, this may not be an issue.

**Scale Factors:** Roadway capacity (planned or existing) to handle existing and proposed traffic as well as population growth.

- "10": Two lanes each direction for both primary roads
- "7": Two lanes each direction for at least one primary road
- "5": One lane in each direction operating at less than 60% capacity
- "3": One lane each direction operating at greater than 60% capacity
- "0": One lane each direction operating at greater than 80% capacity

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 16	6.0	6.0	3.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	4.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	6.0
Weighted Score Criteria 16	30	30	15	25	30	30	25	25	20	15	35	30	35	20	30	25	20	30	35	40	40	30

**CRITERIA # 17 Arterial / Collector Road Access**  
**Weight: 4**

**Assessment Definition:** In keeping with the goal of situating the Facility in close proximity to population, the Facility should be located with close access to major transportation corridors within the tributary region. Typically, most hospitals have an address on an arterial road or equivalent. They also should have close access to major roadways for connectivity to Regional communities.

**Scale Factors:** Consideration of direct potential or established access to an existing Highway:

- "10": Less than 1/2 km from arterial/collector
- "7": 1/2 to 1 km from arterial/collector
- "5": 1 to 1 1/2 km from arterial/collector
- "3": 1/2 to 2 km from arterial/collector
- "1": More than 2 km from arterial/collector

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 17	8.0	9.0	4.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	3.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	8.0
Weighted Score Criteria 17	32	36	16	20	40	32	28	28	16	16	28	28	40	28	32	28	12	32	32	40	36	32

**CRITERIA # 18 User Access (roadway, drop-off, loading)**  
**Weight: 4**

**Assessment Definition:** Access, drop off requirements and shipping and receiving are inevitably linked to a site layout. Functionally it is assumed there will need to be reasonable access for wheel-trans, patient transfer vehicles, emergency vehicles and the like with protected drop-off at main and secondary entrances. A reasonable assumption would be three loading bays plus any refuse/recycling holding. Wherever possible truck and transfer vehicles should be separated from ambulatory visitor drop-off. Overall a site area ratio may be in the range of 15-25%. Control of signalization and other traffic planning aspects may be required.

**Scale Factors:** Multiple points of access to the parcel and a minimum frontage on municipal road(s) to locate access roads are desirable:

- "10": Frontage on at least 2 roads and a minimum frontage of 300M on at least one arterial road and a drop off area
- "7": Frontage on at least 2 roads and a minimum frontage of 250M on at least one arterial road and a drop off area
- "5": Frontage on at least 2 roads and a minimum frontage of 200M on at least one arterial road and a drop off area
- "3": Frontage on at least 1 road and a minimum frontage of 250M on at least one arterial road and a drop off area
- "1": Frontage on at least 1 road and a minimum frontage of 200M on at least one arterial road and no drop off area

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 18	1.0	9.0	2.0	0.0	10.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	9.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	3.0	10.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	5.0
Weighted Score Criteria 18	4	36	8	0	40	8	12	12	12	12	36	4	40	4	40	4	12	40	4	4	40	20

**CRITERIA # 19 Transit Route (Established or Potential) to and on the site**  
**Weight: 5**

**Assessment Definition:** The user access area should front a local transit route in order to best serve the entire population and to encourage staff, visitors and patients to use public transit when appropriate. A site could also have potential for a transit route which could be found in the Transportation Master Plan.

**Scale Factors: Transit route:**

- "10": Established by opening day on two roads
- "7": Established by opening day on one road
- "5": To be established in the future on two roads
- "3": To be established in the future on one road
- "0": Not in the plans presently

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 19	4.0	9.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	0.0
Weighted Score Criteria 19	20	45	35	0	10	0	15	25	0	0	50	35	35	15	0	15	0	0	35	35	45	0

**CRITERIA # 20 Safe and convenient access for pedestrians / bicycles / e-bikes**  
**Weight: 3**

**Assessment Definition:** Municipal sidewalks should be available or planned for the roads leading to the site and in particular to the user access points. Bike routes should be safe and the preference is for dedicated on road bike lanes.

**Scale Factors:** Street bike lanes existing or proposed and sidewalk existing or proposed

- "10": Established both bike and sidewalk
- "7": Established one of bike and sidewalk with the other in the future
- "5": To be established in the future both bike and sidewalk
- "3": Only one to be established in the future
- "0": No bike or sidewalk and nothing proposed in the future

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 20	3.0	9.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	2.0
Weighted Score Criteria 20	9	27	12	9	9	6	3	9	3	9	24	15	15	6	6	6	9	6	12	21	24	6

**CRITERIA # 21 Two Road Frontage (Established or Potential)**

**Weight: 4**

**Assessment Definition:** Site must have more than one main entrance route in case a secondary access route is required.

**Scale Factors:** Local conditions include:

- "10": Two road frontage currently established
- "7": Two road frontage proposed
- "5": One road frontage established
- "3": One road frontage proposed
- "0": Not in an area with a planned street network

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 21	5.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	6.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	5.0
Weighted Score Criteria 21	20	40	16	40	40	28	24	20	40	20	40	20	40	20	40	20	20	40	36	40	32	20

**CRITERIA # 22 Distance Route to United States Border Crossing**  
**Weight: 1**

**Assessment Definition:** Patient transfers occur at various border crossings. Routes and travel times need to ensure ease of access.

**Scale Factors:** The distance to the nearest border crossing

- "10": within 5 km of the border
- "7": within 6-10 km of the border
- "5": within 11-15 km of the border
- "3": within 16-20 km of the border
- "1": greater than 20 km of the border

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 22	5.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0
Weighted Score Criteria 22	5	7	5	1	5	3	5	3	1	1	10	3	5	3	3	5	1	1	7	7	7	3

**CRITERIA # 23 Helicopter Flight Potential / Proximity / Access to Fixed Wing Aircraft Landing**  
**Weight: 3**

**Assessment Definition:** The site should be able to accommodate a helicopter landing area. As a result, the site must be free from adjacent tall buildings greater than 30m in height and out of the air path of the Windsor airport. Accessibility to the airport with effective travel routes is also required for patient transfers in order to accommodate all-condition (all-weather) navigation.

**Scale Factors:** Restrictions on flight path elevations (existing structures higher than 30M, within 1/2 km of parcel will limit directions for flight path / final approach or limit options to locate helipad on-site)

- "10": No structures higher than 30m within 1/2 km and direct access to airport (1 arterial/collector)
- "7": No structures higher than 30m within 1/2 km and indirect access to airport (2 arterial/collectors)
- "5": No structures higher than 30m within 1/2 km and with indirect access to the airport (1 or 2 arterial/collector and 1 local road)
- "3": No structures higher than 30m within 1/2 km and with indirect access to the airport (1 or 2 arterial/collector and more than 1 local road)
- "0": Existing structures higher than 30M within 1/2 km of parcel

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 23	8.0	8.0	8.0	6.0	8.0	1.0	9.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	8.0	7.0
Weighted Score Criteria 23	24	24	24	18	24	3	27	6	0	0	9	9	30	27	21	27	0	21	21	9	24	21

**CRITERIA # 24 Topography**  
**Weight: 3**

**Assessment Definition:** The site should be relatively flat without too many grade changes in order to reduce the amount of cut and fill grading activities that would occur during construction.

**Scale Factors: Topography:**

- "10": Good topography - gentle to no fluctuations of relief
- "7": Site is mostly level and can accommodate all anticipated uses
- "5": Site is not level, but can still accommodate all anticipated uses
- "3": Site is not level and can only accommodate a limited number of anticipated uses
- "1": Poor topography - extreme fluctuations of relief and cannot accommodate anticipated uses

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 24	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Weighted Score Criteria 24	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

**CRITERIA # 25 Servicing (Established or Potential, Redundant Services for Electrical and Water required)**

**Weight: 4**

**Assessment Definition:** The site should have capacity to support the Facility. Electrical, water, sewer, gas and other services should be in place now or by the time construction is scheduled to start. There are special considerations for plumbing and electrical systems in health care facilities. Access to two feeds for electrical and water should be available to the site.

**Scale Factors:** Water, sanitary, sewer, power (2 feeds required):

- "10": is established services
- "7": is good potential to service
- "5": is fair potential to service
- "3": is minimal potential to service
- "1": is poor potential to service

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 25	7.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	4.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	6.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	5.0
Weighted Score Criteria 25	28	40	28	40	28	16	20	28	20	20	40	28	28	8	12	12	28	24	36	40	40	20

**CRITERIA # 26 Drainage**  
**Weight: 2**

**Assessment Definition:** The site must have the ability to provide for storm water retention on site or in a nearby storm pond or in municipal storm water pipes.

**Scale Factors: Potential for surface drainage:**

- "10": Excellent potential
- "7": Good potential
- "5": Fair potential
- "3": Minimal potential
- "0": Limited potential

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 26	6.0	9.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	2.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	2.0	9.0	9.0	1.0	9.0	3.0
Weighted Score Criteria 26	12	18	10	12	12	4	12	10	16	16	20	14	14	10	12	12	4	18	18	2	18	6

**CRITERIA # 27 Heritage and Environmental Features (Rivers / Streams) / Archaeological  
Weight: 4**

**Assessment Definition:** The site should have no heritage or environmental features, unless the site exceeds the minimum size requirement. These types of features require additional study prior to site plan approvals, and may involve setbacks from the feature and well as flooding concerns in some areas. An archaeological impact assessment could be required where potential impacts to archaeological resources are identified.

**Scale Factors:** Presence of surface water, and natural and heritage features located on site:

- "10": No presence of any on site
- "7": Presence of one feature that does not impact the development site
- "5": Presence of one feature that does impact the development site
- "3": Presence of both features with minimal impact on development site
- "0": Presence of both features with impacts on development site

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 27	3.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	6.0	2.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	6.0	2.0	10.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	10.0	4.0
Weighted Score Criteria 27	12	40	40	16	24	8	40	24	40	40	40	24	40	24	8	40	8	20	8	20	40	16

**CRITERIA # 28 Vegetation**  
**Weight: 2**

**Assessment Definition:** The site should not impinge on native wooded areas. A vegetation management plan would be required if there are trees that provide linkages to wildlife corridors, contain significant species, or provide breeding habitat for migratory birds. Vegetation also limits the season in which work on site can be done if it is found to be habitat for breeding birds. Replacement tree programs may be required if proposing to remove any species greater than 10 cm in diameter.

**Scale Factors:** Presence of wooded areas on site:

- "10": No vegetation on site
- "7": Low vegetation (hedgerow, scrub)
- "5": Young plantation
- "3": Mature plantation
- "0": Significant species (e.g. butternuts)

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 28	4.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	3.0
Weighted Score Criteria 28	8	16	16	14	14	6	14	16	16	14	20	16	16	18	10	16	6	14	14	4	14	6

**CRITERIA # 29 Protected Wetlands**

**Weight: 3**

**Assessment Definition:** Wetlands are often regulated in the municipal policy documents and through the local conservation authority. Depending on the type of wetland, development of any kind may be prohibited and thus that area of land will not be available for hospital use. The size of the wetland area will impact the suitability of the site. It would be negative if the site was majority wetland (i.e. there would be no room to build). A positive would be if there was a small wetland which would create a natural feature and/or a visual enhancement on site.

**Scale Factors:** Presence of the following located on the site that impact development:

- "10": No wetlands
- "7": Some of the site is classified as wetlands, little or no impact to developable area
- "5": Some of the site is classified as wetlands; some impact to building likely
- "3": Most of the site is wetlands; considerable impact to building likely
- "0": Classified Wetlands (MNR), significant impact to building

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 29	8.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	6.0
Weighted Score Criteria 29	24	30	30	24	24	15	30	24	30	30	30	21	30	24	18	30	15	21	27	30	30	18

**CRITERIA # 30 Wind**  
**Weight: 2**

**Assessment Definition:** The user access area should be free of downward draft from adjacent buildings or structures. Avoidance of north entrances which offer little winter sunlight, and exposure to cold northern winds. The site must also consider any required setbacks from existing wind farms.

**Scale Factors: Impact of local conditions:**

- "10": Low Impact
- "7": Little impact
- "5": Moderate Impact
- "3": High Impact
- "0": Significant impact

Response #	Site																						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	
Consensus Criteria 30	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0
Weighted Score Criteria 30	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	14	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	18	20	20

**CRITERIA # 31 Noise  
Weight: 2**

**Assessment Definition:** The site should not be adjacent to any generator of noise that may impact the quality of experience for patients and staff within the hospital or on the grounds.

**Scale Factors: Impact of local conditions:**

- "10": Low Impact
- "7": Little Impact
- "5": Moderate Impact
- "3": High Impact
- "0": Significant impact

	Site																						
Response #	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	
Consensus Criteria 31	10.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	4.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	6.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	
Weighted Score Criteria 31	20	12	10	14	20	14	14	10	20	20	8	8	18	14	20	12	16	20	10	12	12	14	

**CRITERIA # 32 Air Quality  
Weight: 3**

**Assessment Definition:** The Facility should not be downwind of any noxious fume generator or subject to other flows of effluent. The site should be free of designated substances.

**Scale Factors:** Impact of local conditions:

- "10": Low Impact
- "7": Little Impact
- "5": Moderate Impact
- "3": High Impact
- "0": Significant Impact

Response #	Site																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
Consensus Criteria 32	8.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	3.0	9.0	5.0
Weighted Score Criteria 32	24	21	15	21	24	15	24	24	24	24	9	15	24	15	24	15	21	24	9	9	27	15