

## Executive Summary

In 1998, consultants hired by a Multi Purpose Facility Task Force based in Kingston, Ontario concluded that the City's "lack of appropriate spectator facilities has limited (its) ability to host large conferences, trade shows, concerts, plays, performances, spectator sporting events, and many other recreation programs" (Crowe and Dexter, 1998: 1). Therefore, the goal of this report was to make a "first cut" at selecting a suitable location for a spectator arena in Kingston.

The examination was limited to four sites: Block D, the Kingston Memorial Centre site, Queen's University's West Campus at the southwest corner of the Sir John A. Macdonald Boulevard/Johnson Street intersection, and the northwest quadrant of the Division Street/Highway 401 intersection. The main purpose of including Block D was to allow for a comparison between a site that has already been examined extensively with sites that have yet to be investigated. The remaining three sites were selected for assessment based on suggestions made by the City of Kingston's Manager of Strategic Planning.

The evaluation method that was used for this investigation is based on the approach employed by Porter Dillon Limited for locating a Civic Centre in St. John's, Newfoundland. In total, three categories were examined for each Kingston site: property factors, accessibility to and from the arena, and community locale. The evaluation criteria that were used for each of these categories are listed in Table I, along with their weighting and a brief description of why they are important considerations from a planning perspective.

**Table I – Evaluation Criteria for Locating an Arena in Kingston**

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Reason for Inclusion</b>	<b>Weight</b>
<b>Property Factors</b>		
1. Official Plan Policies	- location of arena should comply with city policies	7
2. Zoning By-laws	- location of arena show comply with the zoning by-law insofar as zoning is an indication of compatibility of land uses	5
3. Size and Configuration	- site must be large enough to hold the proposed arena; irregularly shaped properties may present problems	7
4. Availability and Ownership	- necessary land must be available and transferable to the City	7
5. Implementation Schedule	- arena should be built in an acceptable amount of time	5
<b>Accessibility to and from the Arena</b>		
1. Proximity to Major Roads	- impact of traffic will be reduced if the major roadways around the site have the capacity for additional traffic volumes	8
2. Site Accessibility	- access to building is important to the public and to trucks that make regular deliveries	8
3. Public Transit	- transit is an important means of transporting both employees and patrons to the facility	5
4. Pedestrian Traffic	- desirable for the facility to be located near established pedestrian pathways	5
5. Parking Availability	- most patrons will drive their own vehicle to the facility and must have a place to park	7
<b>Community Locale</b>		
1. Residential Land Use	- necessary to protect the rights of residents from nearby non-residential uses	7
2. Prominence of Location	- visual impact of the arena is crucial in advertising the arena to event promoters	5
3. Proximity to Hotel Accommodations	- sporting events, concerts, etc. rely on convenient overnight accommodations	7
4. Proximity to Retail/Entertainment Uses	- important for the facility to be located near other non-residential uses, such as restaurants and pubs	5

For each evaluation criterion, the sites were ranked from 1 to 4 (Table II), based on the analysis that was conducted. The criteria were then assessed using the Concordance Evaluation Method. This is a computerized method that allows the input of ordinal (rank) and interval (real number) data to obtain an overall evaluation based on multiple criteria. According to Porter Dillon Limited (1998: 52):

The Concordance Method involves the systematic comparison of options. Each option is compared for each criterion considered and the better option is given the weight associated with that criterion. If the options are equal, the weight is divided between them. The proportions of the weights assigned to each option on the basis of one-to-one comparisons are then summed to develop an overall score for each option. The option with the most points calculated through this process is considered to be the best.

The resulting Concordance Matrix is presented in Table III.

**Table II – Evaluation Criteria and Rankings, Proposed Kingston Arena Site Evaluation**

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Wt.</b>	<b>Block D</b>	<b>Kingston Memorial Centre</b>	<b>West Campus</b>	<b>Division Street/ Highway 401</b>
<b>Property Factors</b>					
1. Official Plan Policies	7	4	1	1	3
2. Zoning By-laws	5	4	1	1	3
3. Size and Configuration	7	2	1	3	3
4. Availability and Ownership	7	2	1	4	2
5. Implementation Schedule	5	2	1	2	4
<b>Accessibility to and from the Arena</b>					
1. Proximity to Major Roads	8	3	3	1	1
2. Site Accessibility	8	2	1	3	4
3. Public Transit	5	1	1	3	4
4. Pedestrian Traffic	5	1	2	3	4
5. Parking Availability	7	3	3	2	1
<b>Community Locale</b>					
1. Residential Land Use	7	3	3	2	1
2. Prominence of Location	5	1	4	3	1
3. Proximity to Hotel Accommodations	7	1	2	4	3
4. Proximity to Retail/Entertainment Uses	5	1	2	3	4

**Table III – Concordance Matrix, Proposed Kingston Arena Site Evaluation**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Block D</b>	<b>Kingston Memorial Centre</b>	<b>West Campus</b>	<b>Division Street/ Highway 401</b>	<b>Sum of Points</b>
<b>Block D</b>		0.403	0.585	0.545	1.533
<b>Kingston Memorial Centre</b>	0.597		0.625	0.693	1.915
<b>West Campus</b>	0.415	0.375		0.460	1.250
<b>Division Street/ Highway 401</b>	0.455	0.307	0.540		1.302

Examination of the rankings in Table II and the summary provided by the Concordance Matrix in Table III indicates that the West Campus site is the least attractive location for an arena. This site is located over two kilometres from the downtown, and thus ranks poorly for criteria such as proximity to hotel accommodations and proximity to retail and entertainment uses. The site also lacks public transit availability and pedestrian accessibility.

The Division Street/Highway 401 site is slightly more advantageous because it is located at a prominent highway interchange without residential neighbourhoods in the vicinity. However, like the West Campus site, it is not proximal to hotels and retail and entertainment uses.

The Block D site benefits from its prominent location at the edge of the downtown. As a result, it is within walking distance of various retail stores and hotels

and is well served by existing transit routes. However, two major shortcomings of this site are its lack of parking availability, which leads to the possibility of spillover parking into nearby residential areas, and the surrounding roadway system, which allows vehicular access into these residential areas.

The Kingston Memorial Centre site is the most attractive location for a spectator arena of the four sites that were examined. In fact, the summed concordance score for this site is 25% higher than the nearest competitor, Block D. The Kingston Memorial Centre site is a suitable location for an arena since no Official Plan or Zoning By-law Amendments are required to permit construction. The site is also easily accessed by vehicles and pedestrians, well served by public transit, and proximal to hotels, restaurants, and shops.

The intention of this report, however, was not to conclusively determine where to locate a spectator arena in Kingston. Instead, its purpose was to demonstrate the application of a site selection method that could be used to inform future decision-making. This method can easily be adapted by those parties that have an interest in such a project, such as the City of Kingston, to account for more and different sites, the addition and deletion of evaluation criteria, and/or the adjustment of criteria weightings.