

### OPR Summary Results – Cherry Hills Village

Below are the results of the OPR for Cherry Hills Village conducted on June 25, 2013. Results were tabulated based on the votes received during the workshop and do not yet factor in any additional votes that may be received from absent stakeholders. Results also do not have any weighting factors applied.

#### Question A: What don't you like about the current Public Works Facility?

Response #	Responses	Rank	A/E	Owner	Occupant	User	Resident	Overall Score
A-1	Proximity to park land, open space, and elementary school	1	2.0		5.0	5.0	14.0	28.0
A-7	Outdated	2		4.0	18.0	4.0		26.0
A-2	Extreme industrial appearance in the middle of the village	3		10.0			12.0	25.0
A-34	It's just plain ugly	4	5.0		1.0	4.0	2.0	17.0
A-13	No covered storage	5			12.0	4.0		16.0

#### Question B: What do you like about the current Public Works Facility?

Response #	Responses	Rank	A/E	Owner	Occupant	User	Resident	Overall Score
B-2	Convenient location and shorten response time for anywhere in the City	1	5.0	10.0	35.0	20.0		75.0
B-10	All City staff is on one campus	2		8.0	7.0	7.0		26.0
B-1	Having the ability with staff is a positive feature	3	4.0	4.0	4.0	8.0		20.0
B-21	Has a fueling station – also benefits police and fire	4		4.0	5.0	7.0		17.0
B-25	One stop shopping	5		6.0	5.0	3.0		16.0

## 2013 Public Works Survey Methodology

- Web-based survey with postcard invitations.
- Total of 2,447 postcards mailed -- reaching nearly every household in the village.
- Web address was hosted on Cherry Hills Village website ([www.cherryhillsvillage.com](http://www.cherryhillsvillage.com)).
- Results based on data from 189 Cherry Hills Village residents.
- Response rate of 8% is typical for surveys of this nature.
- Maximum statistical error for study results is  $\pm 7.1\%$  at the 95% confidence level.
- Relatively high levels of agreement among study respondents for a number of issues, so average statistical error is  $\pm 6.5\%$  -- more than sufficient for directional research of this nature.
- Conducted by Pioneer Marketing Research on behalf of the City.

# **Cherry Hills Village Public Works Survey**

## **Key Findings**

***Study data analysis indicates CHV residents as a whole prefer Public Works Facility to remain at current location.***

- CHV residents generally satisfied with Public Works Dept. services
- Relatively few residents dissatisfied with current Public Works facility. Substantial majority satisfied or neutral about current facility.
- Significantly more CHV residents feel having centrally located Public Works facility is important.
- Majority of CHV residents relatively unconcerned about issues around location of current facility: traffic flow, aesthetics, noise, odors.
- Majority of residents think relocating Public Works facility and re-purposing old site for John Meade Park expansion to be poor or fair idea.
- Importantly, 71% of residents not willing to pay for higher operating costs associated with less centrally located Public Works facility.
- Study respondents split as to value of expanding amenities at John Meade Park.
- Finally, major negative concern among residents is potential for longer response times for delivery of Public Works services, if facility is moved to less central location.

# Verbatim Respondent Comments

- At the conclusion of the survey, study participants were given the opportunity to: *"Include any general comments you would like to make regarding the development of the Public Works improvement plan [Please be as specific as possible]."* A breakdown of study respondents' verbatim comments by category is presented in Table 14 on the following page.

- It is not surprising that the comments made by respondents at the conclusion of the survey closely match the overall findings of this research:

*As a community, residents of Cherry Hills Village want the Public Works facility to remain at its current location.*

- Specifically, comments from respondents who support keeping the current location (41%) outnumber comments from those favoring relocation (11%) by a margin of nearly four-to-one.
- About one-in-five (18%) respondents had no comments to add.
- Of interest, one fourth of study participants suggested that the relocation *decision should be cost related/cost effective/fiscally responsible* (18%) or they needed *more information to make a decision* (8%).
- Comments among respondents who felt the facility should remain at its current location fell into four categories:
  - *Satisfied with current site* (31%)
  - *Spruce up current site* (9%)
  - *Prefer central location* (5%)
  - *Keep current site - due to cost of relocation* (4%)
- Suggestions by respondents who supported relocating the Public Works facility were sorted into three categories:
  - *Prefer moving site - general* (7%)
  - *Favor relocation - better use of land* (4%)
  - *Suggestions for new location* (4%)
- Several respondents took this opportunity to make comments not directly related to the Public Works facility.
  - *Concerns about handling winter conditions/snow plowing* (4%)
  - *Bury utility lines* (3%)
  - *Consider outsourcing public works* (1%)
  - *Comments about survey process* (4%)

## Real Estate Evaluation Process

The Consultant Team and the Cherry Hills Village Team (referred to as “CHV Team”) identified the criteria for site selection in an interactive work session held on September 10, 2013. The criteria were broken into two categories, required criteria which were necessary for the function of the facility, and variable criteria which support the function of the facility, but are not requirements.

The required criteria are as follows:

1. The site must be within the desired location boundaries
2. The property must be between .99 AC to 4.01 AC
3. The property must have adequate site infrastructure, including wet utilities, power requirements, natural gas, and fiber optic service.
4. The property must have cell phone reception for Verizon.
5. If there is an existing building on the property, it is to be between 5,000 to 13,000 SF.
6. If there is an existing building on the property, it is to be constructed in 1966 or later.
7. There are no zoning requirements for the site search.

The variable criteria are prioritized, or “weighted” from 1.0 to 5.0, based on their importance to the CHV Team. The variable criteria are as follows:

1. Within 3.0 mi to Cherry Hills Village Police Department (weight: 4.0)
2. Within .25 mi of an Arterial Road (weight: 5.0)

CBRE identified all **possible options** by searching the geographic region that was acceptable to the CHV Team and applying the required criteria to eliminate unsuitable options. CBRE conducted three searches: existing buildings for sale, land sales that were currently available on the market, and properties that were listed as vacant, but not currently on the market. 21 possible options were identified; 3 existing buildings, 5 land sites available for sale, and 13 sites vacant sites.

In a worksession held on September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013, the Team reviewed the possible options, and using the Consultant Team’s findings and the CHV Team’s input, 6 properties were identified as **viable options**; 1 was an existing building for sale, 1 was vacant land for sale, 4 were vacant land not currently on the market.

After additional research, the CHV Team reviewed the viable options in a worksession held on September 24, 2013. Only the St. George’s Church option was retained as a preferred option.

The St. George’s Church property has floodplain concerns which constrain future development options, which the Consultant Team has considered in a opportunities and constraints study for the property.

Description	Acceptable Criteria	Criteria Weight	3600 S Clarkson St	3500 S Sherman St	3405 S Broadway	5050 S Broadway	3421 S Akron St	3600 S Yosemite
Map ID			1	2	3	4	5	6
Price			3.0M	1.9M	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant
Price per SF (BSF & LSF)			252.96 (BSF)	26.65 (LSF)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Required Criteria								
Inside Required Location Boundaries	See Location Boundaries Attached.		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Property Size	0.99 AC > 4.01 AC		N 5.94AC	1.68 AC	1.85 AC	1.79 AC	1.8 AC	3.05 AC
Adequate Site Infrastructure: Wet Utilities	1 1/4"		Y	Y	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Adequate Site Infrastructure: Power Requirements	XMFR		Y	Y	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Adequate Site Infrastructure: Natural Gas	Required		Y	Y	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Adequate Site Infrastructure: Fiberoptic Service	Required		Y	Y	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Cellphone Reception	Verizon Required		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Physical Size Available (Existing Bldgs Only)	5,000 > 13,000 SF		11,840	8,000	0	3,482	NA	NA
Age of Building (Existing Bldgs Only)	< 1966		1989	Unknown	NA	NA	NA	NA
Zoning Requirements	None		R3	MU-B-1	None Listed	MUB-2	B2	None Listed
Variable Criteria								
Proximity to Cherry Hills Village Police Department	3.0 Mi	4	5	5	5	4	3	3
Access to Arterial Road	1/4 Mi.	5	5	5	5	5	5	4
<b>Variable Criteria Total (45 Max)</b>			45	45	45	41	37	32
Comments 09/17/13			Religious Center	Commercial, Retail, Office, Mixed Use, Medical, Etc.	City of Englewood Community Development	Bank Site; On Hold for Development		Commercial
Comments 09/24/13			100-Year Floodway Concern	Too Small for Needs	Proposed MU Dvpt; 114 Residential Units, 23,500 Commercial, & Parking Structure.	.63 AC; Owned by Vectra Bank; Not Appropriate Use; Non-Taxable Use on Broadway a Concern	Potential Utility Easements; Residential Neighbors	Office Property for Lease

Color Key:

	Not Viable
	Potential Option
	Preferred Option





Description	Acceptable Criteria	Criteria Weight	Existing Buildings			Vacant Land - For Sale					Vacant Land - Not on the Market												
			3600 S Clarkson St.	9755 E Hampden Ave	10175 E Hampden Ave	E Hampden (Same as # 16)	707 E Jefferson Ave	Clarkson St & Jefferson Ave	405 W Prentice Ave	3500 S Sherman St	1013 E Bellevue Ave	6735 E Bellevue	6900 E Bellevue Ave	3405 S Broadway	5050 S Broadway	20 Cherry Hills Park Dr	6383 E Girard Pl	6325 E Hampden Ave	4700 S Monaco St	4700 S Monaco St	5351 S Roslyn St	Yosemite	3600 S Yosemite
Map ID			1	2	3	8	10	13	14	16	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	11	12	15	17	18
Price			3.0M	1.5M	1.4M	1.8M	Not Listed	1.3M	.4M	1.9M	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant
Price per SF			252.96	177.34	123.58	30.67	NA	27.42	7.34	26.65	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Required Criteria																							
Inside Required Location Boundaries	See Location Boundaries; Attached.		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Property Size	0.99 AC > 4.01 AC		N 5.94AC	N 0.9AC	1.0 AC	1.31 AC	1.14 AC	1.05 AC	1.11 AC	1.68 AC	1.03 AC	3.51 AC	2.6 AC	1.85 AC	1.79 AC	2.42 AC	2.0 AC	1.01 AC	3.77 AC	2.0 AC	2.0 AC	1.8 AC	3.05 AC
Adequate Site Infrastructure: Wet Utilities	1 1/4"		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Adequate Site Infrastructure: Power Requirements	XMFR		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Adequate Site Infrastructure: Natural Gas	Required		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Adequate Site Infrastructure: Fiberoptic Service	Required		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Cellphone Reception	Verizon Required		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Physical Size Available (Existing Bldgs Only)	5,000 > 13,000 SF		11,840	8,402	11,329	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Age of Building (Existing Bldgs Only)	< 1966		1969	1975; Reno 2006	1980	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Zoning Requirements	None		R3	B3	B3	None Listed	MU-R3B	MU-2	R-5	MU-B-1	CR3	T30	RDCOM	None Listed	MUB-2	CR-1	B4	B4	B4	B4	None Listed	B2	None Listed
Variable Criteria																							
Proximity to Cherry Hills Village Police Department	3.0 Mi	4	5	1	1	5	5	5	3	5	4	1	3	5	4	5	5	5	3	3	2	3	3
Access to Arterial Road	1/4 Mi.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	4
<b>Variable Criteria Total (45 Max)</b>			45	29	29	45	45	45	27	45	41	29	37	45	41	30	45	45	37	37	33	37	32
CBRE Comments			Religious Center	Tenant Occupied Event/Restaurant		Masonic Lodge; Redevelopment Site	Medical, Retail & Residential, Near Hospital	Retail, Office, Multifamily, Medical	Multifamily	Commercial, Retail, Office, Mixed Use, Medical, Etc.	On hold for Development		Rough Graded	City of Englewood Community Development	Bank Site; On Hold for Development	Proposed Use: Medical	Proposed Use: Restaurant; Currently Being Developed	Proposed Use: Hotel	Proposed Use: Commercial	Commercial, Retail, Restaurant		Commercial	
Discussion 09/17/2013			St. George's Church	Current use not adaptable for building - site ratio. Location at very edge of boundary. Tenant Occupied	Current use not adaptable for building - site ratio. Location at very edge of boundary. Tenant Occupied	Same Property as # 16. Brochure is pending	Possible topographic challenges w/ht site. Waiting additional price information.	Hampden frontage; Concern of community push back on rezoning.	Residential - Not Suitable Use		On hold for Development	TOD Development - Not Suitable Use	TOD Development - Not Suitable Use	Security an issue	Bank Site; On Hold for Development	Residential - Not Suitable Use	Medical - Not Suitable Use	Under Development	TOD Development - Not Suitable Use	TOD Development - Not Suitable Use	TOD Development - Not Suitable Use	Owned by Public Service Co. Information Not Readily Available.	Lease Opportunity. Not Suitable Use.

Color Key:	Not Viable
	Potential Option
	Preferred Option



