

# Settlement Site Evaluation Framework

Version 2.0

---

## Purpose

Site selection is where philosophy first encounters physical reality.

Conventional development analysis typically begins with price, access, utilities, entitlement, infrastructure, and marketability. Those considerations matter, but they are not our first question.

Our first question is:

**Does this place already contain—or have the realistic capacity to develop—the conditions necessary for a capable, connected, resilient human settlement?**

A settlement does not exist within its property lines alone.

It participates in a larger system of land, water, agriculture, ecology, people, towns, markets, knowledge, infrastructure, institutions, culture, and regional relationships.

Site evaluation must therefore consider not only the property being acquired, but the **capacity of the place as a whole**.

---

## Capacity of Place

Investor Developments evaluates the capacity of a place across four dimensions.

### Intrinsic Capacity

What the land and immediate place already possess.

This may include water, soil, climate, ecology, topography, forests, agricultural potential, existing structures, landscape character, and other inherent characteristics.

### Network Capacity

What becomes available through healthy relationships with the surrounding community and region.

This may include farmers, tradespeople, markets, healthcare, education, businesses, transportation, institutions, knowledge, cultural traditions, infrastructure, and regional production.

## Developable Capacity

What can responsibly be created, restored, or strengthened over time.

This may include water systems, agriculture, productive landscapes, energy, enterprises, infrastructure, education, workshops, public spaces, ecological restoration, and community institutions.

## External Capacity

Systems upon which the settlement depends but exercises relatively little influence or control.

These may include centralized utilities, distant supply chains, imported resources, major institutions, national transportation systems, specialized equipment, and other external networks.

None of these categories is inherently good or bad.

A capable settlement is not one that attempts to internalize everything.

Resilience is not isolation.

The objective is **Connected Resilience**: maintaining beneficial relationships with larger systems while retaining sufficient local and regional capacity, alternatives, knowledge, and redundancy that disruption of a single external system does not make ordinary life immediately impossible.

This changes the nature of site evaluation.

We ask:

**What exists here?**

**What exists nearby?**

**What can responsibly be developed?**

**What should remain connected to larger systems?**

**What dependencies do those relationships create?**

---

## Evaluation Hierarchy

Each major criterion is classified according to its importance.

**E — Essential** Failure may eliminate the site.

**C — Critical** Strongly preferred. Weakness requires a credible solution.

**V — Valuable** Significantly strengthens the settlement.

**O — Opportunity** Not required, but capable of becoming a distinctive asset.

Essential criteria cannot be averaged away.

A spectacular property with inadequate water security, unacceptable legal risk, insufficient functional capacity, or fundamental ecological constraints remains a poor settlement site regardless of its strengths elsewhere.

The objective is therefore not to identify the property with the highest aggregate score.

It is to understand the **capacity, limitations, dependencies, relationships, and developmental potential of a place as a whole.**

---

## 1. Water — E

Water is the first filter.

A settlement cannot be resilient if the water system upon which ordinary life depends is insecure, poorly understood, ecologically unsustainable, or controlled entirely beyond the settlement's influence.

The question is not simply whether water is present today.

We need to understand the **water capacity of the place**: where water comes from, how reliably it can support the intended population and productive landscape, what ecological system replenishes it, what infrastructure is required to use it, and what dependencies could interrupt access to it.

### Evaluate

- Reliable year-round water sources
- Quantity relative to projected population
- Agricultural and livestock requirements
- Water quality
- Legal access and water rights
- Springs, wells, surface water, and other available sources
- Groundwater and spring recharge
- Watershed condition
- Seasonal variability
- Historical drought conditions and drought vulnerability
- Rainfall and rainwater-capture potential
- Storage potential
- Gravity-fed distribution potential
- Energy required for pumping and distribution
- Treatment requirements
- Irrigation requirements and efficiency

- Wastewater treatment and reuse
- Flooding and contamination risk
- Upstream activities affecting quantity or quality
- Long-term ecological sustainability of extraction

## Water-System Resilience

The existence of a reliable water source does not by itself constitute water security.

Evaluate:

- Diversity of sources
- Redundancy
- Storage capacity and duration
- Dependence upon electricity
- Dependence upon pumps or specialized equipment
- Dependence upon externally supplied filters, chemicals, parts, or services
- Local repairability
- Alternative means of distribution
- Ability to isolate failures
- Time before disruption affects ordinary life
- Recovery requirements
- Cascading effects upon food, sanitation, health, or other essential systems

A productive well, for example, may appear secure while remaining dependent upon grid electricity, a single pump, specialized parts, or declining groundwater recharge.

The **water source** and the **water system** must therefore be evaluated separately.

## The Deeper Question

We should not ask only:

**Is there water?**

We should ask:

**Can this settlement understand, protect, manage, replenish, and remain connected to its water system—and can that system continue supporting ordinary life when conditions change or individual components fail?**

## 2. Food-System Capacity — E

A capable settlement does not need to produce everything it consumes.

It does need access to a diverse, productive, and sufficiently resilient food system.

Food capacity cannot therefore be evaluated only within the property boundary. The surrounding agricultural landscape, farmers, markets, processors, knowledge, transportation networks, and regional food economy are part of the capacity of the place.

The objective is not food independence.

It is **Connected Resilience**.

## Evaluate

- Productive soils
- Soil depth, fertility, drainage, and limitations
- Rainfall and growing season
- Agricultural suitability
- Irrigation availability and requirements
- Existing agriculture on and around the site
- Local farmers and producers
- Agricultural knowledge
- Household garden potential
- Settlement-scale food production
- Orchards and perennial crops
- Livestock potential
- Feed and forage availability
- Seed and planting-material availability
- Local and regional crop diversity
- Local food markets
- Food processing
- Preservation and storage
- Cold-storage requirements
- Transportation and distribution
- Regional agricultural diversity
- Seasonal availability
- Vulnerability to drought, flooding, pests, or disease
- Dependence upon imported agricultural inputs

## Layers of the Food System

Food resilience should be understood as a layered system:

**Home + Settlement + Local Producers + Regional Markets + Conventional Supply Chains**

Each layer performs a different function.

The strength of the system comes not from eliminating these relationships, but from having multiple layers capable of supporting one another.

A smaller property surrounded by productive farms, knowledgeable farmers, functioning markets, and diverse regional agriculture may possess greater food resilience than a much larger isolated property attempting to produce everything internally.

## Reciprocity

The surrounding agricultural community should not be viewed merely as a resource for the settlement.

The settlement should also ask:

**Can we strengthen the local food system?**

This may occur through purchasing from local producers, providing dependable markets, sharing processing or storage infrastructure, supporting agricultural knowledge, restoring productive land, or creating complementary enterprises.

The objective is a stronger **place**, not simply a protected settlement within it.

## The Deeper Question

**Does this place contain—or can it responsibly develop—a diverse, connected food system capable of nourishing its people while strengthening rather than weakening the agricultural community around it?**

And:

**If one layer of the food system were disrupted, could the remaining layers adapt sufficiently for ordinary life to continue?**

---

## 3. Functional Land-to-Human Capacity — E

Land area alone tells us very little about how many people a place can responsibly support.

Two properties of equal size may possess radically different capacities because of differences in water, soils, climate, topography, ecology, agriculture, surrounding community, infrastructure, settlement form, and productive potential.

The question is not:

**How many people can we fit on this land?**

It is:

**How many people can this place responsibly support while preserving the relationships, systems, ecological functions, and quality of life the settlement is intended to provide?**

This is **Functional Land-to-Human Capacity**.

## Evaluate Land by Function

Understand what different portions of the property must do.

Consider land required or appropriate for:

- Housing
- Food production
- Orchards and perennial agriculture
- Livestock where appropriate
- Water systems and watershed protection
- Productive activities and enterprise
- Workshops and small-scale production
- Education
- Public and civic life
- Gathering
- Recreation
- Ecological protection
- Wildlife habitat and corridors
- Forest and watershed conservation
- Waste and resource cycling
- Energy systems
- Roads and mobility
- Utilities and infrastructure
- Community services
- Future adaptation
- Areas that should remain undeveloped

Not every hectare is interchangeable.

A hectare of forest protecting a watershed performs a different function from productive agricultural soil. Both perform different functions from land appropriate for buildings, workshops, roads, or public space.

All may contribute to settlement capacity.

## From Gross Area to Functional Capacity

Land should progressively be understood as:

**Gross Land Area → Ecologically Available Land → Developable Land → Productive Land → Settlement Land → Functional Capacity**

The purpose is not to maximize developable area.

It is to understand what each part of the place can responsibly do.

## No Universal Ratio

There should be no universal hectares-per-person standard.

The appropriate ratio must emerge from the place itself.

Capacity varies according to climate, rainfall, water, soils, agriculture, ecology, topography, infrastructure, settlement pattern, surrounding regional capacity, economy, intended lifestyle, and long-term adaptability.

**Density should be an outcome of capacity analysis, not a target imposed upon the land.**

## Capacity Thresholds

Capacity should also be tested incrementally as population grows.

At each meaningful population stage, evaluate changes in:

- Water demand
- Food requirements
- Productive land
- Energy
- Infrastructure
- Mobility
- Waste systems
- Enterprise
- Community institutions
- Ecological pressure
- External dependency

A site may physically accommodate additional buildings while already having exceeded its functional capacity.

The important threshold may therefore not be the point at which another building cannot fit.

It may be the point at which adding people begins fundamentally changing the relationship between human life and the systems that support it.

## The Deeper Question

**What population can this place responsibly support while keeping the essential systems of human life sufficiently close, capable, understandable, productive, resilient, and connected to the people who depend upon them?**



And:

At what point would additional population increase dependency, degrade ecological or human capacity, or progressively force important systems off-site?

---

## 4. Ecological Capacity & Environmental Fit — E

The settlement must work with the ecological reality of the site rather than forcing the land to accommodate a predetermined development concept.

### Evaluate

- Topography
- Soil stability
- Watersheds
- Existing vegetation
- Forests
- Biodiversity
- Wildlife corridors
- Erosion
- Fire risk
- Flooding
- Landslide risk
- Severe weather
- Heat
- Drought
- Long-term climatic exposure
- Ecologically sensitive areas
- Areas inappropriate for development

Ecology should not be considered only as a collection of restrictions.

It is part of the productive and protective capacity of the place.

Determine which portions of the property should be:

- Productive
- Restored
- Protected
- Lightly occupied

- Intensively used
- Left substantially untouched

Some land supports human life most effectively by remaining forest, watershed, habitat, agricultural land, or open landscape.

**Some land should tell us no.**

Responsible development begins by listening.

---

## 5. Existing Human & Regional Community — C

A capable settlement should normally be connected to an existing human community rather than functioning as an isolated enclave.

### Evaluate

- Nearby towns and villages
- Local families
- Farmers
- Tradespeople
- Craftspeople
- Small businesses
- Markets
- Schools
- Clinics
- Social and civic institutions
- Local knowledge
- Local traditions
- Existing economic activity
- Community organizations
- Regional relationships

The surrounding community is not something from which the settlement should protect itself.

It can be one of its greatest assets.

Equally important, the settlement must consider what effect it will have upon the community already there.

Ask:

**What can this community contribute to the settlement?**

But also:

**What can the settlement contribute to this community?**

Evaluate whether development is likely to strengthen or weaken:

- Local livelihoods
- Land affordability
- Agriculture
- Local businesses
- Social relationships
- Infrastructure
- Cultural continuity
- Access to resources
- Community capacity

The objective is integration without absorption and participation without displacement.

A settlement should not achieve internal resilience by exporting its costs, scarcity, dependency, or environmental consequences to the surrounding community.

---

## 6. Productive Economic Potential — C

A settlement needs economic metabolism.

People require opportunities to create, produce, exchange, serve, build, teach, repair, grow, and contribute.

Money and value should enter, circulate, create further value, and support meaningful livelihoods.

### Evaluate Potential For

- Agriculture
- Food processing
- Workshops
- Trades
- Construction
- Professional services
- Remote work
- Cottage industries
- Appropriate manufacturing
- Hospitality where appropriate

- Education
- Research
- Healthcare
- Services
- Artisan production
- Regional commerce
- Exportable goods and services

Consider three overlapping economic layers:

**Internal Economy** — value created and exchanged within the settlement.

**Local & Regional Economy** — exchange with surrounding communities.

**External Economy** — income and value entering from beyond the region.

A healthy settlement should not depend excessively upon one employer, industry, commodity, tourism market, external funding source, or remote-work economy.

Economic diversity creates adaptive capacity.

The deeper question is:

**What can people actually do here?**

---

## 7. Energy Potential — C

Energy resilience should be created through layers rather than through a simplistic pursuit of independence.

### Evaluate

- Passive climatic design
- Energy efficiency
- Solar resource
- Micro-hydro where appropriate
- Wind where genuinely viable
- Biomass and waste opportunities
- Grid availability
- Grid reliability
- Local generation
- Storage
- Backup systems
- Microgrid potential

- Fuel availability
- Maintenance requirements
- Replacement-part dependency
- Local technical capability

The preferred model is:

**Efficiency + Passive Design + Local Generation + Storage + Grid Connection + Backup**

The objective is not maximum generation.

It is an energy system appropriate to the place, understandable enough to maintain, diverse enough to adapt, and sufficiently redundant that individual failures do not immediately interrupt ordinary life.

---

## 8. Regional Connection Without Dependency — C

Isolation is not resilience.

A capable settlement should remain strongly connected to its surrounding region and larger society.

### Evaluate Access To

- Nearby towns
- Regional cities
- Hospitals
- Universities
- Airports
- Major markets
- Suppliers
- Government services
- Transportation networks
- Telecommunications
- Specialized professional services

Accessibility, however, should not be measured only in travel time.

Ask:

**If one of these connections were interrupted temporarily, would ordinary life immediately become impossible?**

A place can be well connected without being helplessly dependent.

That distinction is central to Connected Resilience.

---

## 9. Human Scale & Walkability Potential — C

Some land naturally supports human-scale settlement.

Other land fights it.

### Evaluate

- Terrain conducive to walking
- Ability to cluster development
- Short everyday distances
- Natural centers and gathering places
- Comfortable microclimates
- Shade
- Mixed-use possibilities
- Opportunities for paths and pedestrian networks
- Limited need for internal automobile travel
- Topography capable of creating meaningful spatial relationships
- Accessibility for people of different ages and abilities

Movement should be embedded in ordinary life rather than requiring deliberate exercise or constant vehicle use.

A beautiful property that forces everyone into a vehicle for every activity contradicts an important part of the settlement model.

---

## 10. Health-Supporting Environment — C

The physical environment should make healthy patterns of living easier to sustain through ordinary life.

### Evaluate Whether the Place Naturally Supports

- Everyday movement
- Walking
- Nature contact
- Social interaction
- Fresh food
- Purposeful activity
- Intergenerational contact

- Low environmental pollution
- Rest
- Community participation
- Meaningful work
- Time outdoors
- Appropriate sunlight and shade
- Access to recreation

The question is not whether health-oriented amenities can be added later.

It is:

**Does healthy behavior emerge naturally from ordinary life here, or must it constantly be engineered around the deficiencies of the place?**

---

## 11. Climate & Human Comfort — C

Climate has profound consequences for quality of life, building design, energy demand, agriculture, water, health, and the amount of time people can comfortably spend outdoors.

### Evaluate

- Temperature
- Humidity
- Diurnal temperature variation
- Rainfall
- Seasonal extremes
- Natural ventilation
- Solar exposure
- Shade
- Heating requirements
- Cooling requirements
- Outdoor comfort
- Mosquito and vector pressure
- Severe-weather exposure
- Length and quality of the outdoor-living season

A benign climate reduces the amount of technology and energy required simply to make ordinary life comfortable.

**A benign climate is effectively a natural infrastructure asset.**

---

## 12. Legal & Governance Environment — E/C

Some otherwise extraordinary sites should not be pursued.

### Essential Legal Considerations

- Clear and defensible title
- Legal ability to acquire and hold the property
- Land-use feasibility
- Water rights
- Development permissions
- Environmental restrictions
- Agricultural restrictions
- Subdivision or condominium regimes
- Building requirements
- Foreign ownership restrictions
- Ability to establish the intended ownership and governance structures

### Critical Institutional Considerations

- Tax structure
- Political stability
- Government competence
- Regulatory predictability
- Corruption and institutional risk
- Enforcement of property and contractual rights
- Administrative burden
- Relationship with local authorities

Clear title and fundamental legal feasibility are **Essential**.

Broader governance quality is **Critical**.

Legal uncertainty affecting ownership, water, fundamental land use, or the ability to implement the intended settlement model should not be compensated for by strengths elsewhere.

---

## 13. Appropriate Infrastructure — C

Existing infrastructure is not automatically better infrastructure.

Nor should local infrastructure automatically be created simply because it can be.

## Evaluate

- Roads
- Electricity
- Internet
- Water
- Wastewater
- Drainage
- Solid waste
- Communications
- Transportation
- Maintenance capability
- Replacement requirements
- Long-term operating cost

For each major system, ask:

**Which systems should we connect to?**

**Which should we supplement?**

**Which should we create locally?**

**Which can be decentralized?**

**Which should remain regional?**

**What happens when one fails?**

Infrastructure should be appropriate to the scale, capacity, climate, economy, and culture of the place.

The objective is not maximum infrastructure.

It is **appropriate infrastructure**.

---

## 14. Education & Knowledge Ecosystem — V

A place contains knowledge as well as physical resources.

Site evaluation should therefore look beyond formal schools and ask what people, institutions, practices, and traditions can contribute to learning.

### Look For

- Skilled local people

- Farmers
- Builders
- Craftspeople
- Elders
- Universities
- Technical schools
- Researchers
- Ecological organizations
- Apprenticeship opportunities
- Businesses willing to teach
- Traditional knowledge
- Local history
- Practical skills
- Opportunities for intergenerational learning

The settlement should not assume that knowledge must be imported.

Some of the most valuable knowledge may already exist in the place.

Ask:

**What can this place teach?**

---

## 15. Cultural Compatibility & Local Receptiveness — C

Technical feasibility does not guarantee that a settlement belongs in a particular place.

### Ask

- Will the surrounding community welcome the project?
- Can genuine reciprocal value be created?
- Are local people likely to participate?
- Can employment and enterprise be created without displacement?
- Can newcomers integrate rather than form an isolated enclave?
- Are existing cultural practices worth reinforcing?
- Is there potential for trust?
- Could rising land values harm the community?
- Could development alter local resource access?
- Does the project's scale fit the social context?
- Can relationships develop naturally over time?



A technically exceptional property surrounded by deep local hostility or serious cultural incompatibility may still be fundamentally wrong.

The settlement should become part of the place without attempting to replace the place.

---

## 16. Beauty, Identity & Sense of Place — V

Beauty should not be dismissed as merely subjective or decorative.

People form relationships with places.

Those relationships influence belonging, stewardship, memory, identity, and the desire to care for what surrounds them.

### Look For

- Views
- Water
- Forest
- Mountains
- Agricultural landscapes
- Mature trees
- Topographic character
- Historic structures
- Local building traditions
- Distinctive materials
- Seasonal change
- Sounds
- Natural landmarks
- Existing patterns of settlement
- Places that naturally invite gathering or reflection

Beauty does not excuse ecological, legal, economic, or functional weakness.

But it matters.

People protect places they love.

Beauty can become an asset for stewardship.

---

## 17. Adaptability & Evolution — V

A settlement should have the capacity to become, rather than merely to be built.

The future cannot be fully predicted at the time of initial planning.

## Evaluate Capacity For

- Phased growth
- Changing uses
- New enterprises
- Additional food production
- Evolving infrastructure
- Experimental projects
- New technologies
- Demographic change
- Intergenerational change
- Changing economic conditions
- Expansion without destroying human scale
- Reuse and adaptation of buildings
- Changes in mobility or energy systems

Overly rigid planning can make a settlement fragile.

The objective is not disorder.

It is enough structure to create coherence while preserving enough openness for adaptation.

---

## 18. Affordability & Economic Feasibility — E

A place may be philosophically compelling and physically capable while remaining economically unachievable.

Economic feasibility is therefore **Essential**.

### Evaluate

- Land acquisition cost
- Infrastructure cost
- Site preparation
- Water development
- Energy systems
- Roads
- Permitting
- Construction costs



- Carrying costs
- Financing
- Market affordability
- Revenue opportunities
- Phasing
- Long-term operating costs
- Maintenance
- Replacement cycles
- Transportation costs
- Cost of external dependencies

Acquisition price alone is a poor measure of affordability.

Cheap land is not necessarily affordable land.

A remote property requiring enormous infrastructure investment, extensive earthwork, continuous transportation, imported resources, or expensive maintenance may ultimately be far more costly than a more expensive but inherently capable property.

**Evaluate total settlement cost, not merely land price.**

---

## 19. The Unmeasurable Quality — V

Analysis has limits.

After water, ecology, economics, law, agriculture, infrastructure, community, and the other measurable characteristics have been examined, there remains another legitimate question:

**Does this place have the potential to become somewhere people genuinely want to belong?**

Some places possess a coherence that is difficult to reduce to individual variables.

Landscape, climate, agriculture, town, people, history, scale, vegetation, views, sounds, culture, and physical character may combine in ways that create possibilities not immediately visible in a spreadsheet.

You walk the land and begin seeing life there.

This quality must never override water security, legal feasibility, ecological reality, functional capacity, or economics.

But it should not be ignored.

A settlement is not ultimately a collection of optimized systems.

It becomes a place.

---

# Site Assessment Method

The framework should be applied in three stages.

## Stage One — Non-Negotiable Screen

Before substantial acquisition expense, design work, or development planning occurs, the site must demonstrate credible potential in the Essential categories.

Confirm:

- ✓ Secure and sustainable water potential
- ✓ Clear title and fundamental legal feasibility
- ✓ Ecologically appropriate land
- ✓ Sufficient functional land-to-human capacity
- ✓ Viable food-system capacity locally and regionally
- ✓ Economically achievable acquisition and development
- ✓ No unacceptable natural or environmental hazard

Failure in one of these areas may constitute a No-Go, regardless of performance elsewhere.

**An Essential weakness should never disappear inside an average.**

## Stage Two — Settlement Capacity Profile

Sites that pass the Non-Negotiable Screen receive a broader Settlement Capacity Assessment.

Each major criterion may be scored:

- 1 – Fundamentally Weak
- 2 – Significant Limitation
- 3 – Workable
- 4 – Strong
- 5 – Exceptional

The numerical score is not the final conclusion.

For each important system, identify the source of its capacity.

**Intrinsic** — What already exists within the land and immediate place?

**Network** — What exists through the surrounding community and region?

**Developable** — What can responsibly be created or strengthened?

**External** — What remains dependent upon systems beyond the place?

A criterion might therefore appear as:

#### **Food-System Capacity**

- Intrinsic: 3
- Network: 5
- Developable: 4
- External Dependency: Moderate

This communicates substantially more than a single score of 4.

The objective is to create a **Settlement Potential Profile**, not a ranking disguised as precision.

### **Stage Three — Dependency & Resilience Test**

Every Essential system—and significant Critical systems—should then undergo a dependency analysis.

Ask:

- What does ordinary life depend upon?
- Where does that capacity reside?
- Who controls it?
- How far away is it?
- What infrastructure connects us to it?
- How quickly would failure be felt?
- What alternatives exist?
- How substitutable is it?
- How much can be stored?
- What knowledge is required to maintain it?
- Can it be repaired locally?
- How long could ordinary life continue without it?
- How quickly could capacity be restored?
- Could its failure cause failures elsewhere?

This analysis should distinguish between connection and dependency.

Connection is desirable.

Dependency becomes problematic when the failure of a distant, fragile, singular, or uncontrollable system rapidly makes ordinary life impossible.

The goal is not independence from the world.

**The goal is informed interdependence.**

# Evaluating Development Potential

A weak existing condition does not always make a site weak.

Some limitations represent opportunities for responsible development.

Others represent fundamental constraints.

For each weakness, determine:

- Can this condition realistically be improved?
- At what financial cost?
- At what ecological cost?
- At what maintenance cost?
- With what additional dependency?
- Over what period of time?
- Who must maintain it?
- Does solving one problem create another?

This distinction is essential.

We are not merely looking for places where all desirable conditions already exist.

We are looking for places where the right conditions either exist or can responsibly be developed without undermining the capacity of the place itself.

---

## Reciprocity Test

Site evaluation should not consider only what the settlement can obtain from its surroundings.

It must also consider what its presence will do to them.

Ask:

**Will this settlement increase or decrease the capacity of the surrounding place?**

Consider its likely effect upon:

- Local agriculture
- Employment
- Small businesses
- Land prices
- Housing affordability
- Water
- Infrastructure



- Traffic
- Ecology
- Cultural continuity
- Local knowledge
- Public institutions
- Community relationships
- Access to resources

A settlement that becomes more resilient by making its neighbors less resilient has failed an important test.

The desired relationship is reciprocal:

**The place strengthens the settlement, and the settlement strengthens the place.**

---

## The Final Assessment

No single numerical score should determine whether Investor Developments pursues a site.

The final assessment should describe the place as a whole.

It should identify:

- Its inherent strengths.
- Its limiting conditions.
- Its surrounding human and regional capacity.
- What can responsibly be developed.
- What should not be developed.
- Its important external dependencies.
- Its resilience under disruption.
- Its functional population capacity.
- Its relationship with the surrounding community.
- Its economic feasibility.
- Its ability to evolve.
- And its potential to become a place of genuine belonging.

Site selection is therefore not an exercise in finding perfect land.

Perfect land does not exist.

It is an exercise in understanding a place deeply enough to determine whether human settlement there can become coherent, capable, productive, connected, adaptable, and enduring.

---



# The Guiding Question

Investor Developments is not asking:

**"How much development can this land support?"**

We are asking:

**"What kind of human life can this land and its surrounding community responsibly support?"**

That is the measure against which the site should ultimately be judged.

