

**Appendix A**  
**DATA SUPPLEMENT FOR CHAPTER 2**



**TABLE A.1**  
**Change in Labor Force Status, 1980-2000**  
**Town of Normal**

|                                      | 1980   | 1990   | 2000   |                         |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------------------------|
| <b>Total Persons Age 16 and Over</b> | 29,827 | 33,894 | 38,339 |                         |
| <b>Total in Labor Force</b>          | 17,800 | 22,448 | 26,943 |                         |
| <b>Percent in labor force</b>        | 59.7%  | 66.2%  | 70.3%  |                         |
| <b>Armed Forces</b>                  | 7      | 71     | 60     |                         |
| <b>Civilian Labor Force</b>          | 17,793 | 22,377 | 26,883 |                         |
| <b>employed</b>                      | 16,942 | 21,262 | 25,973 | Labor Force<br>Employer |
| <b>unemployed</b>                    | 851    | 1,115  | 910    |                         |
| <b>percent unemployed</b>            | 4.8%   | 5.0%   | 3.4%   |                         |
| <b>Not in Labor Force</b>            | 12,027 | 11,446 | 11,396 |                         |

Source: 1980 and 1990 Census; U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, 2004; Census 2000, SF3 Table P43. Sex by Employment Status for the Population 16 Years and Over

**Table A.2**  
**1999 Income in Dollars for Normal and Selected Places**

|                      | Median Income |          | Per Capita | % of Persons Below Poverty Level |     |
|----------------------|---------------|----------|------------|----------------------------------|-----|
|                      | Household     | Family*  | Income     | All Ages                         | 65+ |
| <b>Normal</b>        | \$40,379      | \$60,644 | \$17,775   | 19.3                             | 3.9 |
| <b>Bloomington</b>   | \$46,496      | \$61,093 | \$24,751   | 7.8                              | 5.8 |
| <b>Champaign</b>     | \$32,795      | \$52,628 | \$18,664   | 22.1                             | 5.6 |
| <b>Urbana</b>        | \$27,819      | \$42,655 | \$15,969   | 27.3                             | 7.2 |
| <b>Peoria</b>        | \$36,397      | \$46,882 | \$20,512   | 18.8                             | 8.6 |
| <b>Decatur</b>       | \$33,111      | \$42,379 | \$19,009   | 16.5                             | 9.0 |
| <b>Springfield</b>   | \$39,388      | \$51,298 | \$23,324   | 11.7                             | 7.7 |
| <b>McLean County</b> | \$47,021      | \$61,073 | \$22,227   | 9.7                              | 5.0 |
| <b>Illinois</b>      | \$46,590      | \$55,545 | \$23,104   | 10.7                             | 8.3 |

\*Two or more related individuals residing within a household.

Source: 2000 Census Table DP-3 Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics: 2000

**Table A.3**  
**CHANGE IN SALES TAX RETURNS (STATE SHARE)**  
**Town of Normal and Selected Places, 2000 - 2002 (in thousands of dollars)**

| City and Year      | Number of Taxpayers | Total Receipts | General Merchandise | Food  | Drinking and Eating Places | Apparel | Furniture & H.H. & Radio | Lumber, Bldg. Hardware | Automotive & Filling Stations | Drugs & Misc. Retail | Agriculture & All Others | Manufacturers |
|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------|----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Normal</b>      |                     |                |                     |       |                            |         |                          |                        |                               |                      |                          |               |
| 2002               | 898                 | 22,364         | 5,367               | 1,714 | 3,013                      | 532     | 1,095                    | 2,538                  | 4,193                         | 2,455                | 1,177                    | 277           |
| 2001               | 904                 | 22,316         | 5,408               | 1,537 | 2,994                      | 532     | 1,103                    | 2,513                  | 4,357                         | 2,380                | 1,154                    | 338           |
| 2000               | 919                 | 21,757         | 5,146               | 1,097 | 2,609                      | 678     | 1,158                    | 2,505                  | 4,105                         | 2,062                | 2,116                    | 282           |
| % Change           | -2.3%               | 2.8%           | 4.3%                | 56.2% | 15.5%                      | -21.5%  | -5.4%                    | 1.3%                   | 2.1%                          | 19.1%                | -44.4%                   | -1.8%         |
| <b>Bloomington</b> |                     |                |                     |       |                            |         |                          |                        |                               |                      |                          |               |
| 2002               | 2,126               | 51,585         | 6,529               | 2,850 | 6,437                      | 2,294   | 4,304                    | 4,140                  | 13,489                        | 5,423                | 5,495                    | 626           |
| 2001               | 2,137               | 52,826         | 6,130               | 2,474 | 6,328                      | 2,438   | 6,435                    | 2,516                  | 14,526                        | 4,844                | 6,113                    | 1,021         |
| 2000               | 2,073               | 48,778         | 5,009               | 1,926 | 6,975                      | 2,264   | 5,371                    | 2,423                  | 12,183                        | 4,896                | 5,931                    | 1,800         |
| % Change           | 2.6%                | 5.8%           | 30.3%               | 48.0% | -7.7%                      | 1.3%    | -19.9%                   | 70.9%                  | 10.7%                         | 10.8%                | -7.4%                    | -65.2%        |
| <b>Champaign</b>   |                     |                |                     |       |                            |         |                          |                        |                               |                      |                          |               |
| 2002               | 1,999               | 54,990         | 10,212              | 3,683 | 7,224                      | 3,250   | 5,216                    | 4,529                  | 7,904                         | 6,077                | 6,474                    | 421           |
| 2001               | 1,995               | 54,095         | 10,297              | 3,453 | 7,082                      | 2,873   | 5,095                    | 4,402                  | 8,351                         | 5,989                | 5,956                    | 597           |
| 2000               | 2,039               | 52,845         | 9,774               | 2,902 | 7,732                      | 2,761   | 5,203                    | 4,368                  | 8,231                         | 5,840                | 5,447                    | 586           |
| % Change           | -2.0%               | 4.1%           | 4.5%                | 26.9% | -6.6%                      | 17.7%   | 0.2%                     | 3.7%                   | -4.0%                         | 4.1%                 | 18.9%                    | -28.2%        |
| <b>Urbana</b>      |                     |                |                     |       |                            |         |                          |                        |                               |                      |                          |               |
| 2002               | 773                 | 11,971         | 640                 | 1,257 | 2,086                      | 219     | 348                      | 276                    | 4,010                         | 1,383                | 1,642                    | 108           |
| 2001               | 776                 | 11,995         | 817                 | 1,008 | 2,158                      | 215     | 381                      | 256                    | 4,005                         | 1,239                | 1,655                    | 260           |
| 2000               | 776                 | 11,237         | 538                 | 836   | 2,397                      | 212     | 320                      | 300                    | 3,650                         | 1,037                | 1,559                    | 389           |
| % Change           | -0.4%               | 6.5%           | 19.0%               | 50.4% | -13.0%                     | 3.3%    | 8.7%                     | -8.0%                  | 9.9%                          | 33.4%                | 5.3%                     | -72.2%        |
| <b>Decatur</b>     |                     |                |                     |       |                            |         |                          |                        |                               |                      |                          |               |
| 2002               | 2,047               | 40,118         | 7,307               | 1,645 | 4,831                      | 408     | 2,086                    | 1,194                  | 13,148                        | 3,587                | 4,721                    | 1,191         |
| 2001               | 2,018               | 40,463         | 7,149               | 1,722 | 4,650                      | 431     | 2,372                    | 1,218                  | 13,251                        | 3,466                | 4,822                    | 1,380         |
| 2000               | 2,062               | 38,983         | 6,899               | 1,707 | 4,599                      | 430     | 2,019                    | 1,288                  | 11,814                        | 3,544                | 5,068                    | 1,614         |
| % Change           | -0.7%               | 2.9%           | 5.9%                | -3.6% | 5.0%                       | -5.1%   | 3.3%                     | -7.3%                  | 11.3%                         | 1.2%                 | -6.8%                    | -26.2%        |
| <b>Peoria</b>      |                     |                |                     |       |                            |         |                          |                        |                               |                      |                          |               |
| 2002               | 3,267               | 76,934         | 14,337              | 3,576 | 8,971                      | 3,079   | 6,944                    | 5,259                  | 17,346                        | 8,495                | 7,700                    | 1,226         |
| 2001               | 3,232               | 79,439         | 14,402              | 3,133 | 8,858                      | 3,065   | 7,595                    | 5,681                  | 17,892                        | 8,585                | 8,996                    | 1,231         |
| 2000               | 3,281               | 78,686         | 12,854              | 2,957 | 9,720                      | 3,178   | 8,041                    | 5,819                  | 16,317                        | 8,738                | 9,766                    | 1,296         |
| % Change           | -0.4%               | -2.2%          | 11.5%               | 20.9% | -7.7%                      | -3.1%   | -13.6%                   | -9.6%                  | 6.3%                          | -2.8%                | -21.2%                   | -5.4%         |
| <b>Springfield</b> |                     |                |                     |       |                            |         |                          |                        |                               |                      |                          |               |
| 2002               | 4,118               | 90,314         | 16,996              | 5,139 | 11,072                     | 3,274   | 5,970                    | 6,615                  | 20,593                        | 8,995                | 10,539                   | 1,122         |
| 2001               | 4,090               | 85,840         | 15,705              | 5,257 | 10,586                     | 3,337   | 5,927                    | 6,188                  | 20,997                        | 8,753                | 7,968                    | 1,122         |
| 2000               | 4,204               | 83,076         | 14,329              | 4,303 | 11,140                     | 3,449   | 6,196                    | 7,182                  | 18,214                        | 8,911                | 8,162                    | 1,190         |
| % Change           | -2.0%               | 8.7%           | 18.6%               | 19.4% | -0.6%                      | -5.1%   | -3.6%                    | -7.9%                  | 13.1%                         | 0.9%                 | 29.1%                    | -5.7%         |

Source: Illinois Department of Revenue

**TABLE A.4**  
**Population Growth: 1970-2000**  
**Town of Normal**

|      | Total Population | Change | Mean Absolute Change/Year | Mean Percentage Change/Year |
|------|------------------|--------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1970 | 26,396           | ---    | ---                       | ---                         |
| 1980 | 35,672           | 9,276  | 928                       | 3.5                         |
| 1990 | 40,023           | 4,351  | 435                       | 1.2                         |
| 2000 | 45,386           | 5,363  | 536                       | 1.3                         |

Source: US Bureau of Census

**Table A.5**  
**Change in Age and Gender Composition, 1970-2000**  
**Town of Normal**

| FEMALE<br>by age | Year | 0-4   | 5-9   | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85+ | Total  |
|------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|--------|
|                  |      | 1970  | 775   | 932   | 908   | 3,544 | 3,320 | 758   | 594   | 563   | 574   | 532   | 458   | 366   | 311   | 259   | 223   | 183   | 134 | 109    |
|                  | 2000 | 1,111 | 1,091 | 1,050 | 3,781 | 6,315 | 1,504 | 1,212 | 1,320 | 1,270 | 1,138 | 932   | 700   | 502   | 498   | 512   | 442   | 324   | 368 | 24,070 |
| MALE<br>by age   | Year | 0-4   | 5-9   | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85+ | Total  |
|                  |      | 1970  | 820   | 885   | 1,023 | 2,273 | 2,499 | 748   | 564   | 559   | 556   | 490   | 407   | 299   | 250   | 162   | 129   | 99    | 51  | 39     |
|                  | 2000 | 1,130 | 1,164 | 1,096 | 2,642 | 5,847 | 1,663 | 1,184 | 1,225 | 1,093 | 1,024 | 860   | 598   | 477   | 382   | 366   | 287   | 174   | 104 | 21,316 |

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census

**TABLE A.6**  
**Educational Attainment in the Town of Normal**  
**(percent population 25 years and over)**

| Level of Attainment            | Normal | Bloomington | Peoria | Champaign | Urbana | Decatur |
|--------------------------------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|
| Less than 9th grade            | 2.3    | 3.2         | 6.2    | 3.0       | 3.6    | 4.9     |
| High school graduate or higher | 93.9   | 89.8        | 82.8   | 91.6      | 90.8   | 80.8    |
| Bachelor's Degree or higher    | 42.4   | 39.7        | 28.0   | 44.3      | 53.5   | 17.0    |

Source: 2000 Census Table GCT-P11 Language, School Enrollment & Educational Attainment

**TABLE A.7**  
**Change in Occupied Households**  
**Town of Normal**

| Type of Occupied Unit (Tenure) | 1990                |                |                |                          | 2000                |                |                |                          |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|
|                                | Population in Units | Occupied Units |                | Average Persons Per Unit | Population in Units | Occupied Units |                | Average Persons Per Unit |
|                                |                     | Total          | Percent Change |                          |                     | Total          | Percent Change |                          |
| Owner                          | 17,858              | 6,516          | 11.2           | 2.74                     | 21,375              | 8,312          | 27.6           | 2.57                     |
| Renter                         | 13,413              | 5,340          | 37.8           | 2.51                     | 15,377              | 6,815          | 27.6           | 2.26                     |
| Total                          | 31,271              | 11,856         | 21.8           | 2.64                     | 36,752              | 15,127         | 27.6           | 2.43**                   |

\* The average number of persons per occupied unit in the Town in 1980 was 2.96 for owner, 2.61 for renter and 2.78 for total units.

\*\* The average number of persons per occupied unit statewide in 2000 was 2.63.

Source: McLean County Regional Planning Commission; 2000 Census Summary File 3, Table H7 Tenure; Table H15 Total Population in Occupied Housing Units by Tenure; Table H18 Average Household Size of Occupied Housing Units by Tenure

**Table A.8**  
**Summary of Existing Land Use Data**  
**Town of Normal**

| Land Use Category  | Number of Acres | Percent of Total Area | Percent of Developed Area | Acres of Developed Land Per 100 Persons |                           |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
|  |                 |                       |                           | Town of Normal <sup>1</sup>             | Average City <sup>2</sup> |
| Total Residential  | 2,725           | 24.7                  | 28.4                      | 5.8                                     | 9.9                       |
| a. 1-6 units   | 2,281           | 20.7                  | 23.8                      | 4.8                                     | 9.6                       |
| b. 6 plus units  | 444             | 4.0                   | 4.6                       | 0.9                                     | 0.3                       |
| Commercial   | 1,200           | 10.9                  | 12.5                      | 2.5                                     | 1.2                       |
| Industrial   | 667             | 6.0                   | 7.0                       | 1.4                                     | 1.6                       |
| Public & Semi-Public<br>(including parks, trails & golf courses) | 3,069           | 27.8                  | 32.0                      | 6.5                                     | 4.6                       |
| Streets & Railroad Right of Way                                  | 1,932           | 17.5                  | 20.1                      | 4.1                                     | 4.8                       |
| Total Developed Area   | 9,593           | 87.0                  | 100.0                     | 20.4                                    | 22.1                      |
| Vacant or Agricultural   | 1,432           | 13.0                  |                           |   |                           |
| Total Area   | 11,025          | 100.0                 |                           |   |                           |

<sup>1</sup>Based on an estimated 2003 population of 47,075

<sup>2</sup>Average derived from data compiled for comprehensive plans prepared between 1970 and 2003 for midwestern cities

Source: Normal Township Assessor's office database for year 2003

**Table A.9  
Inventory of Existing Park Facilities  
Town of Normal**

| Park Name                                   | Acres         | Miles      | Shelter   | Restrooms | Indoor Rec Facility | Baseball Softball | Football Soccer | Basketball | Volleyball | Horseshoe | Tennis Courts | Play Equipment | Swim Pool Aquatic Ctr. | Track    |
|---|---------------|------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------|------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|----------|
| <b>NEIGHBORHOOD/SMALL COMMUNITY PARKS</b>   |               |            |           |           |                     |                   |                 |            |            |           |               |                |                        |          |
| Anderson Park                               | 14.0          | 0.0        | 2         | 1         | 0                   | 1                 | 0               | 1          | 1          | 0         | 3             | 3              | 1                      | 0        |
| Fell Park                                   | 2.0           | 0.0        | 1         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 1          | 0          | 1         | 0             | 1              | 0                      | 0        |
| East Dentention Basin                       | 9.0           | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 3               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 1              | 0                      | 0        |
| West Dentention Basin                       | 13.5          | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Eloise Burner Craig Park                    | 0.5           | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Franssen Nature Area                        | 5.0           | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Underwood Park                              | 11.0          | 0.0        | 5         | 1         | 0                   | 1                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 2             | 1              | 0                      | 0        |
| Maartin Luther King Park                    | 4.0           | 0.0        | 1         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 1               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 1              | 0                      | 0        |
| Ironwood Park                               | 8.0           | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 1                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 4             | 1              | 0                      | 0        |
| Oak Street Ball Diamond                     | 2.5           | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 1                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Carden Park                                 | 5.0           | 0.0        | 1         | 0         | 0                   | 1                 | 2               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 1              | 0                      | 0        |
| Kelly Dentention Basin                      | 16.0          | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Savannah Park                               | 2.25          | 0.0        | 1         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 1              | 0                      | 0        |
| Hidden Creek Nature Sanctuary               | 5.5           | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Green Briar Property (undeveloped)          | 18.25         | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Chiddix School                              | 16.75         | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 1                 | 1               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 1        |
| Colene Hoose School                         | 19.25         | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 3                 | 0               | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Fairview School                             | 4.75          | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 1                 | 0               | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 1              | 0                      | 0        |
| Glenn School                                | 4.75          | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 1                 | 0               | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Kingsley Jr. High School                    | 14.41         | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 1                 | 1               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 1        |
| Oakdale School                              | 8.0           | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 2                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Sugar Creek                                 | 15.0          | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 3                 | 1               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| One Normal Plaza                            | 24            | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 1                 | 1               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| <b>Totals</b>                               | <b>223.41</b> | <b>0.0</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>2</b>  | <b>0</b>            | <b>18</b>         | <b>10</b>       | <b>6</b>   | <b>1</b>   | <b>1</b>  | <b>9</b>      | <b>12</b>      | <b>1</b>               | <b>2</b> |
| <b>LARGE COMMUNITY/REGIONAL PARKS</b>       |               |            |           |           |                     |                   |                 |            |            |           |               |                |                        |          |
| Fairview Park                               | 46.0          | 0.0        | 6         | 1         | 0                   | 1                 | 0               | 0          | 1          | 0         | 2             | 2              | 1                      | 0        |
| Maxwell Park/Parkside Schools/NCWHS Complex | 225.0         | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 11                | 2               | 2          | 0          | 12        | 6             | 1              | 0                      | 1        |
| Constitution Trail                          | 57.5          | ?          | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| Ironwood Golf Course                        | 300.0*        | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| ISU Golf Course                             | 176.4*        | 0.0        | 0         | 0         | 0                   | 0                 | 0               | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0             | 0              | 0                      | 0        |
| <b>Totals</b>                               | <b>328.5</b>  | <b>0.0</b> | <b>6</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>0</b>            | <b>12</b>         | <b>2</b>        | <b>2</b>   | <b>1</b>   | <b>12</b> | <b>8</b>      | <b>3</b>       | <b>1</b>               | <b>1</b> |
| <b>TOTALS</b>                               | <b>551.91</b> | <b>0.0</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>3</b>  | <b>0</b>            | <b>30</b>         | <b>12</b>       | <b>8</b>   | <b>2</b>   | <b>13</b> | <b>17</b>     | <b>15</b>      | <b>2</b>               | <b>3</b> |
| <b>Total Acres/1,000 population</b>         | <b>11.45</b>  |            |           |           |                     |                   |                 |            |            |           |               |                |                        |          |

\* not included in acreage total

Source: McLean County Regional Planning Commission, Town of Normal Parks and Recreation Department





**Appendix B**  
**DATA SUPPLEMENT FOR CHAPTER 4**



**TABLE B.1**  
**Projected Change in Labor Force Status, 2000-2025**  
**Town of Normal**

|                                      | 2000   | 2010   | 2020   | 2025   |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| <b>Total Persons Age 16 and Over</b> | 38,339 | 43,643 | 48,946 | 51,068 |
| <b>Total in Labor Force</b>          | 26,943 | 30,681 | 34,409 | 35,900 |
| <b>Percent in labor force</b>        | 70.3%  | 70.3%  | 70.3%  | 70.3%  |
| <b>Armed Forces</b>                  | 60     | 75     | 94     | 94     |
| <b>Civilian Labor Force</b>          | 26,883 | 30,606 | 34,315 | 35,806 |
| <b>employed</b>                      | 25,973 | 29,565 | 33,148 | 34,589 |
| <b>unemployed</b>                    | 910    | 1,041  | 1,167  | 1,217  |
| <b>percent unemployed</b>            | 3.4%   | 3.4%   | 3.4%   | 3.4%   |
| <b>Not in Labor Force</b>            | 11,396 | 12,962 | 14,537 | 15,168 |

Source: U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, 2004; Census 2000, SF3 Table P43. Sex by Employment Status for the Population 16 Years and Over; MCRPC

**Table B.2**  
**Industry of Employed Persons, 1980-2000**  
**Town of Normal**

| Industry   | 1980          |      | 1990          |      | 2000          |      | 1980<br>Total |
|--|---------------|------|---------------|------|---------------|------|---------------|
|  | Total         | %    | Total         | %    | Total         | %    |               |
| Professional and Related Services                | 6,313         | 37.3 | 7,074         | 33.3 | 7,810         | 32.8 |               |
| Retail Trade                                     | 3,739         | 22.1 | 5,083         | 23.9 | 3,195         | 13.4 |               |
| Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate              | 2,244         | 13.2 | 2,767         | 13.0 | 3,898         | 16.4 |               |
| Manufacturing                                    | 1,159         | 6.8  | 1,630         | 7.7  | 1,461         | 6.1  |               |
| Personal, Entertainment, and Recreation Services | 548           | 3.2  | 958           | 4.5  | 3,301         | 13.9 |               |
| Business and Repair Services                     | 522           | 3.1  | 698           | 3.3  | 962           | 4.0  |               |
| Public Administration                            | 382           | 2.3  | 630           | 3.0  | 665           | 2.8  |               |
| Construction                                     | 450           | 2.7  | 577           | 2.7  | 690           | 2.9  |               |
| Wholesale Trade                                  | 519           | 3.1  | 539           | 2.5  | 453           | 1.9  |               |
| Communications and Other Public Utilities        | 448           | 2.6  | 536           | 2.5  | 815           | 3.4  |               |
| Transportation                                   | 301           | 1.8  | 468           | 2.2  | 477           | 2.0  |               |
| Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, and Mining     | 317           | 1.9  | 302           | 1.4  | 76            | 0.3  |               |
| <b>Total</b>                                     | <b>16,942</b> |      | <b>21,262</b> |      | <b>23,803</b> |      |               |

Source: 1980, 1990 Census; Census 2000, Table P49, Sex by Industry for the Employed Civilian Population 16 Years and Over

**Table B.3**  
**Change in Age and Gender Composition 2000 - 2025**  
**Town of Normal**

| FEMALE | Year  | 0 to 4 | 5 to 9 | 10 to 14 | 15 to 19 | 20 to 24 | 25 to 29 | 30 to 34 | 35 to 39 | 40 to 44 | 45 to 49 | 50 to 54 | 55 to 59 | 60 to 64 | 65 to 69 | 70 to 74 | 75 to 79 | 80-84 | 85+    | Total  |
|--------|-------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|--------|--------|
| by age | 2000  | 1,111  | 1,091  | 1,050    | 3,781    | 6,315    | 1,504    | 1,212    | 1,320    | 1,270    | 1,138    | 932      | 700      | 502      | 498      | 512      | 442      | 324   | 368    | 24,070 |
|        | 2005  | 1,005  | 1,171  | 1,148    | 3,620    | 8,053    | 1,470    | 1,109    | 1,143    | 1,337    | 1,296    | 1,155    | 948      | 721      | 574      | 495      | 499      | 400   | 406    | 26,551 |
|        | 2010  | 1,050  | 1,035  | 1,186    | 3,936    | 8,228    | 1,652    | 1,120    | 1,222    | 1,250    | 1,451    | 1,376    | 1,194    | 997      | 795      | 558      | 469      | 456   | 468    | 28,442 |
|        | 2015  | 1,102  | 1,077  | 1,074    | 3,952    | 8,928    | 1,659    | 1,193    | 1,291    | 1,300    | 1,249    | 1,418    | 1,338    | 1,138    | 988      | 717      | 519      | 431   | 555    | 29,930 |
|        | 2020  | 1,162  | 1,115  | 1,096    | 3,962    | 9,350    | 1,715    | 1,321    | 1,337    | 1,333    | 1,293    | 1,249    | 1,389    | 1,291    | 1,136    | 940      | 653      | 471   | 602    | 31,413 |
|        | 2025  | 1,240  | 1,173  | 1,131    | 3,873    | 9,614    | 1,876    | 1,423    | 1,480    | 1,380    | 1,317    | 1,295    | 1,251    | 1,443    | 1,374    | 1,098    | 870      | 576   | 668    | 33,082 |
| MALE   | Year  | 0 to 4 | 5 to 9 | 10 to 14 | 15 to 19 | 20 to 24 | 25 to 29 | 30 to 34 | 35 to 39 | 40 to 44 | 45 to 49 | 50 to 54 | 55 to 59 | 60 to 64 | 65 to 69 | 70 to 74 | 75 to 79 | 80-84 | 85+    | Total  |
|        | 2000  | 1,130  | 1,164  | 1,096    | 2,642    | 5,847    | 1,663    | 1,184    | 1,225    | 1,093    | 1,024    | 860      | 598      | 477      | 382      | 366      | 287      | 174   | 104    | 21,316 |
|        | 2005  | 1,023  | 1,295  | 1,192    | 2,286    | 8,620    | 795      | 1,169    | 1,075    | 1,243    | 1,115    | 1,045    | 854      | 601      | 507      | 370      | 343      | 214   | 141    | 23,887 |
|        | 2010  | 1,069  | 1,146  | 1,268    | 2,473    | 8,795    | 820      | 760      | 1,247    | 1,177    | 1,393    | 1,179    | 1,073    | 885      | 673      | 484      | 353      | 249   | 184    | 25,228 |
|        | 2015  | 1,122  | 1,179  | 1,135    | 2,518    | 9,541    | 811      | 752      | 1,033    | 1,324    | 1,172    | 1,361    | 1,123    | 999      | 873      | 604      | 445      | 257   | 221    | 26,470 |
|        | 2020  | 1,183  | 1,247  | 1,176    | 2,475    | 10,005   | 890      | 908      | 1,031    | 1,146    | 1,316    | 1,180    | 1,308    | 1,074    | 1,005    | 813      | 545      | 322   | 248    | 27,871 |
| 2025   | 1,263 | 1,313  | 1,234  | 2,456    | 10,273   | 936      | 998      | 1,169    | 1,132    | 1,152    | 1,317    | 1,160    | 1,351    | 1,121    | 939      | 721      | 390      | 293   | 29,218 |        |
| ALL    | Year  | 0 to 4 | 5 to 9 | 10 to 14 | 15 to 19 | 20 to 24 | 25 to 29 | 30 to 34 | 35 to 39 | 40 to 44 | 45 to 49 | 50 to 54 | 55 to 59 | 60 to 64 | 65 to 69 | 70 to 74 | 75 to 79 | 80-84 | 85+    | Total  |
|        | 2000  | 2,241  | 2,255  | 2,146    | 6,423    | 12,162   | 3,167    | 2,396    | 2,545    | 2,363    | 2,162    | 1,792    | 1,298    | 979      | 880      | 878      | 729      | 498   | 472    | 45,386 |
|        | 2005  | 2,028  | 2,466  | 2,340    | 5,906    | 16,673   | 2,265    | 2,278    | 2,219    | 2,580    | 2,410    | 2,200    | 1,802    | 1,322    | 1,081    | 865      | 843      | 613   | 547    | 50,438 |
|        | 2010  | 2,119  | 2,181  | 2,454    | 6,408    | 17,023   | 2,472    | 1,880    | 2,469    | 2,427    | 2,844    | 2,554    | 2,267    | 1,882    | 1,468    | 1,043    | 822      | 705   | 652    | 53,670 |
|        | 2015  | 2,223  | 2,256  | 2,209    | 6,470    | 18,469   | 2,470    | 1,945    | 2,324    | 2,624    | 2,421    | 2,779    | 2,461    | 2,137    | 1,861    | 1,321    | 964      | 688   | 776    | 56,400 |
|        | 2020  | 2,344  | 2,362  | 2,272    | 6,437    | 19,355   | 2,605    | 2,229    | 2,369    | 2,479    | 2,609    | 2,429    | 2,696    | 2,364    | 2,142    | 1,752    | 1,197    | 792   | 850    | 59,285 |
| 2025   | 2,503 | 2,486  | 2,365  | 6,329    | 19,887   | 2,811    | 2,422    | 2,649    | 2,512    | 2,469    | 2,613    | 2,411    | 2,794    | 2,495    | 2,037    | 1,591    | 966      | 961   | 62,300 |        |

Source: McLean County Regional Planning Commission

**Table B.4  
Projected Population by Housing Type and Year, 2000-2025  
Town of Normal**

|   | 2000   |        | 2005   |        | 2010   |        | 2015   |        | 2020   |        | 2025   |        |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|   | #      | %      | #      | %      | #      | %      | #      | %      | #      | %      | #      | %      |
| <b>Population</b>                                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Total   | 45,386 | 100%   | 50,438 | 100%   | 53,670 | 100%   | 56,400 | 100%   | 59,285 | 100%   | 62,300 | 100%   |
| Persons 65 or older                               | 3,457  | 7.62%  | 3,949  | 7.83%  | 4,690  | 8.74%  | 5,611  | 9.95%  | 6,733  | 11.36% | 8,050  | 12.92% |
| <b>In Housing</b>                                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|   | 36,802 | 81.09% | 41,470 | 82.22% | 44,613 | 83.12% | 47,242 | 83.76% | 50,009 | 84.35% | 52,889 | 84.89% |
| <i>Owner units</i>                                | 21,491 | 58.40% | 24,675 | 59.50% | 26,991 | 60.50% | 29,054 | 61.50% | 31,256 | 62.50% | 33,584 | 63.50% |
| <i>Renter units</i>                               | 15,311 | 41.60% | 16,796 | 40.50% | 17,622 | 39.50% | 18,188 | 38.50% | 18,753 | 37.50% | 19,304 | 36.50% |
| <b>In Group Quarters</b>                          |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Total   | 8,584  | 18.91% | 8,968  | 17.78% | 9,057  | 16.88% | 9,158  | 16.24% | 9,276  | 15.65% | 9,411  | 15.11% |
| <i>Non-institutional</i>                          |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| College housing <sup>1</sup>                      | 8,126  | 17.90% | 8,200  | 16.26% | 8,200  | 15.28% | 8,200  | 14.54% | 8,200  | 13.83% | 8,200  | 13.16% |
| Other non-institutional                           | 35     | 0.08%  | 244    | 0.48%  | 260    | 0.48%  | 273    | 0.48%  | 287    | 0.48%  | 302    | 0.48%  |
| <i>Institutional</i>                              |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Nursing homes (persons 65 and older) <sup>2</sup> | 287    | 0.63%  | 328    | 0.65%  | 389    | 0.73%  | 466    | 0.83%  | 559    | 0.94%  | 668    | 1.07%  |
| Other   | 68     | 0.15%  | 195    | 0.39%  | 208    | 0.39%  | 218    | 0.39%  | 230    | 0.39%  | 241    | 0.39%  |

<sup>1</sup> Assumes constant college enrollment over period, thus no change in college housing residents

<sup>2</sup> As percentage of total population; assumes 2000 data as constant rate (8.3%) of nursing home occupancy among persons 65 and older

Source: Census 2000; Special Census 2005; McLean County Regional Planning Commission

**Table B.5  
Projected Housing Units and Occupancy Characteristics  
Town of Normal**

|                  | 2000   | 2005   | 2010   | 2015   | 2020   | 2025   |  |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--|
| Total Units      | 15,683 | 17,964 | 19,324 | 20,463 | 21,660 | 22,907 |  |
| Vacancy Rate (%) | 3.47   | 3.5    | 3.6    | 3.7    | 3.8    | 3.9    |  |
| Occupied Units   | 15,157 | 17,335 | 18,628 | 19,706 | 20,837 | 22,014 |  |
| Population/Unit  | 2.43   | 2.39   | 2.39   | 2.40   | 2.40   | 2.40   |  |
| Owner            | 8,364  | 9,870  | 10,796 | 11,622 | 12,502 | 13,434 |  |
| Population/Units | 2.57   | 2.5    | 2.5    | 2.5    | 2.5    | 2.5    |  |
| Renter           | 6,793  | 7,465  | 7,832  | 8,084  | 8,335  | 8,580  |  |
| Population/Units | 2.25   | 2.25   | 2.25   | 2.25   | 2.25   | 2.25   |  |

Source: McLean County Regional Planning Commission; 2000 Census SF1 Table H3 Occupancy Status; Table H4 Tenure, Table H10 Total Population in Occupied Housing Units; Table H11 Total Population in Occupied Housing Units by Tenure

**Table B.6  
Projected Change in Urban Land Area 2003-2025  
Town of Normal**

| Land Use                   | 2003  |                           |                       | 2025             |             |                              |                       |
|----------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
|                            | Acres | Percent of Developed Area | Acres per 100 Persons | Additional Acres | Total Acres | Percentage of Developed Area | Acres Per 100 Persons |
| Residential                | 2,725 | 28.4                      | 5.8                   | 2,488            | 5,213       | 35.3                         | 8.4                   |
| 1-6 Units                  | 2,281 | 23.8                      | 4.9                   | 2,462            | 4,743       | 32.1                         | 7.6                   |
| 6+ Units                   | 444   | 4.6                       | 0.9                   | 26               | 470         | 3.2                          | 0.8                   |
| Commercial                 | 1,200 | 12.5                      | 2.5                   | 200              | 1,400       | 9.5                          | 2.2                   |
| Industrial                 | 667   | 4.0                       | 1.4                   | 891              | 1,558       | 10.5                         | 2.5                   |
| Public and Semi Public     | 3,069 | 32.0                      | 6.5                   | 714              | 3,783       | 25.6                         | 6.1                   |
| Streets, Alleys & Roadways | 1,932 | 20.1                      | 4.1                   | 900              | 2,832       | 19.2                         | 4.5                   |
| Total Developed Area       | 9,593 | 100.0                     | 20.4                  | 5,193            | 14,786      | 100.0                        | 23.7                  |

Source: Appendix A, Table A.8; Chapter 2, Map 2.4, Map 5.1



**Appendix C**  
**GENERAL PLANNING AND DESIGN PRINCIPLES**





Planning and design principles provide general parameters for evaluating existing development characteristics and systems, and for assessing the demands of future growth. Planning and design principles also establish parameters for sizing and locating future land uses, streets and community facilities. Commonly accepted planning and design principles for each of these basic components of the comprehensive plan are summarized in this appendix, beginning with the land use component.

## **LAND USE**

Land use planning and design principles address general development characteristics as well as features pertaining to specific land use types. These land use types include residential, commercial, industrial, and public and semi-public uses.

### **General Development Principles**

The character and efficiency of urban development is determined to a large degree by at least three basic principles of design as described below.

#### *Human Scale Development*

First, communities should be designed on a human scale using neighborhood units as the basic building blocks. Ideally, each neighborhood would be self-sufficient by offering residents a variety of housing types and costs, as well as providing commerce, employment opportunities and civic services. The land use pattern should be balanced around a series of community and neighborhood activity centers in order to promote convenience and accessibility, and to enhance the sense of community.

#### *Compact and Contiguous Development*

Secondly, urban development should

be compact and contiguous. This allows for orderly growth that can be most efficiently and economically provided with services. Scattered, or leap-frog, development can be difficult and often impractical to provide with services. It frequently consumes immeasurably large amounts of often prime farmland and it increases dependence on the automobile, which detracts from the human scale and pedestrian accessibility.

#### *Compatibility of Uses*

Thirdly, the mixing of incompatible uses should be avoided. The separation or screening of incompatible uses serves to protect the character of residential, commercial and industrial areas. It also decreases traffic hazards while conserving the taxable value of land and structures. However, it should be noted that different uses are not necessarily incompatible. Within downtown and neighborhood shopping districts, mixed uses can add to the vibrance and economic vitality of these areas. The mixing of uses becomes incompatible when major conflicts occur or can be expected in the future.

### **Residential Areas**

A community's residential areas should provide a wide variety of housing types to serve all residents in a manner conducive to a safe and high quality of life. This requires that residential areas be screened from incompatible uses and developed in an assorted range of densities. Desirable characteristics of various density ranges are described below.

#### *Low Density*

Low density areas generally contain from one to five dwelling units per acre and should normally comprise the greatest proportion of residential land. These areas consist primarily of single-family houses on relatively

large lots. However, in some instances low density areas may include a limited number of areas appropriate for more intensive uses, such as duplexes, apartments or cluster developments. Ideally, low density residential areas should be located on the fringe areas of the community or neighborhood, away from major thoroughfares and activity centers.

### *Medium Density*

Medium density residential areas generally contain an average of from six to twelve dwelling units per acre. These areas may exhibit a somewhat wider variety of housing types, such as duplexes, townhouses, condominiums and apartments, although single-family units on smaller lots are more typical. Medium density areas may be effectively accommodated through planned unit or neo-traditional developments. Medium density residential areas should generally be designed to serve as transitions between low density residential areas and areas of higher intensity development.

### *High Density*

High density residential areas usually contain an average of twelve or more dwelling units per acre. These areas consist primarily of apartment complexes, high rise apartment buildings and similar multiple-family units. University dormitories and senior citizen retirement facilities are also examples of high density residential areas. High density areas should be located in or adjacent to activity centers to support those activities, reduce travel distances, and buffer surrounding areas of less intensive use. These areas should also be located near traffic arteries and transit routes where available.

## **Commercial Areas**

Design criteria for four types of com-

mercial areas are presented below. These are the downtown or central business district (CBD), the neighborhood shopping area, the outlying or regional commercial district, and the highway commercial area. Many of the characteristics of downtowns and neighborhood commercial areas are the same, and differ only in scale and location within the community. Close similarities also exist between the regional or outlying and highway commercial areas. For planning purposes, the downtowns and neighborhood commercial areas are sometimes grouped together, as are regional/outlying and highway commercial areas.

### *Central Business District (Downtown)*

From a design perspective a community's central business district should contain the major shopping facilities and professional services of the community. It should also contain a concentration of municipal and other government services. The downtown should also be centrally located and serve the entire community.

However, competition from outlying shopping centers has lessened the commercial significance of downtowns. This has led to many, if not most, downtowns functioning like neighborhood shopping districts. Nevertheless, the central business district should be viewed as the focal point of the community, serving as a center of government and providing important professional and commercial services as well as mixed uses with apartments located above businesses. As noted previously, downtowns should differ from neighborhood commercial areas only in scale and location.

### *Neighborhood Commercial Areas*

The neighborhood commercial area should serve as the focal point of the neighborhood and provide items such as groceries, drugs and similar convenience items and serv-

ices to nearby residential areas. Anton Nelessen, author of *Visions for a New American Dream*, notes that a neighborhood commercial area should provide retail space and jobs for nearby residential areas at a rate from .5 to 1 job per housing unit and 25 to 56 square feet of retail space per housing unit. Neighborhood commercial areas should also provide for limited amounts of public services, such as a branch library or community center, and multiple and mixed uses, such as offices and apartments above retail space.

The shopping facilities of neighborhood commercial areas should be grouped together at major street intersections and spaced approximately one mile apart to encourage pedestrian access and interfere as little as possible with adjacent residential areas. Neighborhood commercial centers should be designed to accommodate both automobile and pedestrian traffic as distinguished from strip malls which cater almost exclusively to automobile traffic. The design of a neighborhood commercial area should incorporate the practice of locating buildings near sidewalks to promote pedestrian access, with parking provided in the rear in order to accommodate automobile traffic.

#### *Outlying Shopping Districts*

The outlying or regional shopping center provides major commercial facilities often much greater than those of the downtown. It usually has the advantages of less traffic congestion, more parking space and more space for expansion. Outlying shopping centers, however, often lack the full range of professional and public services offered by the central business district. Moreover, they seldom have a central location or offer pedestrian accessibility. Outlying shopping districts can also create traffic hazards if not provided with appropriate frontage roads. These districts should as much as possible be designed to complement the downtown. Ideally, they should offer added shopping variety by providing residents with an alternative to, rather

than a replacement for, the CBD.

#### *Highway Commercial Areas*

The highway commercial area is designed to serve automobile oriented needs and may include such establishments as motels, restaurants and gasoline filling stations. High intensity uses such as these should be grouped together near the intersections of major roadways. Highway commercial uses often complement the outlying shopping district and may be advantageously developed in combination. On some roadways, certain highway commercial uses of low intensity, such as real estate or insurance offices, may be appropriately situated between intersections without creating conflicts or traffic hazards.

#### **Industrial Areas**

The plan for industrial development addresses both light and heavy industry. The design criteria for these uses are presented below.

Industrial sites should be adequate in area, supplemented by pleasant surroundings, separated or screened from incompatible uses and grouped together near adequate transportation networks to ensure the efficient movement of people, goods and services. Although pollutants such as noise and smoke are less problematic today than in the past, large traffic volumes, particularly truck traffic, often create conflicts with other uses. This is especially true for heavy industrial uses, which include manufacturing, construction, refining and transportation uses, such as trucking and railroads.

Perimeter locations are often desirable for both light and heavy industrial uses due to less traffic congestion, greater highway accessibility and greater availability of land. However, light industrial uses such as office, research and warehousing may complement and be effectively integrated into commercial nodes, which are often closer to people and

services.

### **Public and Semi-Public Areas**

Public and semi-public areas consist of land used to serve all or significant portions of the community's residents. Public lands may include government buildings and lands owned by the federal and state governments as well as counties, townships, municipalities, special districts, airports and churches. These lands may also include recreation areas for parks, playgrounds and open space. Public lands generally do not produce tax revenue for municipalities.

Semi-public areas include the properties of organizations which are generally privately owned and serve a defined segment of the population. VFW Halls and Lions Clubs are examples. Semi-public lands normally produce tax revenues for municipalities.

Some public and semi-public uses should be grouped together to form nodes of community activity. These nodes should be developed in conjunction with downtown and neighborhood commercial districts to increase activity levels and thus provide additional support for local businesses. These public and semi-public areas should, therefore, be developed according to the same general criteria as downtown and neighborhood commercial districts, giving equal emphasis to automobile, bicycle and pedestrian access. These areas should be located near the intersection of major streets and spaced approximately one mile apart. The viability of the activity centers is further enhanced when connected by greenways and trails.

Certain other types of public and semi-public uses have unique characteristics which require special design considerations. These uses include cemeteries and various recreational uses such as golf courses, parks and trails. Other major public and semi-public uses such as those noted should each be evaluated on an individual basis to determine locational suitability with regard to site characteristics and compatibility with nearby uses.

## **TRANSPORTATION**

The transportation system is a major factor affecting the growth and development of a community. Since residents depend upon the community's transportation network for the movement of vehicles, goods and people, an efficient transportation system consisting of various modes can positively influence the quality and direction of development. Therefore, the transportation plan and its policies should complement and reinforce the community's land use plan, and should be based on accepted design principles. These principles are summarized on the following pages for the street system and bicycle transportation.

### **The Street System**

A community's street system should provide for the safe and efficient movement of traffic and be developed to support the community's land use plan. The system should provide for cost effective, efficient, and safe movement throughout the community, and should provide convenient access to and from the community. The transportation network should also consider regional needs, including access to Bloomington and the state and interstate highway system.

The traffic circulation system should be designed as a continuous network of arterials, collectors, and local streets. Each of these street classifications has different characteristics, functions and requirements.

#### *Arterials*

Arterials are intended to provide for the movement of relatively large volumes of traffic across the community and region. Arterial streets can be classified into three categories: (1) interstate highways, (2) principal arterials, and (3) minor arterials. The interstate highway usually carries the largest volumes for the greatest distances. Principal arte-

**Exhibit C.1**  
**DESIGN CRITERIA FOR PRINCIPAL ARTERIALS**  
**(Interstates, Expressways, and Other Principal Arterials)**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>Service</b>    | Principal arterials should provide for a high degree of continuity for travel through or around the urban area.  |
| <b>Connection</b> | Principal arterials should connect to other similar facilities.  |
| <b>Form</b>       | Principal arterials should have a total of at least four lanes with opposing traffic divided by a median.  |
| <b>Frequency</b>  | Spacing of principal arterials should relate to the need to connect major destinations.  |
| <b>Access</b>     | Properties abutting the principal arterial should not have access onto those facilities.   |
| <b>Land Use</b>   | Residential land uses adjoining a principal arterial should be protected from the negative effects of traffic by deep setbacks and landscaping techniques including the use of tree screens and earthen berms. |

**Exhibit C.2**  
**DESIGN CRITERIA FOR MINOR ARTERIALS**  
**(Major Streets)**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>Service</b>    | Minor arterials should provide continuous travel through the urban area.   |
| <b>Connection</b> | Minor arterials should provide connection to areas of high activity and can connect the County Highway System to the Urban Street System.  |
| <b>Form</b>       | Minor arterials should be a total of four lanes wide with opposing traffic separated by a median or two lanes wide with a third lane for turning movements.  |
| <b>Frequency</b>  | Minor arterials should occur at a frequency of no more than one mile intervals throughout the urban area.  |
| <b>Access</b>     | Access to minor arterials from abutting property should be limited to public roads and larger developments.  |
| <b>Land Use</b>   | Residential land uses adjoining a minor arterial should be protected from the negative effects of traffic by deep setbacks and landscaping techniques including the use of tree screens and earthen berms. |

**Exhibit C.3**  
**DESIGN CRITERIA FOR COLLECTOR STREETS**  
**(Collector Streets)**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>Service</b>    | Urban collectors provide access by linking local streets to minor arterials. Urban collectors should not provide a high degree of continuity for travel or serve as alternatives to minor arterials. |
| <b>Connection</b> | Urban collectors should collect traffic from local streets and distribute it to the minor arterials.   |
| <b>Form</b>       | Urban collectors should be from two to four lanes wide and should not be over two miles in length.   |
| <b>Frequency</b>  | Urban collectors should occur throughout the urban area.   |
| <b>Access</b>     | Abutting properties should have access onto urban collectors.  |
| <b>Land Use</b>   | When urban collectors only provide connection between local streets and minor arterials no special land use considerations are needed.   |

**Exhibit C.4**  
**DESIGN CRITERIA FOR LOCAL STREETS**  
**(Minor Residential Streets)**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>Service</b>    | Local streets should provide for travel from individual properties to urban collectors. |
| <b>Connection</b> | Local streets should connect local traffic to urban collectors.                         |
| <b>Form</b>       | Local streets should be not more than two lanes wide.                                   |
| <b>Frequency</b>  | Local streets should occur throughout the urban area.                                   |
| <b>Access</b>     | Properties are allowed direct access on to the local street.                            |
| <b>Land Use</b>   | Local streets typically require no special land use considerations.                     |

rials carry large volumes of traffic across and between communities within the region. Minor arterials are streets whose primary function is carrying traffic between major destinations within the community. Design criteria for arterial streets are summarized in Exhibits C.1 and C.2.

### *Collectors*

Collectors comprise the balance of the main interior streets. These streets provide traffic movements between arterial and local streets. Design criteria for collector streets are presented in Exhibit C.3.

### *Local Streets*

Local streets serve to collect and distribute traffic between parcels of land and the collector or arterial street system. Exhibit C.4 provides further details on characteristics of local streets.

## **Bicycle Transportation**

Bicycle transportation is an important component of the Transportation Plan. A well planned network of bicycle transportation facilities that connect major origins and destinations can serve as a practical alternative mode of transportation. Such a network can result in reduced congestion on area roads, reduced energy consumption and cleaner air. Thus proper attention should be given to planning for bicycle transportation. In providing or improving facilities for bicycling, three types of cyclists should be considered.

The first is the advanced bicyclists. Advanced bicyclists are experienced riders who are confident and comfortable in operating under most traffic conditions. These bicyclists are typically recognized as being the most frequent users of collector and arterial streets in order to serve both utilitarian and recreational trips. Trips to work can average

between four and six miles while recreational trips can be considerably longer ranging from a couple of miles to over twenty-five miles.

Advanced cyclists require direct access to facilities and destinations with preferred routes utilizing the existing street system.

Furthermore, these cyclists desire the opportunity to operate at maximum speeds with minimal delays. Frequently, these cyclists will avoid trail routes to avoid other less skilled non-motorized traffic in order to maintain speed. In addition, sufficient road width is desired by advanced cyclists to decrease the need for changing position in order to allow motorized traffic to pass.

The second is the casual basic cyclist. Basic bicyclists are adults and teenagers that are less comfortable and capable of integrating well within high traffic volume situations.

This group of riders are casual users that need special provisions to safely use arterial streets. Recreational trips are the primary basis for most bicycle use by these users. For these reasons, these cyclists are often drawn towards off road trails. Some basic bicyclists will progress to the advanced level, but large numbers of basic cyclists will always be present. Basic bicyclists desire comfortable access to destinations either through use of low volume streets or by designated bicycle facilities. Direct access to destinations is still preferred, but typically is not as important as comfort and safety concerns. A well defined separation between motor vehicles and cyclists is a requirement of these users.

The third is the child cyclist. The child cyclist is a pre-teen rider whose trips are generally short and at low speeds. Initially monitored by parents, child cyclists are frequent users of local streets and bicycle trails. With improving skill, many child cyclists are granted independent use of collector streets and bicycle trails. This group of users tends to make trips between neighborhoods for both transportation and recreational purposes. Child cyclists and their guardians both prefer that these users have access to important facilities surrounding residential areas such as schools, parks and recreation facilities, shopping, and

other neighborhoods. Low volumes, low speeds, and clear separation from motorized traffic are all requirements for the child cyclists to minimize safety concerns.

It is important to recognize that all three groups of cyclists will utilize a combination of the street network and the bicycle trail system, and that all three groups will use the bicycle as a means of transportation between destinations. Where possible, design of the street network and the system of bicycle routes, whether on-road or off-road, should consider the needs of all cyclists and should consider connections to popular destinations.

The design, construction, operation and maintenance of bicycle transportation facilities should be done in accordance with generally accepted standards, such as the *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities* published by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the standards adopted by the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT).

## COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Community facilities are an important component of a Town's infrastructure. Facilities such as public buildings, parks, schools, water and sewer systems, utilities and other essential facilities support the community in many ways. These facilities are responsible for the image the community portrays and how well the community will attract and guide future growth. Community facilities should be consistent with the land use and transportation plans as well as reflect the overall goals and objectives of the community. Community facility improvements often require considerable capital expenditures and therefore should be planned well in advance.

Facilities addressed herein are public buildings, parks and recreation, schools, water and sewer systems and stormwater management. General design principles and criteria for each type of facility are presented on the following pages.

## Public Buildings

Public buildings may include but are not limited to the Town Hall, police station, fire stations, library, public works facility and post office.

Public buildings generally serve all or major portions of the Town with essential services. Therefore, these structures should be situated in areas easily accessible and preferably near the centers of the respective service areas. As a result, these facilities should be located near the center of the town or neighborhood in a location of dense population that is conducive to pedestrian use. Since the construction of public buildings requires considerable public expenditures, such structures should be situated and designed in a manner that allows for future expansion. It is also desirable to group certain public buildings together to form or enhance activity nodes which can provide convenience and promote a sense of community.

Although a central location is usually advantageous, there are three major factors in determining fire protection needs. These are population density, travel time, and type and intensity of development. Criteria frequently used in determining fire protection requirements are summarized in Table C.1 and as follows: one engine company should be located within 3/4 to 1 mile of a high-value district, one within 1-1/2 to 2 miles of a densely developed residential district, and one within 3 to 4 miles of a sparsely developed residential district.

## Parks and Recreation

Parks and recreation facilities are an important measure of the local quality of life. Besides providing areas for outdoor recreation, parks can be used to help preserve a community's scenic and historic character. Parks also allow land that may not be suitable for certain types of development to be protected from harmful uses. Thus, the provision of adequate parkland should be of major concern

**TABLE C.1**  
Design Guidelines for Determining Fire Protection Requirements

| Type of District               | Maximum Distance from Engine Company |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| High value                     | ¾ - 1 mile                           |
| Densely developed residential  | 1½ - 2 miles                         |
| Sparsely developed residential | 3 - 4 miles                          |

Source: Joseph de Chiara, Urban Planning and Design Criteria, 1982

to a community.

According to the National Recreation and Park Association, a community should have a total of at least 15 acres of local parkland per 1,000 persons and 10 acres of regional parkland per 1,000 persons. It also recommends that a minimum of 25 percent of new towns, planned unit developments and large subdivisions be devoted to park and recreation

land and open space. Ideally, a community's recreation land should consist of at least one community park, and a combination of smaller neighborhood parks, playgrounds and mini-parks supplemented by a system of green belts and open space.

Service areas and site requirements for selected park classifications are summarized in Table C.2. The community park should pro-

**TABLE C.2**  
Parkland Acreage Standards

| Type of Recreation Area    | Minimum Desired Acres/1,000 Residents | Desirable Size in Acres | Population Served                            | Service Area                              |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| Mini-Parks/ Totlots        | 0.5                                   | 1 or less               | 500 - 3,000                                  | Sub-neighborhood (less than ¼ mi. radius) |
| Neighborhood               | 2.0                                   | 15+                     | Up to 5,000                                  | ¼ to ½ mile radius                        |
| Community                  | 8.0                                   | 25+                     | 5,000 - 15,000                               | Several neighborhoods 1 to 2 mile radius  |
| Regional/ Forest Preserves | 10.0                                  | 200+                    | Several communities within 1 hour drive time |   |
| Total                      | 20.0                                  | N/A                     | N/A  | N/A                                       |

Source: "Recreation, Park and Open Space Standards and Guidelines," National Recreation and Park Association, 1983.



vide the major recreation facilities to serve the entire community and should be easily accessible to all residents. Neighborhood parks serve individual neighborhoods and offer a more limited variety of facilities than community parks. Greenways and certain park facilities may sometimes be developed in areas such as floodplains, steep slopes or other areas poorly suited for other urban uses. However, some facilities, such as baseball diamonds, require well drained and nearly level terrain.

### **Schools**

The availability of quality educational facilities and programs is vital for the continued growth and prosperity of a community. The opportunity for a quality education is viewed as an essential element in the selection of a community or neighborhood in which to live. Although the primary function of a school is an educational facility, it also serves a secondary role as a common neighborhood activity center by providing a variety of meeting and recreational facilities as well as activities and events. Therefore, quality schools are an essential component of community facilities.

Schools should be designed according to certain basic criteria that reflect local needs and conditions. A desirable location for a school is as close to the center of its service area as possible. Schools that are developed adjacent to a neighborhood park or playground can function together as a neighborhood center. For safety reasons, elementary schools should to the extent possible be located away from major streets.

Criteria for the planning and design of schools may be on the verge of change, and should therefore, be closely monitored and evaluated in the selection and design of school sites. In the recent past, emphasis has been placed on developing new schools in suburban locations with large acreage requirements to accommodate large enrollments and extensive busing requirements to transport students for long distances. For social and health reasons,

leading authorities are now questioning these practices and placing greater emphasis on neighborhood schools that allow more students to walk and bicycle to school. Neighborhood schools are especially advantageous to the community when developed in conjunction with neighborhood parks and trails and/or commercial and public use centers.

### **Stormwater Management**

There are several factors considered in designing a stormwater management system. Such factors include the watershed and the timing of development to preserve potential detention/retention sites and discharge. A third is to recognize those areas that cannot support development which should be preserved for open space use. Width requirements of a floodway and a floodplain along the main channel and each tributary channel should be identified and preserved as development occurs. The effects of a certain type of development at a particular location in the watershed area down stream must also be considered. Since local watershed and political boundaries are not the same, this often requires cooperation between various units of government, such as municipalities, counties and drainage districts. Master drainage plans for each watershed should be coordinated with land use, transportation and recreation plans. The Town recently adopted a stormwater management plan that addresses structural and non-structural, more natural approaches as well as regulatory measures for local stormwater management.

The design of detention ponds and basins requires special attention to a number of factors. For safety reasons, careful planning and design as well as emergency spillways or bypasses are essential in preventing unwanted or unexpected overflows and failure of dams. Special precautions should be taken in design and construction to minimize shoreline erosion credited to ice, wind and wave action. Stipulations should be created for the design to control sediment accumulations and

water pollution in large ponds—especially where recreational uses are considered.