

CHAPTER 4

PARK AND OPEN SPACE STANDARDS

Parks and Open Space Planning

Since the formation of the Park District in 1948, the District has experienced minimal growth in population with little expansion of park land. However, within the past two years, a number of new developments are under construction or in the planning stages which will substantially increase the population and add new park land.

The development and expansion of a park system can take many forms. Park land can be obtained as pieces of land in developments, where the developer is required to donate a certain amount of land based on the size and/or number of homes. Quite often, these pieces of land are not highly suited to recrea-

tional facilities, and more often, they are small and in poor locations. Or, as in the case of the Village of Hampshire and the Park District, agencies can be assertive in the land they acquire or receive through contribution. They have accepted only land which is highly suited to recreation uses and large enough to be properly developed and located to serve the needs of the residents.

Numerous concepts for the development of park land and open space systems can be found throughout the region and the country. Many of these include the development of numerous neighborhood parks versus the development of one or two large community parks. Park systems can be developed solely on the basis of natural resource systems, or they can be dependent upon development patterns and densities. Whatever concept is chosen for the development of a park and open space system, it must be flexible and meet the specific needs of the community, including its financial resources.

Experience has shown that simply defining a park by its classification does not adequately relate a park to other open space requirements in a community park system. A procedure has to be established that can distinguish between recreation, conservation, and shaping functions of open space. The responsibilities for open space and park land also require understanding of community priorities. The role played by the Park District is fundamental to the development of the Village's *2000 Comprehensive Land Use Plan*.

PARK LAND/OPEN SPACE PURPOSE AND FUNCTIONS

The term open space, in its broadest sense, includes land to serve parks and recreation, conservation and protection, and community

shaping functions. Open space should never be considered synonymous with "vacant" or "unused" land since open space does not lay idle. Open space is also not synonymous with "parks and recreation areas." While vacant or undeveloped land has the potential for being classified as open, that should be done only after a conscious decision has been made to purchase or regulate these lands to perform open space functions.

Along with residential, agriculture, commercial, and industrial land uses, open space serves an important purpose in land classification and in planning for how land is to be used. Open space is classified according to its function or use. The three primary functions of open space are:

- **Recreation Function** ~ to provide recreation resources
- **Conservation and Protection Function** ~ to preserve natural resources
- **Shaping Function** ~ to structure the form of community development

RECREATION FUNCTION

Open space land used for recreation covers a multitude of facility types and activities, from neighborhood parks to the larger regional forest preserves and state parks.

Recreation open space may be used for either passive or active recreational activities and may be either publicly or privately owned. Each type of recreation area will be further classified to better define its purpose, objective, size, service area, population served, and location.

CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION FUNCTION

Conservation open space protects and maintains natural processes, and thereby, safeguards people from certain natural hazards by protecting unique or fragile areas.

Protection of open space elements are identified and defined by their physiographic, geologic, vegetative, hydrologic, or biologic characteristics. The designation of areas as conservation open space does not depend upon demand as in the case for the provision of most recreation open spaces, but rather upon their unsuitability for urban development or their uniqueness as natural resources.

Open space for conservation encompasses objectives such as: protecting water bodies and water courses, groundwater recharge areas, erodible slopes, forests, floodwater control and woodlands, soils having severe limitations for development, unique or endangered vegetation and wildlife habitats, and areas of unique historic and architectural merit. Protection, however, does not mean total prohibition of use. Such lands may be used for a variety of recreation activities, such as hiking, outdoor recreation, education, interpretation, etc., as long as that usage will not cause deterioration or interfere with the capacity to perform the protective function.

SHAPING FUNCTION

The use of open space areas to shape the pattern of suburban development is the open space function, which has been least recognized. It is based, however, on the following objectives:

- Open space can promote the formation of distinct cohesive neighborhoods, which

can be served effectively by municipal services and facilities, thus promoting suburban growth into efficient corridors of development and helping to prevent suburban sprawl.

- Open space can define the boundaries of neighborhoods, districts, or entire communities to maintain distinctive characteristics, thus giving a sense of community identity.
- Open space can provide relief from extensive suburbanization by preserving elements of the natural environment near developed areas, thus breaking visual monotony by its own contact with development.

The *Shaping Function* may not be a primary responsibility of the Park District, but it can be a primary responsibility of the Village in their land use Plan. However, the Park District needs to support this function and cooperate with the Village and regional planning agencies in its planning, classification, and establishment. All open space functions can and do overlap one another. The lands designated by this Plan as filling a *Recreation* or *Conservation/Protection* function may also be determined by community and regional planning agencies to have value as a shaping function.

Park and Open Space Classification

Prior to the development of this Plan, the Park District has been utilizing a classification system for the District's parks. The two classifications include Community Parks and Neighborhood Parks. This Plan formalizes a classification system for park and open space

that provides a guideline for the orderly and effective development of the District's existing parks and the establishment of future park needs. This system is based upon the existing park and open space lands, population served, future population growth, use of the park and open space lands, service area and distance, and size of the park. The classification system for park and open space land is listed in Table 4-1.

Park and Open Space Planning Guidelines

If recreation, park, and other public officials are to be responsive to the present and future needs of the community, they must be guided by standards that recognize resident needs as well as cultural, geographic, and economic differences in the community.

Within the field of parks and recreation management, standards have been developed to guide local governments in evaluating demand for park lands and facilities. In many cases, these standards are guidelines designed to provide a starting point in evaluating local facilities.

Standards must be flexible guides for planning, acquiring, and developing park and recreation areas. The standards recommended by this plan must be uniquely designed to accommodate the Hampshire Township Park District.

PARK CLASSIFICATION GUIDELINES

Based on the classification of parks in Table 4-1, the following is a description of planning criteria for each park classification.

Park Classification	Use
Special Use Park	Covers a broad range of parks and recreation facilities oriented toward single-purpose use; visual and aesthetic uses.
Mini Park	Used to address limited, isolated or unique recreational needs; specialized playground and aesthetic use.
Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood park remains the basic unit of the park system and serves as the recreational and social focus of the neighborhood. Focus is on active and passive recreation; active recreational fields and facilities, playgrounds.
School-Park	Depending on circumstances, combining parks with school sites can fulfill the space requirements for other classes of parks, such as neighborhood, community, sports complex, and special use.
Community Park	Serves broader purpose than neighborhood park. Focus is on meeting community-based recreational needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces. Active recreational fields, diverse facilities, specialized district wide uses and events, community center.
Conservancy Park	Lands set aside for protection and conservation of significant natural resources, remnant landscape, open space, and visual aesthetic/buffering.
Sports Complex	Consolidates heavily programmed athletic fields and associated facilities to larger and fewer sites strategically located throughout the community.
Greenways	Effectively tie park system components together to form a continuous park environment; provide recreational travel, hiking, bicycling.
Private Park/Recreation Facility	Parks and recreation facilities that are privately owned yet contribute to the public park and recreation system.

Source: 1996 National Recreation and Park Association Guidelines

Table 4-1: Park Classification System

Special Use Park:

The Special Use classification covers a broad range of parks and recreation facilities oriented toward single-purpose use. Special uses generally fall into three categories:

- Historic/Cultural/Social Site ~ unique local resources offering historical, educational, and cultural opportunities. Examples include historic downtown areas, performing arts parks, arboretums, ornamental gardens, performing arts facilities, indoor theaters, churches, public buildings, and amphitheaters.
- Recreation Facilities ~ specialized or single purpose facilities. Examples include community centers, senior centers, community theaters, hockey arenas, marinas, golf courses, and aquatic parks. Frequently, community buildings are located in neighborhood and community parks.
- Outdoor Recreation Facilities ~ Examples include tennis centers, softball complexes, and sports stadiums.

Location Criteria: Recreation need, community interests, the type of facility, and land availability are the primary factors influencing location. Special use facilities should be viewed as strategically located community-wide facilities rather than as serving well-defined neighborhoods or areas. The site should be easily accessible from arterial and collector streets, where feasible. It should also be accessible from the light traffic system, as well.

Size Criteria: Facility space requirements are the primary determinants of site size. As an example, a golf course may require 150 acres, whereas a community center with parking may fit on 10 or 15 acres.

Site Selection Criteria/Guidelines: Where feasible, a geographically central site is optimal.

Given the variety of potential special uses, no specific standards are defined for site selection. As with all park types, the site itself should exhibit the physical characteristics appropriate for its use.

Mini-Parks:

Mini-park is the smallest park classification and used to address limited or isolated recreation needs. Examples include (a) concentrated or limited populations, (b) isolated development areas, (c) unique recreation opportunities, and (d) playgrounds.

Location Criteria: Although demographics and population density play a role in location, the justification for a mini-park lies in servicing a specific recreation need or taking advantage of a unique opportunity. Given the potential variety of mini-parks activities and location, service area will vary. In a residential setting, however, the service area is usually ¼ mile or less in radius. Accessibility by way of interconnecting trails, sidewalks, or low-volume residential streets increases use opportunities and therefore is an important consideration.

Size Criteria: Typically, mini-parks are between 2,500 square feet and one acre in size. However, park areas less than 3 acres would be considered a mini-park. Anything larger would be considered a neighborhood park.

Neighborhood Park:

Neighborhood parks remain the basic unit of the park system and serve as the recreation and social focus of the neighborhood. They should be developed for both active and passive recreation activities geared specifically for those living within the service area. Accommodating a wide variety of age and user groups, including children, adults, the elderly, and special populations, is important. Creating a sense of place by

bringing together the unique character of the site with that of the neighborhood is vital to successful design.

Location Criteria: A neighborhood park should be centrally located within its service area, which encompasses a ¼ to ½ mile distance uninterrupted by non-residential roads and other physical barriers. These distances might vary depending on development diversity. The site should be accessible from throughout its service area by way of interconnecting trails, sidewalks, or low-volume residential streets. Ease of access and walking distance are critical factors in locating a neighborhood park. A person's propensity to use a neighborhood park is greatly reduced if they perceive it to be difficult to access or not within a reasonable walking distance. Frequently, neighborhood parks are developed adjacent to an elementary school.

Size Criteria: Demographic profiles and population density within the park's service area are the primary determinants of a neighborhood park's size. Generally, five acres is accepted as the minimum size necessary to provide space for a variety of recreation activities. Seven to ten acres is considered optimal.

Site Selection Criteria/Guidelines: Ease of access from the surrounding neighborhood, central location, and linkage to greenways is the key concerns when selecting a site. The site itself should exhibit the physical characteristics appropriate for both active and passive recreation uses. Since one of the primary reasons people go to a park is to experience a pleasant outdoor environment, the site should exhibit some innate aesthetic qualities. "Left-over" parcels of land that are undesirable for development and generally undesirable for neighborhood parks should be avoided. Additionally, it is more cost effective to select a site with inherent aesthetic qualities, rather than trying to create them through extensive site development. Given the

importance of location, neighborhood parks should be selected before a subdivision is plotted and acquired as part of the development process.

The site should have well-drained and suitable soils and relatively level topography. Ideally, it should be connected to other park system components such as natural resource areas, lakes, ponds, and greenways. Land within a flood plain should only be considered if the facilities are constructed above the 100 year flood elevation. Although a minimum park size of five acres is recommended, the actual size should be based on the land area needed to accommodate desired uses.

Development Parameters/Recreation Activities: Development of a neighborhood park should seek to achieve a balance between active and passive park uses. Active recreation facilities are intended to be used in an informal and unstructured manner. With the exception of limited use by youth teams, neighborhood parks are not intended to be used for programmed activities that result in overuse, noise, parking problems, and congestion.

Potential active recreation facilities includes playgrounds, court games, "informal" (i.e. non-programmed) playfield or open space, tennis courts, volleyball courts, shuffleboard courts, horseshoe area, ice skating area, wading pool, and activity room. Facilities for passive activities include internal trails (that could connect to the greenway system), picnic/sitting areas, general open space, and "people watching" areas. As a general rule, active recreation facilities should consume roughly 50% of the park's acreage. The remaining 50% should be used for passive activities, reserve, landscape, and conservation as appropriate. Developing an appealing park atmosphere should be considered an important design element.

School-Park:

By combining the resources of two public agencies, the School-Park classification allows for expanding the recreation, social, and educational opportunities available to the community in an efficient and cost effective manner. Depending on the circumstances, school-park sites often complement other community open lands. As an example, an elementary/middle school site could serve as a neighborhood park. Likewise, a middle or high school could serve as a community park or as youth athletic fields. Depending on its size, one school park site may serve in a number of capacities, such as a neighborhood park, youth athletic fields, and a school. Given the inherent variability of type, size, and location, determining how a school-park site is integrated into the park system will depend on particular circumstances. The important outcome in the joint-use relationship is that both the school district and the park district benefit from shared use of facilities and land area.

Location Criteria: For the most part, the location of a school-park site will be determined by the school district based on local policy for the distribution of schools. Given this, the location of a school will often dictate how it is best integrated into the park and recreation system. Where planning efforts coincide, attempts should be made to coordinate the needs of the school district with that of the park and recreation district. This allows for siting, acquisition, and facility development to be responsive to community needs in a most effective and efficient manner. Service areas for school-park sites depend on the type of use. They should be surrounded by neighborhood streets.

Site Criteria: The optimum size of a school-park site is dependent upon its intended use. The size criteria established for Neighborhood

Park and Community Park classifications should be used as appropriate.

Site Selection Criteria/Guidelines: The criteria established for Neighborhood Park and Community Park classifications should be used to determine how a School-Park site should function. The key factor is to ensure that the site exhibits the physical characteristics appropriate for intended uses.

Development Parameters/Recreation Activities: The criteria established for Neighborhood Park and Community Park should be used to determine how a School-Park site is developed. Where feasible, if athletic fields are developed at a school-park site, they should be oriented toward youth rather than adult programs.

Establishing a clearly defined joint-use agreement between involved agencies is critical to making school-park relationships workable. This is particularly important with respect to acquisition, development, maintenance, liability, use, and programming of facility issues.

Community Park:

Community Parks are larger in size and serve a broader purpose than neighborhood parks. Their focus is on meeting the recreation needs of several neighborhoods or large sections of the community, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces. They allow for group activities and offer other recreation opportunities not feasible- nor perhaps desirable at the neighborhood level. As with Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks should be developed for both active and passive recreation activities.

Location Criteria: A Community Park should serve two or more neighborhoods. Although its service area should be ½ to 3 miles in radius, the quality of the natural resource base

should play a significant role in site selection. The site should be serviced by arterial and collector streets and be easily accessible from throughout its service area by way of interconnecting trails. While Community Parks should be strategically sited throughout the community, their locations can be significantly impacted by other types of parks. Most notable among these are school-parks, natural resource areas, and regional parks ~ each of which may provide some of the same recreation opportunities provided in Community Parks. The level of service these other parks provide should be used, in part, as justification for or against a Community Park in a specific area.

Size Criteria: Demographic profiles, population density, resource availability, and recreation demand within its service area are the primary determinants of a Community Park's size. Although an optimal size for a community park is between 20 and 50 acres, its actual size should be based on the land area needed to accommodate desired uses.

Site Selection/Guidelines: The site's natural character should play a very significant role in site selection, with emphasis on sites that preserve unique landscapes within the community and/or provide recreation opportunities not otherwise available. Ease of access from throughout the service area, geographically centered, and relationship to other park areas are also key concerns in site selection.

The site should exhibit physical characteristics appropriate for both active and passive recreation use. It should have suitable soils, positive drainage, varying topography, and a variety of vegetation. Where feasible, it should be adjacent to natural resource areas and greenways. These linkages tend to expand the recreation opportunities within the community and enhance one's perception of surrounding open space.

Depending upon their individual character and use, lakes, ponds, and rivers may be associated with either Community Parks or natural resource areas. Although largely a matter of semantics, Community Park and Conservancy Park classifications differ in that the former is generally more developed for recreation use than the latter. Land within a flood plain should only be considered if the facilities are above the 100 year flood elevation. Land below that elevation would typically fall within the Conservancy Park classification.

Development Parameters/Recreation Activities:

As stated, Community Parks are typically developed for both active and passive uses. Active recreation facilities are intended to be used in a formal and structured manner, reserved and programmed.

A variety of potential active recreation facilities includes large playgrounds and/or creative play attractions, game courts, formal ball fields for youth and adult play, tennis courts, volleyball courts, shuffleboard courts, horseshoe areas, ice skating areas, swimming pools, swimming beaches, archery ranges, and disc golf areas. Passive activity facilities include extensive internal trails (that connect to the community trail system), individual and group picnic/sitting areas, general open space and unique landscapes/features, nature study areas, and ornamental gardens. Facilities for cultural activities, such as plays and concerts in the park, are also appropriate. The distribution of land area between active and passive recreation, reserve, landscape, conservation, and cultural areas is determined on a site by site basis.

Parking lots should be provided as necessary to accommodate user access. Park lighting should be used for security, safety, and lighting facilities as appropriate.

Sports Complex:

The Sports Complex classification consolidates heavily programmed athletic fields and associated facilities at larger and fewer sites strategically located throughout the community. This allows for:

- Economies of scale and higher quality facilities;
- Improved management/scheduling;
- Improved control of facility use; and
- Greater control of negative impacts to Neighborhood and Community Parks, such as overuse, noise, traffic congestion, parking, and domination of facilities by those outside the neighborhood.

Sports Complexes should be developed to accommodate the specific needs of user groups and athletic associations based on demands and program offerings. Where possible, School-Park sites should be used for youth athletics, such as T-ball, soccer, and flag football, to minimize duplication of facilities. Athletic fields are a good example of the multiple use concepts in park facility grouping. The fields can be used for a variety of sports so as to accommodate more participants. Also, the facility can be scheduled more heavily than a single use facility. Sports Complexes include fields and courts for softball, baseball, soccer, tennis, basketball, volleyball, and racket-ball.

Location Criteria: Sport Complexes should be viewed as strategically located community-wide facilities rather than serving well-defined neighborhoods or areas. They should be located within reasonable and equal driving distance from populations served. Locating them adjacent to non-residential land uses is preferred. Buffering (topographic breaks, vegetation, etc.) should be used where facilities are located adjacent to residential areas. Identifying athletic field sites prior to residential

development is critical to avoiding long term conflicts. Sites should be accessible from major thoroughfares. Direct access through residential areas should be avoided. Given that athletic facilities will likely be used for league play and tournaments, access routes from outside the community should also be considered. The site should be easily accessible by way of interconnecting trails, as well.

Projected facility needs based on demographic profiles, age-group population forecasts, and participation rates should be used to determine the types of facilities for a Sports Complex. The space requirements should be facility driven to meet projected need. Space for adequate spectator seating should be provided.

Consideration should be given to acquiring an additional 20% to 25 % of the total acreage for reserve against unforeseen space needs. To minimize the number of sites required, each site should be a minimum of 40 acres, with 80 to 150 acres being optimal.

Site Selection Criteria/Guidelines: The site should exhibit physical characteristics appropriate for developing athletic facilities. Topography and soils are of the utmost concern in this instance. Although extreme topographical change should be avoided, some elevation change is desirable to allow for drainage and to give the site some character. Well-drained and suitable soils are also important. Natural vegetation along the perimeter of the site and in non-field areas is desirable in that it adds to the overall visual appeal of the site. Locating Sports Complexes adjacent to other park system components, especially natural resource areas and greenways, is also desirable to buffer their impact on surrounding land uses. Access to public utilities must also be considered.

Development Parameters: Projected demand for specific types of facilities should be the primary determinant of a Sports Complex development program.

Sports Complexes are intended for programmed athletic use, such as adult organized softball, etc. and tournaments. Sports Complexes increase tourism, drawing both tournament participants and spectators. A menu of potential facilities includes ball-fields, soccer fields, football fields, outdoor and indoor skating rinks, tennis courts, play structures, hard-courts, and volleyball courts. Internal trails should provide access to all facilities as well as connection to the pathway system. Group picnic areas and shelters should also be considered. Support facilities include multi-purpose buildings, restrooms, and common space.

Parking lots should be provided as necessary to accommodate participants and spectators. Lights should be used for security, safety, and lighting facilities as appropriate. Field lighting should not be located so as to create a nuisance to nearby residents. Also, note that each sports governing body provides specific facility development standards.

Conservancy Areas:

Conservancy Areas are lands set aside for preservation of significant natural resources, remnant landscapes, open space, and visual aesthetics/buffering. These lands consist of:

- Individual sites exhibiting natural resources;
- Land that is unsuitable for development but offer natural resource potential. Examples include parcels with steep slopes and natural vegetation, drainage-ways and ravines, surface water management areas

(man-made ponding areas), and utility easements; and

- Protected lands, such as wetlands/lowlands and shorelines along waterways, lakes, and ponds.

The objective with all these lands is to enhance the livability and character of a community by preserving as many of its natural amenities as possible. This can be accomplished in a number of ways:

- Setting aside specific natural resource areas for preservation purposes through the Conservancy Area classification.
- Carefully and insightfully regulating development to preserve natural resources and open space.
- Working with other natural resource agencies, such as the Corps of Engineers, local watershed districts, forest preserve districts, floodplain and wetland districts, etc. to protect natural resources and ecosystems.

Examples of these types of resources include:

- Geologic features
- Functioning ecosystem
- Maintain biodiversity
- Aquifer recharge
- Wetlands
- Watershed
- Protection of rare, threatened or endangered species
- Forests/woodlands
- Wildlife habitat

Location Criteria: Resource availability and opportunity are the primary factors determining location.

Size Criteria: As with location, resource availability and opportunity are the primary factors determining size. The practical limit of acreage set aside under this classification lies in re-

source quality, availability, community development considerations, and acquisition costs. Through an array of creative real estate strategies, many acres can be preserved as community open lands. Often blighted lands such as abandoned waterfront sites, industrial sites, quarries, and abandoned landfills, have potential to be converted from community liabilities to community open land resources. Reclaimed wetlands and wetland banks fall into this category.

Site Selection Criteria/Guidelines: Resource quality is the primary determinant when it comes to selecting a site for preservation. Sites that exhibit unique natural resources or remnant landscapes of the region should be of the highest priority. How they can be integrated into the park system is an important challenge and requires creative policy and design. Many of these areas serve as recreation connectors and habitat corridors.

Out-lots and undevelopable/protected lands should be selected on the basis of enhancing the character of the community, buffering, and providing linkages with other park components protecting natural systems and processes.

Development Parameters/Recreation Activity: Although natural resource areas are resource rather than user based, they can provide some passive recreational opportunities. Most notable are nature viewing and study. They can also function as greenways. Development should be kept to a level that preserves the integrity of the resource.

Greenways:

Greenways serve a number of important functions, including:

- They tie park components together to form a cohesive park, recreation, and open space system;
- They emphasize harmony with the natural environment;
- They allow for uninterrupted and safe pedestrian movement between parks throughout the community;
- They provide people with a resource based outdoor recreation opportunity and experience; and
- They can enhance property values.

In many respects, Greenways and Conservancy Areas have much in common. Both preserve natural resources and mediate between larger habitat areas, open space, and corridors for wildlife. The primary distinction between the two is that Greenways emphasize use (i.e. park trails) to a greater extent than Conservancy Areas.

Location Criteria: Land availability and opportunity are the primary factors determining location. "Natural" Greenways generally follow suitable natural resource areas (as defined under the Conservancy Area classification). "Man-made" Greenways are corridors that are built as part of development projects or during renovation of old development areas. Man-made Greenways include residential subdivisions, revitalized river fronts, abandoned railroad beds, old industrial sites, power-line rights-of-way, pipeline easements, collector parkway rights-of-way, etc. Some boulevards and many parkways can also be considered man-made Greenways if they exhibit a park-like quality and provide off-street trail opportunities. Since Greenways are the preferred way to get people from their homes and into the parks, adjacency to development areas and parks is important. The location of Greenways is integral to the trail system plan and, in some cases, they can also be considered light traffic facilities.

Corridor Width Criteria: As with location, resource availability and opportunity are the primary factors determining the width of the Greenway corridor. Although corridor width can be as little as 25 feet in a subdivision, 50 feet is usually considered the minimum. Widths approaching 200 feet are considered optimal.

Site Selection Criteria/Guideline: Resource availability in conjunction with the trail system plan is the primary determinants when it comes to selecting land for greenways. Natural corridors are most desirable, but man-made corridors can also be very appealing if designed properly. Greenways can be developed for a number of different modes of recreational travel. Most notable are hiking, walking, jogging, bicycling, and in-line skating. They can also be developed for cross-country skiing and horseback riding. Canoeing is another possibility, where the Greenway includes a navigable river or stream.

Private Park/Recreation Facility:

The Private Park/Recreation Facility is a new classification that recognizes the contribution of private providers to the community park and recreation system. It also encourages greater cooperation between the private and public sector toward meeting growing park and recreation needs. The characteristics of Private Parks and Private Recreation facilities are as follows:

- Private Parks such as swimming pools, tennis courts, and party houses are generally within a residential area developed for the exclusive use of residents and are maintained through a home owners association. They are not, however, a complete substitute for public recreation space.
- Private Recreation Facilities are for-profit enterprises, such as health and fitness clubs, golf courses, water parks, amusement parks, and sports facilities.

In either case, they can be an entirely private (i.e. for the exclusive use of residents or members) or a public-private venture (i.e. local residents receive special rates and privileges). In many instances, private facilities can fill certain voids which the public sector cannot. This frees up limited public funds to meet high priority needs for land and facilities.

The contribution that Private Parks/Recreation facilities make in meeting community park and recreation needs must be determined on a case by case basis. Specific policy guidelines should be prepared for use in the subdivision ordinance.

Location Criteria: For the most part, the location of Private Parks/Recreation facilities will be determined by a developer or private enterprise with the municipality often negotiating the final location at the time of development. Where planning efforts coincide, attempts should be made to coordinate the needs of the private party with that of the community. This allows for the greatest degree of service to the community in the most cost effective manner. Service areas for private parks depend on the type of use.

Size Criteria: The optimal size of a Private Park/Recreation facility site is dependent upon its intended use. The size criteria established for other park classifications should be used as appropriate for private parks in a residential setting. Given the inherent variability, there are no established site size standards for private recreation facilities.

Site Selection Criteria/Guidelines: Again, intended use will determine site selection. The criteria established for other park classifications should be used to determine how a private park should function. The key factor is that the sites exhibit the physical characteristics appropriate for intended uses.

Development Parameters/Recreation Activities:
 For Private Parks and Recreation Areas, the criteria established for other park classifications should be used to determine how a site is developed. Establishing clearly defined joint-use agreements between the municipality and private party is critical to making a public-private relationship workable. This is particularly important with respect to development fees, user charges, and programming policies.

HAMPSHIRE PARKS, SCHOOLS AND OPEN SPACE

Based upon the inventory of parks in the District, the existing parks have been classified according to the Park Classification System and are listed in Table 4-2. Two parks, Bruce Ream Memorial Park and Seyller Park, provide a dual use – as both Community and Neighborhood Parks. Where parks have been classified in more than one category, their acreage has been proportionately applied to each classification.

The District contains three park sites with a total acreage of 34.71 acres. Neighborhood Parks comprise 12.15 acres, or 35.0 %, while Community Parks comprise 22.56 acres, or 65.0%. In addition, 245.13 acres are proposed in seven developments either under construction or in the planning/approval process. An eighth park site, consisting of 15.13 acres, is proposed as potential land to Bruce Ream Memorial Park.

Of the total proposed parks, seven sites are designated proportionally as Neighborhood Parks – consisting of 48.62 acres. Seven park sites, including the potential addition to Bruce Ream Memorial Park, are designated as Community Parks – consisting of 166.52 acres. One park is designated as Conservancy Park with 30 acres. Table 4-2 identifies both the existing and proposed parks in the three classifications.

Existing Park District Parks	
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS	
Seyller Park*	5.00 ac.
Bruce Ream Memorial Park*	4.00 ac.
Dorothy J. Schmidt Memorial Park	3.15 ac.
Total Neighborhood Parks	12.15 ac.
COMMUNITY PARKS	
Seyller Park	12.59 ac.
Bruce Ream Memorial Park	9.97 ac.
Total Community Parks	22.56 ac.
Total Existing Park District Parks	34.71 ac.
Proposed Park District Parks	
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS*	
Prairie Ridge Community 12	4.00 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community 14	10.00 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community 16	8.00 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community 17	8.00 ac.
Oakstead Community 24	10.00 ac.
Tuscany Woods Park	7.00 ac.
Tamms Park	1.62 ac.
Total Proposed Neighborhood Parks	48.62 ac.
COMMUNITY PARKS	
Prairie Ridge Community 12	8.25 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community 14	29.40 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community 16	19.75 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community 17	20.89 ac.
Oakstead Community 24	51.70 ac.
Tuscany Woods Park	21.40 ac.
Bruce Ream Memorial Park Land Addition	15.13 ac.
Total Proposed Community Parks	166.52 ac.
CONSERVANCY PARKS	
Oakstead Community 24	30.00 ac.
Total Proposed Conservancy Parks	30.00 ac.
Total Proposed Park District Parks	245.14 ac.
Total Existing and Proposed Park District Parks	279.85 ac.

* Park's acreage has been designated proportionally as Neighborhood Park

Table 4-2: Classification of Hampshire Township Park District's Existing and Proposed Parks

In addition to the District parks, two school sites exist in the Village. Two school sites are proposed, including 100 acres for a new high school and 19 acres for a new elementary school. The two existing school sites provide recreation resources within the Park District, and the two new school sites will also provide recreation facilities. Table 4-3 identifies the existing and proposed school sites and their acreages in the Park District.

Existing School Sites	
High School/Middle School	26.55 ac.
Hampshire Elementary School	3.72 ac.
Total Existing School Sites	30.27 ac.
Proposed School Sites	
High School Site	100.0 ac.
Elementary School Site	19.0 ac.
Total Proposed School Sites	119.0 ac.
Total Existing and Proposed School Sites	149.27 ac.

Table 4-3: Existing and Proposed School Sites

In the developments under construction and in the planning review/approval process, a total of the 757.53 acres of open space is provided or proposed. The open space will encompass wetlands, flood-plain, natural areas, and streams. It is anticipated that the open space will be transferred to the Village of Hampshire. Table 4-4 identifies the existing and proposed open space in each development.

Three of the proposed developments plan to provide a total of 25 Private Park sites totaling 64.21 acres (see Table 4-5). Two developments are proposing Community Centers – Prairie Ridge with 7.64 acres, and Oakstead with 8.50 acres.

Besides the two Community Center sites, the 23 private park sites will vary in size between 0.41 acres and 6.36 acres, and will be developed with amenities including playgrounds, landscape, paths, and open play fields.

Existing Open Space	
White Oak	57.15 ac.
Hampshire Hills	19.71 ac.
Hampshire Highlands	24.06 ac.
Hampshire Prairie	8.15 ac.
Total Existing Open Space	109.07 ac.
Proposed Open Space	
Prairie Ridge	295.35 ac.
Oakstead	140.45 ac.
Tuscany Woods	111.80 ac.
Brier Hill Crossing	76.46 ac.
Tamms Farm	24.40 ac.
Total Proposed Open Space	648.46 ac.
Total Existing and Proposed Open Space	757.53 ac.

Table 4-4: Existing and Proposed Open Space

Proposed Private Parks	
Prairie Ridge Park 1	0.495 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 2	1.971 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 3	1.166 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 4	2.851 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 5	1.439 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 6	2.284 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 7	1.321 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 8	3.952 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 9	1.346 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 10	2.965 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 11	1.818 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 13	2.403 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 15	0.607 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 18	0.434 ac.
Prairie Ridge Park 19	0.409 ac.
Prairie Ridge Community Center	7.637 ac.
Oakstead Park 1	6.36 ac.
Oakstead Park 2	1.61 ac.
Oakstead Park 5	2.23 ac.
Oakstead Park 6	0.73 ac.
Oakstead Park 7	2.06 ac.
Oakstead Park 25	1.22 ac.
Oakstead Park 26	0.81 ac.
Oakstead Community Center	8.04 ac.
Tuscany Woods 4 Sites	8.50 ac.
Total Proposed Private Parks	64.21 ac.

Table 4-5: Proposed Private Parks

PARK PLANNING STANDARDS

The National Recreation and Park Association, as well as other professional park and recreation organizations, have established standards and guidelines for park planning. NRPA suggests that a park system, at a minimum, be composed of a “core” system of park lands, with a total of 6.25 to 10.5 acres of developed open space per 1,000 population. The precise application of adopted standards is impractical. Deviations are necessary to secure and preserve natural topographic features, accommodate demographics characteristics, and adjust to the shape and population of the park user areas, as well as other elements of the Village's 2004 *Comprehensive Land Use Plan*.

To properly use accepted standards and the population ratio method, adjustments must be made for the following local factors:

1. Distance to the park;
2. Socio-economic factors;
3. Special local conditions, such as barriers;
4. New trends in leisure attitudes and interests;
5. Private or commercial facilities;
6. Available resources; and
7. Expressed needs and desires of users.

Acreage alone does not assure a well-balanced park system. Sites should be designed and developed with a balance of facilities according to the recommended classifications. Therefore, a proper relationship in the size, number, location, and type of facilities developed for each park site is critical to a relevant system for parks and recreation in the Park District.

The changing leisure attitudes and interests of the public must be a continuing factor for consideration along with the standards for planning recreation facilities and programs. Public needs are especially critical in determin-

ing what is to be built in the parks and when it is to be built. Citizen involvement in the planning process is strongly encouraged.

The principal uses of standards are:

1. To provide comprehensive plans;
2. To provide a systematic approach to land acquisition;
3. To justify and assist in determining priorities for acquisition and development of park and recreation areas; and,
4. To measure the effectiveness of a park and recreation system.

To be effective, standards must meet the following criteria:

1. Reflect the needs of the citizens of the Park District;
2. Be reasonably attainable;
3. Be acceptable and usable to the professionals and policy makers;
4. Be based on sound principles and the best available information;
5. Stand the test of time and challenge; and
6. Be applied consistently within the community planning process.

With the adoption by the Village of Hampshire of the 2004 *Comprehensive Land Use Plan*, the Village has established a major goal of preserving open space and providing a strong park system. As discussed in Chapter 2, a number of major residential developments are proposed which meet the goals of the Village. The Park District has the opportunity to acquire, through contributions, considerable park land that will meet the future recreation needs of a growing population.

To meet the present and future needs for Park District park land, Table 4-6 recommends Park Classification Standards. It is recommended that a minimum population ratio of 10 acres

per 1,000 be established, which is consistent with national park and recreation standards (NPRA) and coincides with the Village’s Comprehensive Plan. Table 4-6 also establishes uses for each park classification, service areas, minimum sizes of parks, and population served. These standards should be viewed as guidelines for planning, and adjusted depending upon circumstance

Park Land Analysis

PARK LAND RATIO

Based upon the Park Classification System and Standards discussed above, Table 4-7 provides a comparison of the park land standards to actual developed park land within the District’s system. Park land ratios are compared to both the 2000 census and the estimated 2005

Park Classification	Use	Service Area	Size of Park	Acres per 1,000 Population	Population Served
Special Use Park	Covers a broad range of parks and recreation facilities oriented toward single-purpose use; visual and aesthetic uses	No applicable standards	Variable depending on desired size	variable	Within community
Mini- Park	Used to address limited, isolated or unique recreation needs; specialized playground and aesthetic uses	Less than ¼ mile radius	2 acres or less	variable	300-1,000 residents
Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood park remains the basic unit of the park system and serves as the recreation and social focus of the neighborhood. Focus is on active and passive recreation; active recreation fields and facilities, playgrounds	¼ - ½ mile radius served	3 - 10 acres	2.5 acres/1,000	1,000-3,000 residents
Community Park	Serves broader purpose than neighborhood park. Focus is on meeting community-based recreation needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces. Active recreation fields, diverse facilities, specialized district wide uses and events, community center	½ - 1 mile radius served	Minimum 10 acres	7.5 acres/1,000	5,000-10,000 residents and entire community
Sports Complex	Consolidates heavily programmed athletic fields and associated facilities to larger and fewer sites strategically located throughout the community	1 - 2 mile radius; strategically located community-wide facilities	Determined by projected demand. Usually a minimum of 25 acres, with 40 to 80 acres optimal	variable	Entire population
Conservancy Park	Lands set aside for protection and conservation of significant natural resources, remnant landscape, open space, and visual aesthetic/buffering	Entire District	Sufficient to protect the resources	Variable	Entire population
Greenways	Effectively tie park system components together to form a continuous park environment; provide recreation travel, hiking, bicycling	Entire District	Sufficient width to protect the resource and provide maximum use	Variable	Entire Population

Table 4-6: Recommended Park Classification Standards

PARK AND OPEN SPACE STANDARDS

population. Table 4-8 provides a comparison of existing and proposed park land compared to the projected population of 20,000. The projected population assumes the build-out of the nine developments under construction and in the planning/approval process.

As Table 4-7 demonstrates, the Park District is deficit in park land based on both the 2000 census (-13.22 acres) and the estimated 2005 population (-30.29 acres). The major deficit is in Community Parks with -13.22 acres for 2000 census, and -26.19 acres for the 2005 estimated population. If 31.0 acres of existing school

land is added to the park land, then the District, as a whole exceeds the park land needs for both population periods.

If existing and proposed park land is analyzed based on the projected population of 20,000, then the Park District exceeds the required amount of park land by 49.85 acres, or 25% (see Table 4-8). Total neighborhood park land would equal 60.77 acres compared to 50.00 acres required by the ratio, and total community park land would equal 189.08 acres compared to 150.00 acres required.

Park Classification	District Standard of Acreage per 1,000	Existing District Parks	2000 Census Population (4,793)		2005 Estimated Population (6,500)	
			Park Land Required	Surplus/Deficit	Park Land Required	Surplus/Deficit
Special Use Park	Variable					
Mini Park	Variable					
Neighborhood Park	2.5 ac.	12.15 ac.	11.98 ac.	0.17 ac.	16.25 ac.	-4.10 ac.
Community Park	7.5 ac.	22.56 ac.	35.95 ac.	-13.39 ac.	48.75 ac.	-26.19 ac.
Sports Complex	Variable					
Conservancy Park	n/a					
Greenways	n/a					
TOTALS	10 ac.	34.71 ac.	47.93 ac.	-13.22 ac.	65.00 ac.	-30.29 ac.

Exhibit 4-7: Comparison of Existing Park Land to Park District Standards

Park Classification	District Standard of Acreage per 1,000	Park Land			Projected Population (20,000)	
		Existing Park Land	Proposed Park Land	Total Park Land	Park Land Required	Surplus/Deficit
Special Use Park	Variable					
Mini Park	Variable					
Neighborhood Park	2.5 ac.	12.15 ac.	48.62 ac.	60.77 ac.	50.00 ac.	10.77 ac.
Community Park	7.5 ac.	22.56 ac.	166.52 ac.	189.08 ac.	150.00 ac.	39.08 ac.
Sports Complex	Variable					
Conservancy Park	n/a		30.00 ac.	30.00 ac.		
Greenways	n/a					
TOTALS	10 ac.	34.71 ac.	245.14 ac.	279.85 ac.	200.00 ac.	49.85 ac.

Exhibit 4-8: Comparison of Existing and Proposed Park Land to Park District Standards

PARK LAND SERVICE AREA ANALYSIS

In addition to analyzing the acreage of parks in relation to the standard 10 acres per 1,000 population, of equal importance is analyzing the location of parks in respect to their service area. The following five analyses provide an evaluation of both Neighborhood and Community Parks to meet the needs of existing, proposed, and future development in the Park District.

Neighborhood and Community Park Service Area Analysis for Existing Development

Figure 4-1 illustrates the recommended service areas for existing neighborhood and community parks, respectively ½ mile radius and 1 mile radius. As the figure shows, the ½ mile service area for the three designated neighborhood parks covers the existing developed areas of the District satisfactorily, where the majority of the population occurs. When considering the railroad tracks as a northern barrier, State Street as a north-south barrier, and Illinois Route 72 as a south east-west barrier, the three major population neighborhoods are well covered.

The deficiency in neighborhood parks is coverage of rural population areas outside of the Village. With the low density and scattered large lot residences, the capability to provide neighborhood parks in the rural areas is impractical.

The service areas for the two Community Parks also cover the existing developed areas within the Village satisfactorily. The deficiency in service area coverage for community parks occurs in the residential development south of Illinois Route 72 and the rural low density population areas outside of the Village. The deficiency

south of Illinois Route 72 does suggest the need for a future Community Park in this area.

Overall, the locations of the three existing parks in the Park District satisfy the service area standards for Community and Neighborhood Parks in the densely developed areas of the Park District.

Neighborhood and Community Park Service Area Analysis for Existing and Proposed Developments

Neighborhood and Community Park service areas for existing and proposed developments were analyzed separately due to the number of parks and their complexity.

Neighborhood Park Service Area Analysis for Existing and Proposed Developments:

Figure 4-2 illustrates the location of existing and proposed developments with existing and proposed Neighborhood Parks (proportional areas of Community Parks). As the figure shows, the ½ mile service area for the ten designated existing and proposed Neighborhood Parks covers both existing and proposed developed areas reasonable well. However, five areas, two in Prairie Ridge, two in Oakstead, and one in Brier Hill Crossings are not adequately covered by a service area for Neighborhood Parks.

In Prairie Ridge, these include the following:

Neighborhood Park Area A: Single-family area located at the southwest corner of Harmony Road and Melms Road

Within this area are located two proposed Private Parks – Park 4 with 2.651 acres and Park 5 with 1.349 acres, totaling 4.00 acres. Both Private Parks together should provide

**FIGURE 4-1: MAP ILLUSTRATING
EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD AND
COMMUNITY PARKS FOR
EXISTING DEVELOPMENTS**

**FIGURE 4-2: MAP ILLUSTRATING
EXISTING AND PROPOSED
NEIGHBORHOOD PARK SERVICE
AREAS FOR EXISTING AND
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS**

adequate facilities to meet the Neighborhood Park needs. In addition, a 19 acre elementary school site is proposed opposite the residential area on the east side of Harmony Road, which is a rural collector street. Although the rural collector street may be considered a barrier to its access from the residential area, with proper crossings, the school site can satisfy the Neighborhood Park needs for the area.

Neighborhood Park Area B: Northwest Residential Area south of Big Timber Road:

Within this area are located three proposed Private Parks – Park 8 with 3.952 acres, Park 9 with 1.348 acres, and Park 10 with 2.965 acres, totaling 9.27 acres.

In order to meet the Neighborhood Park needs in this area, the Park District should consider the option of acquiring (by donation) Park 8 to satisfy the neighborhood service area standards.

In Oakstead, the two areas not adequately covered include the following:

Neighborhood Park Area C: The northern single-family area located off of Big Timber Road:

Within this area are located three proposed Private Parks – Park 1 with 6.36 acres, Park 2 with 1.61 acres, and Park 25 with 1.22 acres, totaling 9.19 acres. In addition, there is a proposed Community Center Park with 8.04 acres. Altogether, there will exist over 17 acres of park land.

In order to meet the Neighborhood Park needs in this area, the Park District should consider the option of acquiring (by donation) Park 1 to satisfy the neighborhood service area standards.

Neighborhood Park Area D: The southwest single-family area:

Within this area are located two proposed Private Parks – Park 7 with 2.06 acres, and Park 6 with 0.73 acres, totaling 2.79 acres.

In order to meet the neighborhood park needs in this area, the Park District should consider the option of acquiring (by donation) Park 7 to satisfy the neighborhood service area standards.

Neighborhood Park Area E: Brier Hill Crossings project area:

In the far northeast corner of the Park District, there are 560 residential units proposed in the Brier Hill Crossings development. In this development, there are no proposed park lands, except open space for storm-water management.

The Park District should negotiate with the developer for the donation of a 17+ acre park site to serve as both a Neighborhood and Community Park. Five acres of the site can be designated as a Neighborhood Park to meet the service area standards.

As a result of the neighborhood park service area analysis for existing and proposed development, a total of five areas in the Park District lack service area coverage by Neighborhood Parks. It is recommended that four park sites, totaling 17.37 acres, be acquired through developer donation. Three of the sites exist as proposed private parks, and the fourth site will need to be negotiated with the developer. The fifth area lacking coverage by a neighborhood park can be accommodated by proposed private park sites and a proposed elementary school site.

Community Park Service Area Analysis for Existing and Proposed Developments:

Figure 4-3 illustrates the location of existing and proposed development with existing and proposed Community Parks. As the figure indicates, the 1 mile service area for the eight designated existing and proposed Community Parks covers both existing and proposed developed areas very well.

However, three areas are not adequately covered by a service area for Community Parks. The first area is south of Illinois Route 72 and is within two Community Park service areas. However, the two Community Parks are located north of Illinois Route 72, which is an arterial street. Therefore, to meet Community Park needs south of Illinois Route 72, a new Community Park site should be located in this area when future developments are planned and implemented.

The other two Community Park areas include the following:

Community Park Area A: Tamms Farm project area:

Tamms Farm is not covered by a Community Park service area. However, the single-family residential development will be adjacent to the proposed 100 acre high school/elementary school site. This future school site should adequately serve the Community Park needs for this residential area.

Community Park Area B: Brier Hill Crossings project area:

As discussed under the Neighborhood Park service analysis for existing and proposed developments, the Brier Hill Crossings development lacks any proposed park land.

With 560 residential units proposed, and a projected population of over 1,600, the area is almost surrounded by arterial roads and the Tollway, thereby minimizing its access to existing and future Community Parks. The Park District should negotiate with the developer for the donation of a 17+ acre park site to serve as both a Neighborhood and Community Park. Twelve acres of the site can be designated as a Community Park to meet the service area standards.

As a result of the Community Park service area analysis for existing and proposed development, a total of three areas in the Park District lack service area coverage by Community Parks. It is recommended that one park site of 12.00 acres (total park site of 17 acres to also serve Neighborhood Park needs) be acquired through developer donation. The second area can be served by the future high school/elementary school site, and third area will need a Community Park site when future developments are implemented.

Neighborhood and Community Park Service Area Analysis for Existing, Proposed and Future Developments

As discussed in Chapter 2, there are a total of 12 developments either in the stages of conceptual plan review or pre-application. These developments are identified in Table 2-6 and illustrated in Figure 2-12.

Based on this information, service areas for future Neighborhood and Community Parks were analyzed. The service areas were analyzed separately, with potential general areas identified for Neighborhood and Community Parks. The exact location of these future parks will depend upon the size of development, specific site conditions, sequence of developments,

**FIGURE 4-3: MAP ILLUSTRATING
EXISTING AND PROPOSED
COMMUNITY PARK SERVICE
AREAS FOR EXISTING AND
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS**

location in respect to open space, and roadway systems. However, this analysis does provide a guide for the Park District in meeting park needs for future development and having the guidelines necessary to work with the Village and developers to obtain suitable contributions for park land.

Future Neighborhood Park Service Area Analysis for Existing, Proposed and Future Developments:

Figure 4-4 illustrates the location of existing, proposed and future developments and neighborhood park service areas and existing and proposed Neighborhood Parks. As the figure shows, the ½ mile service area for the thirteen designated existing and proposed Neighborhood Parks covers both existing and proposed developed areas reasonable well. Relative to future developments, there are four areas lacking the coverage of a Neighborhood Park for future development. These areas are numbered and described below. Although a symbol (circle) is indicated on the plan, it does not represent the scale or exact location of the future Neighborhood Park. It is only a guide identifying the need in the area.

Future Neighborhood Park Area 1:

This area is comprised of three future developments – Koehler, Gehringer, and Sajtar – and totals approximately 395 acres. The Gehringer Property lies in the middle of the three future developments, and is adjacent to Allen Road and bisected by a potential open space corridor consisting of waterway and flood plain. This property would provide an excellent opportunity for a future Neighborhood Park bordering the potential open space corridor.

Future Neighborhood Park Area 2:

This area is comprised of the Scarpelli Property (188 acre) and a portion of the Hampshire Hills development, which is under construction. Two potential open space corridors, consisting of waterways and floodplain, cross the property.

Future Neighborhood Park Area 3:

This area is comprised of two future developments – Klock and Thompson Properties – and totals approximately 276 acres. Both properties are bisected by a potential open space corridor consisting of waterway and flood plain. Either property would provide an excellent opportunity for a Neighborhood Park bordering the potential open space corridor.

Future Neighborhood Park Area 4:

This area is comprised of the SMRT Property (387 acres). The western portion of the Property contains a potential open space corridor, consisting of waterway and flood plain, which would provide an open space/greenway linkage with Prairie Ridge.

Future Community Park Service Area Analysis for Existing, Proposed and Future Developments:

Figure 4-5 illustrates the location of existing, proposed and future developments and existing and proposed Community Parks. As the figure indicates, the 1 mile service area for the nine designated existing and proposed Community Parks (including the proposed high school) covers existing and proposed developed areas very well. Relative to future developments, there are two areas lacking the coverage of a Community Park. These areas are numbered and described below. Although a symbol (circle) is indicated on the plan, it does not

represent the scale or exact location of the future community park. It is only a guide identifying the need in the area.

Future Community Park Area 1:

This area lies south of Illinois Route 72 and consists of three future developments - the Scarpelli Property (188 acres), the Klock Property (156 acres), and the Thompson Property (120 acres) - and a portion of the Hampshire Hills development, which is under construction. Two potential open space corridors, consisting of waterways and floodplain, cross three of the properties. In the analysis for future Neighborhood Parks, two future Neighborhood Parks (#2 and #3) are recommended in this area. With additional acreage, either one of these future Neighborhood Parks could be developed to serve both functions.

Future Community Park Area 2:

This area lies in the northern portion of the Park District, and is comprised of the SMRT Property (387 acres). The western portion of the property contains a potential open space corridor, consisting of waterway and flood plain, which would provide an open space/greenway linkage with Prairie Ridge. In the analysis for future neighborhood parks, a future Neighborhood Park (#5) is recommended in this area. With additional acreage, one larger park site could be developed to serve both functions

**FIGURE 4-4: MAP ILLUSTRATING
FUTURE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK
SERVICE AREAS FOR FUTURE
DEVELOPMENTS**

**FIGURE 4-5: MAP ILLUSTRATING
FUTURE COMMUNITY PARK
SERVICE AREAS FOR FUTURE
DEVELOPMENTS**

Park Facilities Analysis

Standards also exist to compare the number of specific facilities offered by the District to the population served. These standards are identified in Table 4-9 in comparison to District facilities. Based on these standards, the Hampshire Township Park District has done an excellent job in providing facilities to the community. In almost all categories listed, except for playgrounds, existing facilities meet or exceed the identified national standards. However, this should not overshadow the need for additional facilities as expressed by resident comments.

Although the national standards are sound, there can be local anomalies that should be considered. Table 4-9 also highlights the fact that over reliance on national standards should be carefully evaluated. For example, according to the standards, the District has 6 more soccer fields than needed based on the total population. However, the demographic characteristics of Park District, along with actual demand and use of soccer facilities, suggest that the national standard is low for the community, and that the actual number of fields may be appropriate

Facility	Standard (1 per x residents)	Existing Facilities	Recommended Facilities	Surplus or Deficit
Basketball (full court)	5,000	2	1	0
Ice Hockey (indoor)	100,000	0	0	0
Ice Skating (outdoor)	30,000	1	1	0
Tennis	2,000	2	3	-1
Volleyball	5,000	0	1	-1
Baseball/Softball (unlighted)	5,000	1	1	0
Baseball/Softball (lighted)	30,000	1	1	0
Football	20,000	0	0	0
Soccer	10,000	7	1	+6
Golf-Driving Range	50,000	0	0	0
Golf- 18 Hole	50,000	0	0	0
Swimming Pool	20,000	0	0	0
Community Center	25,000	1	1	0
Outdoor Theater	20,000	0	0	0
Playground	1,000	2	7	-5

Based upon an estimated population of 6,500 people

Exhibit 4-9: Comparison of Hampshire Township Park District Facilities to National Standards

Land Per Capita Comparison

PARK LAND PER CAPITA

The park land per 1,000 population analyzed previously is a means of comparing “active recreation” park land to 1,000 people in the community. There are no national standards for total park land comparisons. However, it is possible to assess total population per 1,000 population based upon park districts in the Chicago region. Table 4-10 provides a park land per 1,000 population comparison with other communities. The acreages included are total park land, which includes active, passive, conservancy land, and special parks.

In comparison with other park districts, Hampshire ranks the lowest in acreage per 1,000 population with 5.34. The highest, Cary with 32.95 acres per 1,000 population, has extensive acreage in conservancy areas.

Community	Population	Total Park Acreage	Acreage per 1,000 Population
Hampshire PD	6,500	34.71	5.34
Belvidere PD	27,000	243	9.00
Huntley PD	35,000	261	7.46
DeKalb PD	42,000	740	17.62
Sycamore PD	14,000	332	23.71
Cary PD	20,000	659	32.95
Genoa PD	7,000	60	8.57
Dundee PD	53,207	647	12.16

Table 4-10: Park Land Per Capita Comparison