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INTRODUCTION: STATING THE “DESIRED DEVELOPMENT DIRECTION”

Every several years, the City of DeKalb steps back and re-examines its Comprehensive Plan, the policy “blueprint” for the community’s future development and growth. The Comprehensive Plan articulates strategies for implementing the community’s “desired development direction” for itself, taking into account the expectations of its citizens, the infrastructure and services available to serve the community, and consideration of physical, economic, and other factors that can affect how, when, and where development may occur.

Last updated in 1996, the City of DeKalb’s Comprehensive Plan identifies a series of goals and objectives that contribute toward continuous improvement of the community. The Comprehensive Plan addresses goals and strategies for managing DeKalb’s development, including statements regarding the City’s fiscal and economic health, efficiency of services, and quality of life. Many of the stated goals in the 1996 Plan, which were originally conceived in the 1990 Comprehensive Plan, remain valid for the community’s ongoing evolution.

Through the “DeKalb 3D” Comprehensive Plan Update, the City has the opportunity to refine the strategies adopted in the 1996 Plan to shape anticipated growth. DeKalb’s success will rely on the preservation of its heritage and identity, while building a community that is environmentally, economically and fiscally sustainable. This Update provides a foundation for establishing policy direction for subsequent planning endeavors that address particular community elements, such as economic development, transportation, and subarea plans.

Five planning elements were identified early in the process to serve as the foundation for the “DeKalb 3D” Plan updates:

- **Sustainability** – The City would only support developments that are sensitive to the area’s natural features; create economic opportunities for businesses and households, and are compatible with the community’s fiscal resources to provide needed services and to support a high quality of life.

- **Continuous Improvement** – Designs and practices for new developments continuously “raise the bar” for new developments, resulting in projects that contribute toward establishing DeKalb’s long-term sustainability.
The City's decision-makers recognize that new developments approved today may become tomorrow's historic districts worthy of preservation, or tomorrow's blighted properties in need of redevelopment.

- **Character**—Consensus on how big DeKalb should be or what it should look like is constantly evolving. Community discussions indicate the community's target population is around 50,000 people; this size generally corresponds to a size that supports diverse economic, social, educational and cultural opportunities without becoming "yet another Chicago suburb" without its own sense of place, identity and character.

- **Connectivity**—New developments are not created in isolation, but are additions to an existing, evolving built environment. Physical connections between older and newer parts of the community, such as through-streets and bike/pedestrian paths, enhance DeKalb as a desirable community. DeKalb itself is not an island, and its planning strategies will also need to recognize that the community is inextricably linked to a growing urban "place" that includes Sycamore, Cortland and Malta.

- **Cohesion**—Consistent with the DeKalb County's strategies for maintaining large tracts of undeveloped land throughout the region, the City will consider the development of those properties that are immediately adjacent to the City and that can be efficiently served by the City's services. The development of properties that extend "unsupported" away from the heart of the community not only dilutes DeKalb's identity as a community, but also impairs the City's ability to provide quality, efficient urban services.

**Assumptions About the "Desired Development Direction"**

The DeKalb Plan Commission, assigned by Illinois Statute (65 ILCS 5/11-12-5) with the responsibility for adopting and maintaining the municipality's Comprehensive Plan, served as the principal steering committee for the Update's development. At the beginning of the update process, the Plan Commission and City Staff recognized that a number of trends and factors would underlie the forecasts and recommendations resulting from the process. Zoning, land use, property rights, legal precedents, economic forces, social expectations, and many other factors will affect what may realistically happen in the community's foreseeable future.
The following list of assumptions was developed to articulate some of the noted underlying factors. The Plan Commission reviewed the assumptions on several occasions, taking several opportunities to revise their initial assumptions about the community’s development.

These stated assumptions were:

1. It is desirable for DeKalb to maintain and enhance its unique sense of place and community.

2. The free market will generally determine when and where development occurs, and property owners have a certain “bundle of rights” that cannot be denied or intruded upon. The City can influence where and how quickly/slowly it occurs within its jurisdiction, and the City can exert considerable control on the design, appearance and infrastructure of development.

3. DeKalb recognizes that development within and around the existing community will occur, though “how” and “where” are not preordained – it is the City’s challenge and opportunity to effectively manage this growth.

4. Development reflects both economic and social choices people make about how and where they want to live, work, recreate, etc., and about how willing they are to pay for that lifestyle.

5. Automobiles will continue to be the preferred mode of transportation for most people for the foreseeable future.

6. Development occurs when there is an expectation of a return on the investment made in a project, corresponding to the level of risk assumed.

7. “Brownfield” redevelopment is usually more burdensome and costly than “greenfield” development, making development of undeveloped property more likely than the reuse of an existing structure or property.

8. There is a positive relationship between residential density and agricultural/open land preservation.

9. “Agricultural land preservation” is not the same as “open space preservation.”

These assumptions were useful in providing a starting point for discussing the future development of the community. The assumptions were only considered as a starting point for discussion, and their use did not inhibit the consideration of different ideas about community development, growth management, or desired outcomes.
CHAPTER II.

DISCUSSING THE "DESIRED DEVELOPMENT DIRECTION"

For nearly two years, Community Development Staff met with community members and organizations to discuss questions, concerns and ideas about future development in and around DeKalb. These community discussions were conducted as a way to identify and/or verify the issues that may be of concern to community members that could be addressed through the update. These meetings were primarily intended to fuel discussion about the future development of DeKalb, and to help frame or explore policy questions that may be addressed through the Comprehensive Plan update.

COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Three community-at-large meetings were held in 2002, and additional meetings were hosted by various community organizations such as the Main Street/DeKalb Inc., the DeKalb Chamber of Commerce, and the DeKalb County Economic Development Corporations. Presentations were also made to the DeKalb Park District, the DeKalb Sanitary District Board, and the DeKalb School District administrators to discuss and answer their questions about the Comprehensive Plan update. Meeting attendance ranged in size from three to 70+ people, with an estimated total of 300 individuals participating in the process.

Overall, the questions, comments and discussions about DeKalb's future development were fairly similar between the various groups. While each group raised questions and concerns unique to their respective points of view, Staff identified a number of similarities or "patterns" in the discussions, which can be summarized as:

Discussion about DeKalb's "character," which seemed to focus on balancing DeKalb's identities as:

- a "university town," where NIU is the educational, cultural and economic center of the community;
- a "small town" with an agricultural heritage, and
- a community with "suburban" expectations regarding demands for services, tolerances for traffic, etc., sharing viewpoints that are typical of those expressed in the Chicago metropolitan area.

Many of the concerns associated with DeKalb's "character" were indirectly raised or expressed through such questions as "How big will DeKalb become?" "When will ________ [insert name of store] come to DeKalb?" or "What's happening with the downtown?"
These questions often touched on “character” issues, such as perceived safety in the community; the appearance of the downtown, Annie Glidden Road and other community entrances, and management of traffic around the community. These discussions also included consideration of farmland preservation, open space preservation, availability of infrastructure and services, and expanded business, employment, recreational, shopping and other opportunities in the community.

Within the shared concerns, there also appeared to be differing levels of expectations regarding various aspects of the community. Participants’ ideas regarding “traffic congestion” seemed to be relative to their own points of reference, whether it be Naperville’s busiest streets, a residential cul-de-sac in DeKalb, or some other roadway. Discussion of other “character” issues such as the quality of the school system, the number of shopping opportunities, and the number and quality of housing options available are other elements of the community that resulted in varying levels of satisfaction and concern.

Identifying these three particular “sets of values” may be an oversimplification of how the community views itself. However, the three general perspectives serve as a starting point for acknowledging that there does not appear to be a “single vision” for the community’s future development. Considering these different “visions” for DeKalb may help illuminate the values that are shared across the community so that they may be more accurately reflected in the updated Comprehensive Plan.

- **The future of DeKalb’s downtown**, particularly in identifying its role in the community and its appearance. The comments often mirrored questions raised about DeKalb’s identity and direction as a community, where community members were unaware, disagreed or encouraged particular strategies for downtown’s revitalization. Main Street/DeKalb Inc. board members discussed various strategies and improvements that would result in a “balance of uses,” aimed at serving multiple facets/constituencies in the community.

- **The future development of an arterial road on the west side of DeKalb**. This issue was often raised in the context of other concerns, including constructing/managing truck routes around the perimeter of the community, development of NIU’s Far West Campus area, managing traffic from the Convocation Center, and managing private spin-off development from the Far West Campus and from the arterial itself.
• **Tax base development and the ability to pay for services, especially for schools.** Discussions included balancing increased demand and expectations for services with finding appropriate sources of tax revenue to pay for them. This issue also included consideration of how much land should be set aside for long-term industrial development; the location of the “next major commercial corridor” (after Sycamore Road’s build-out); identifying where residential development should be focused, and how to maintain a balance between residential and non-residential development.

Additionally, a number of influences that were often acknowledged as being beyond DeKalb’s immediate control, but were recognized as potentially having major impacts on the community’s development; these factors included:

- **The Rochelle railport,** the truck traffic for which may opt to use Lincoln Highway (IL Route 38) through the downtown to reach the Chicago area, rather than use the I-88 East-West Tollway.

- The development of the **NIU Convocation Center** and the **Far West Campus,** which were generally viewed as providing considerable opportunities for DeKalb, but as also having an impact on traffic on Lincoln Highway, Annie Glidden Road, and the future West Side Arterial.

- The **Metra train service reaching Elburn** in 2006, which may encourage commuter-oriented development on the east and south sides of DeKalb, but especially in Cortland; these concerns were also linked to the potential impacts on the DeKalb School District.

- The potential development of the **“Prairie Parkway,”** which would connect Interstate 88 to Interstate 80 in the vicinity of Kane, Kendall and Will Counties, and would be expected to have the effect of moving the “suburbs” closer to DeKalb.

**ONLINE COMMENTS**

Through March and April 2002, the City of DeKalb’s website (www.cityofdekalb.com) featured an online questionnaire to encourage public participation in the “DeKalb 3D” planning process. The primary purpose of the online questionnaire was to encourage participation in the planning process by people who would not otherwise attend a meeting, write a letter, or participate in a more traditional manner. The online questionnaire is not a statistically-representative survey of community attitudes, but it is a supplemental forum for submitting ideas, questions and issues for consideration during this process.
Based on information provided by the Information Technology Division, 6,990 visitors to the City’s website were exposed to the “DeKalb 3D” pop-up window, which provided a link to the questionnaire and the informational pages. The questionnaire information page was viewed 450 times, with 241 individuals proceeding on to the questionnaire itself; a total of 97 non-duplicative entries were submitted by April 15, 2002. Most (80 of 97) respondents were not NIU students; two-thirds of the participants work in DeKalb, and about half have lived in DeKalb for 11 or more years.

Though the questionnaire is not a statistically-significant profile of community attitudes, many of the responses appear to be consistent with discussions held around the community. In describing DeKalb, three out of four respondents indicated that they viewed the community as primarily a “small, independent city” or as a “university town,” with a smaller number of people identifying DeKalb as a “farming community.” Respondents also preferred to compare DeKalb to smaller, affluent communities like the St. Charles-Geneva area and to university communities like Madison, WI. Respondents favored those locations over larger communities like Aurora, Naperville or Rockford.

These comments were consistent with those received during the community meetings, as were comments received indicating that increased traffic was a major concern (72 people) related to future growth of DeKalb. Respondents also indicated that bike trails and parks are amenities that they strongly desire (78 people), and that a variety of housing types should be included in the community’s design (81 people).

**GROWTH SUMMIT**

In December 2002, the Mayor of the City of DeKalb invited leaders from other units of local government, Northern Illinois University and selected civic leaders to participate in an ad-hoc committee dubbed the “Growth Summit.” The Summit was initially called in response to questions raised about how best to manage growth and prevent school overcrowding.

At the initial meeting, Summit members agreed that they collectively favored “sustainable, balanced growth” as opposed to “unbridled development.” They strongly indicated that they did not want to become another indistinguishable Chicago suburb, but rather wanted to retain and strengthen DeKalb’s identity as a university community in a rural setting.
Over the past decade, the City of DeKalb’s population grew at a modest rate of 1% annually, but new residential projects now underway would likely increase the growth rate to approximately 2% annually. It was projected that with the City would grow from its present population of 40,000+ person to slightly more than 50,000 by the end of the decade. In addition, the Town of Cortland and the Village of Malta were experiencing increased development pressure, and both communities were independently working on policies that would likely increase the growth rate in their respective communities.

Regarding the participating jurisdictions’ capacity to accommodate new development, the Sanitary District projected that the existing treatment plant would accommodate a total population approaching 60,000 and could then be expanded. The City’s water supply and water main system had sufficient supply and pressure to serve the expanded community, facilitated by the recent tapping of the Troy Valley aquifer and the completion of the radium-treatment facilities. Though traffic counts around the community have increased over time, transportation, like sewage treatment capacity and water supply, would not likely place constraints on future development. City services (e.g. fire, police, and public works) and Park District facilities would continue to experience increased demand, but these costs could be offset by an expanding tax base, exactions and impact fees required of new developments.

Northern Illinois University has been a major factor in regional growth as enrollment has grown from 23,000 to 25,000 students, though the balance of resident versus commuter students remains unclear. To combat significant state budget cuts and increased application rates, the University would like to maintain a stable student population of approximately 25,000 for the foreseeable future. The University’s plans for the development of its 240-acre Far West Campus area have also been slowed due to the state’s budget cuts, but this area continues to hold significant potential for the expansion of the University’s campus resources.

The Summit Committee found that the DeKalb School District would most likely be the limiting constraint, as the District reported that the Equalized Assessed Value (EAV) of new development was not keeping pace with the accompanying demand for increased services demand. Also, the delay between the occupation of residential units and the initial collection of property taxes creates a gap between when costs are increased and when revenues can be collected. The District concluded that at the current growth rate, residential development will strain its finances and lead to school overcrowding.
At the conclusion of the Growth Summit process, the Committee reached consensus on ten “Points of Agreement” that would serve as the foundation for considering future development management policies. The Committee’s conclusions included:

1. Increasing the portion of the City’s EAV derived from non-residential uses from its current 41% share to at least 50% should be a long-term objective of the City of DeKalb.

2. The most effective way to increase non-residential EAV is to develop strategies and financial incentives for attracting new industrial development to the area.

3. Population growth resulting from new residential development should be kept at less than 2% per year until the EAV provided by industrial and commercial development is substantially increased.

4. Analysis of the fiscal impact that development proposals may have on the city and other taxing bodies should become a regular part of the planning review process.

5. Smaller scale residential projects are seen as preferable to large scale residential subdivisions that tend to attract young families with school age children.

6. Promoting infill development and revitalizing existing neighborhoods by focusing new capital investment to these areas is a preferred strategy for building the City's tax base.

7. The idea of "linked development" was supported as a concept; "linked development" seeks to balance new housing construction with the simultaneous construction of new commercial or industrial development in order to build the tax base.

8. There is a recognition that DeKalb is a University town and that fact makes the city fundamentally different from the Chicago suburbs and from nearby rural communities in the quality of life it offers. This difference should become part of the area’s economic development and marketing strategy.

9. The recommendations of the Growth Summit should be formalized as part of DeKalb’s Comprehensive Plan’s statement of policy to be discussed by the City Council.

10. After the work of the Summit Committee has been concluded there is a continuing need for strategic planning and public and private sector cooperation on growth management issues.
Other than specifying the desire for fiscal impact analyses to be conducted when considering new developments, the Growth Summit Committee did not specify particular strategies for realizing these goals. The Points of Agreement have left considerable room for further interpretation, which prompted the DeKalb Plan Commission and City Council to discuss the Growth Summit findings on several occasions following the Summit's conclusion. On May 10, 2004, the City Council approved Resolution 04-27, directing Staff to incorporate the Growth Summit Points of Agreement into the “DeKalb 3D” Comprehensive Plan Update.

The Plan Commission, in the context of the Update process, incorporated nine of the ten Findings into the “Desired Development Direction” Update, which are reflected in the Policy Recommendations. However, the Plan Commission excluded Finding #5, pertaining to smaller scale developments to “large scale residential subdivisions that tend to attract young families with school age children.”

The Commission expressed concern about statements that discourage master planning and the accompanying ability to coordinate the efficient provision of infrastructure and services. A series of smaller projects cobbled together increase the risk of incompatible developments or increased capital and/or maintenance costs for the developer, the City, and other taxing bodies. Larger projects also enjoy certain efficiencies, particularly the ability to provide greater community facilities (schools, parks, trails, etc.) than what could be gained from several smaller projects.

In light of recent fiscal difficulties, DeKalb will continue to be particularly sensitive to the impacts of new development on the school district. However, families with children often provide economic, social and educational stimuli as they buy clothes and books, become involved in civic and recreational events, and introduce new ideas to their families. Though young families with children may be a target market for some builders, their comparative lack of accumulated wealth often limits their housing options and prevents them from taking advantage of new housing construction. More likely, young families may be attracted to the area for educational or employment opportunities, which fuel the community’s vibrancy. This segment of the community will still need attainable housing, which is more likely to be found in DeKalb’s existing housing stock.
CHAPTER III. COMMUNITY PROFILE

This summary provides the context in which the community's "Desired Development Direction" was considered and the Plan Recommendations were developed. The Growth Summit deliberations also included consideration of this information, which provided a starting point for their discussions and a foundation for their findings.

Figure 2. Change in Total Populations 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>Population Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of DeKalb</td>
<td>39,018*</td>
<td>35,076**</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb County</td>
<td>88,869</td>
<td>77,932</td>
<td>11,037</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>12,419,293</td>
<td>11,430,602</td>
<td>988,691</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A Special Census conducted in 2004 estimated total population at 42,579, but no new demographic data was collected.
** The original 1990 Census population for DeKalb was reported at 34,925. Even though this figure was revised to 35,076 after a successful challenge, the supporting data was not changed. Consequently, all of the 1990 data reported is based on the original 34,925 figure.

Much of the DeKalb's population growth between 1990 and 2000 can be attributed to increases in racial/ethnic diversity. Over this period, the Black population grew from 1,604 to 3,508 people (119% increase) and the Asian population grew from 1,502 to 1,796 (20% increase). Individuals who identified themselves as being of Latino ethnicity increased from 1,425 to 3,527 (108% increase). Due to the structuring of the Census questions, individuals who identified themselves as "Other races" may also include Latinos.

Figure 3. DeKalb Racial/Ethnic Populations Comparison - 2000 U.S. Census

![DeKalb Racial/Ethnic Population - 1990](image)
![DeKalb Racial/Ethnic Population - 2000](image)
Comparison of the population pyramids for the City of DeKalb, DeKalb County, and the State of Illinois graphically shows the demographic effect of Northern Illinois University. As of the year 2000, nearly 30% of DeKalb's total population was between the ages of 20-24, with another large segment in the 15-19 age cohort. DeKalb County's overall population reflects a similar profile, though the percentage of the County's population that can be attributed to NIU students is lessened.

The population pyramids show DeKalb, as a university community, differs from the "typical" population distribution in Illinois. The large segment of college-age students will affect other socio-economic measures, such as depressing average household incomes without reflecting the amount of disposable income they might bring to the community.
A "household" defines one or more people living together as a single housekeeping unit, excluding individuals living in "group homes" such as University residence halls, rooming houses, and nursing homes.

Between 1990 and 2000, the number of households in DeKalb grew 23.9%, from 10,557 to 13,081 households, which is a greater rate of change than the 11.2% growth in total population. The average household size grew slightly, from 2.42 to 2.44 people per household. The overall percentage of family households relative to non-family households did not change appreciably between 1990 and 2000, indicating consistent growth in both family and non-family households. Sixty-three percent (63%) of all households included either one or two people; approximately 80% of all households included three or fewer people.

The overall population in group quarters declined from 9,319 to 7,374 by the year 2000. Though the nursing home population more than doubled (117%), residence halls saw a 12% decline in their occupancy. By 2000, rooming houses and other group quarters were reduced to one-thirteenth (7%) of their 1990 populations. The decline in residence hall occupancy can be somewhat attributed to the closing and renovation of some of the NIU residence halls, which reopened with fewer beds. The overall declines in group living is also consistent with anecdotal observations that University students have become more inclined to live in 2-4 bedroom apartments than live in group situations.
In 2000, the City of DeKalb included 13,619 housing units, of which 96% were occupied. The proportion of owner-occupied housing units to renter-occupied units remained relatively constant from 1990 to 2000, with 42% of the occupied housing stock (13,081 units) being owner-occupied. This ratio is further indicative of the University students' presence in the community, as the percentage of owner-occupied units is considerably lower than neighboring Sycamore's (69%), the County's (60%), or the State of Illinois' as a whole (67%).

DeKalb has experienced considerable turnover in segments of its population as they move to and from the community. According to the Census, only 33% of its population lived in the same house in 2000 as they did in 1995. This is low compared to the County's and the State's (46% and 57%, respectively) percentages of their populations staying in the same residence for five years. Of the residents who lived in a different house in 1995, only 28% now living in DeKalb came from DeKalb County; 61% of these new residents came from a different County within Illinois, and the remaining 11% moved from another state.

The Census Bureau reports that from 1990 to 2000, DeKalb saw an increase of 1,078 workers to a total of 18,871. By 2000, 26% of DeKalb's workers are estimated to commute to a workplace outside of DeKalb County. This is an increase from the 18% of the workforce that worked outside the County in 1990, reflecting the growing socio-economic connections between DeKalb and the surrounding areas, particularly the Chicago metropolitan area to the east.

More detailed information about workforce travel patterns are not available for the City of DeKalb itself, but the Census Bureau reported statistics for home-work trips at the county level. Of the estimated 44,798 workers in DeKalb County, 31% travel to jobs in the Chicago metropolitan area. Kane County (6,468 workers, 15% of resident workers) is the largest workplace destination outside of DeKalb County, followed by DuPage County (2,857 workers, 6% of resident workers) and Cook County (2,221 workers, 5% of resident workers). Somewhat surprisingly, only 1,007 (2% of DeKalb County's workers) travel north toward Winnebago, Boone or Stephenson Counties for their jobs.

In return, only 3,833 (10%) of the estimated 37,640 jobs in DeKalb are filled by commuters from the Chicago metropolitan area. Only 2% of the workforce is drawn from the north (Winnebago, Boone and Stephenson Counties); 5% of the workforce resides west of DeKalb in Ogle, Lee and Whiteside Counties, while 3% come from the south (LaSalle, Bureau and Grundy Counties).
Though the numbers of commuters driving to work did not change significantly between 1990-2000, there was a decline in the use of transit for trips to work. The number of people walking to work also declined, possibly due to more workers having to travel to the Chicago metropolitan area.

Travel times also saw a shift as fewer people had commutes to work that were under twenty minutes. The number of commuters with 60+ minute commutes more than doubled over the ten-year period. By 2000, 18% of workers who did not work at home had a commute of 40 or minutes, up from 10% in 1990.
The educational levels attained by DeKalb's residents reflect one of NIU's influences on the community's character. Eighty-seven percent (87%) hold a high school diploma, which is somewhat higher than the State as a whole (76%). DeKalb distinguishes itself as a "university community" from the rest of the state as 36% have earned a bachelor's degree (24% statewide), and 17% hold an advanced degree (9% statewide).

Figure 10. DeKalb Employment By Industry – 2000 U.S. Census
NIU’s role in the local economy is highlighted in Figure 10, as 24% of DeKalb’s workforce was employed in “Educational Services” in 2000. Fifteen percent (15%) of the workforce was employed by DeKalb’s growing retail sector, while manufacturing jobs were occupied by 13% of DeKalb’s workforce.

Figure 11 compares the median household incomes of different age groups from DeKalb, DeKalb County, and the State of Illinois. The median household incomes for younger households in DeKalb and DeKalb County reflect the presence of the university students. These students generally have lower incomes while in school, though the income available to them (after school costs) has been observed to be largely disposable. The higher median incomes for the State of Illinois reflect the affluence of the communities in northeastern Illinois, which also corresponds to a higher cost of living.

Though the situations of individual households are not revealed by the median household incomes, the numbers contribute toward understanding the community’s relationship between affluence and housing cost. The banking industry often uses a quick multiplier of three times the household income to estimate the mortgage a household could afford. Based on this multiplier, the “typical” 35-44 year-old householder could potentially afford a mortgage of $155,220. A comparison of this amount to current housing prices could provide an insight on the affordability of existing housing stock or new residential construction in DeKalb.

**Figure 11. Median Household Income by Age of Householder – 2000 U.S. Census**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Householder</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of DeKalb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 years</td>
<td>$15,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>$35,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>$51,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>$59,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>$39,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>$30,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$35,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12 compares the poverty status for DeKalb households in 1990 and 2000, as determined by the Census Bureau. Between 1990 and 2000, the Census Bureau reported that there was a net increase of 97 poverty households in DeKalb. However, the percentage of poverty households relative to the total population declined from 24% to 21% of DeKalb households. The number of senior households (65+ years) in poverty also declined, with a net reduction of 37 households in spite of a 24% increase in the number of 65+ households.

*Figure 12. City of DeKalb Poverty Status*

*By Age Household Types – 1990-2000 U.S. Census*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>At or Above Poverty Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>At or Above Poverty Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,682</td>
<td>24,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 65 Years</td>
<td>6,533</td>
<td>22,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In married couple families</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>14,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other families</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>3,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife present</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>1,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated individuals</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>4,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 Years</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In married couple families</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated individuals</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ Years</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In married couple families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated individuals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2005 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
As the largest employer in DeKalb, changes at NIU often have significant impacts on the community as a whole. Figure 13 shows the change in enrollments at Northern Illinois University from 1990 to 2003. Over this period, the total enrollment at NIU grew by only 3.1%, reaching a peak enrollment over 25,000 students in 2003.

Over this same period, the Office of Institutional Research reported a 27% increase in the number of freshmen applications, though the number of freshmen accepted grew by only 10%. The increased number of applications may reflect the current economic environment, as well as the continued growth of NIU's stature as an academic institution. Actual enrollments remained relatively constant over the 13-year period, with 3,239 new freshmen and 2,233 transfer students enrolled in Fall 2003.

**Figure 13. Northern Illinois University**

**Fall Enrollment Headcounts 1990-2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>18,220</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>24,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>18,220</td>
<td>6,378</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>24,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>17,437</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>24,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>16,805</td>
<td>6,062</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>23,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>16,423</td>
<td>6,129</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>22,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>15,760</td>
<td>6,158</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>22,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>15,387</td>
<td>5,928</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>21,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>15,855</td>
<td>5,947</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>22,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>16,341</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>22,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>16,893</td>
<td>5,674</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>22,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>17,151</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>23,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>17,468</td>
<td>6,012</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>23,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18,104</td>
<td>6,513</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>24,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>18,275</td>
<td>6,651</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>25,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NIU Office of Institutional Research*
CHAPTER IV. POPULATION & DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

As a component of the “DeKalb 3D” Comprehensive Plan Update, Staff prepared draft population projections for the Plan Commission’s review and consideration. The purpose of these projections is to help evaluate possible growth scenarios based on the development decisions that may be considered by the City in the next 5-10 years. The projections are not meant to reflect a “desired” or recommended course of action, but are provided to help demonstrate the linkages between development activity that the City may consider and its resulting population growth.

As of the 2000 Census, DeKalb’s population was set at 39,018 people living in 13,619 dwelling units. The number of dwelling units identified by the Census was similar to the 13,333 dwelling units the City’s records, supporting the premise that the Census Bureau’s numbers are reasonable starting points for projections. A Special Census was concluded in January 2004, which identified a new total population of 42,579, corresponding to a 9.1% total growth rate over the four-year period. Figure 14 shows the number of dwelling units constructed by type since July 1999. The table depicts the transition from multi-family construction to single-family-attached construction, accompanied by an increase in single-family-detached construction in FY 2004.

Figure 14. DeKalb Residential Building Permits FY 1999-2004
Three methodologies were used to project DeKalb’s population growth:

A) Exponential growth rate based on past building permits issued between 1990 and 2004.

B) Development capacity model, based on the number of building permits issued since the 2004 Special Census; this method estimates that there are approximately 1,400 dwelling units in the “development pipeline” that have been approved but not yet built, and that an additional 350 units are built annually thereafter.

C) Linear extrapolation, using projection rates of 1%, 2% and 3% per year, primarily intended as a benchmark.

In comparing the three methodologies, Method B, which relies on past and future building permits, appears to best capture anticipated population growth from new development. As of November 2004, approximately 1,400 dwelling units (both single-family-detached and attached) have been approved but not yet built. Assuming that an average of 350 dwelling units are built annually, the current supply of approved dwelling units would be exhausted by 2010, resulting in a projected population of approximately 48,000. To reach the target population of 50,000, additional units will need to be added to the development pipeline.

![Table of Population Projections to 2030](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method A (Exponential Building Permit Growth)</th>
<th>Method B (&quot;Pipeline Buildout&quot; by 2010 + 350 units/year after)</th>
<th>1% Growth</th>
<th>2% Growth</th>
<th>3% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>35,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>39,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>42,579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>43,770</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>43,430</td>
<td>43,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>50,140</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>50,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>57,220</td>
<td>52,240</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>52,940</td>
<td>58,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>65,870</td>
<td>56,470</td>
<td>49,930</td>
<td>58,450</td>
<td>68,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>76,650</td>
<td>60,710</td>
<td>52,470</td>
<td>64,540</td>
<td>79,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>89,820</td>
<td>64,940</td>
<td>55,150</td>
<td>71,250</td>
<td>91,830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16. DeKalb Population Projections by Methodology

Method A
(Exponential building permit growth):
50,140 in Year 2010

3% Growth Rate:
50,840 in Year 2010

2% Growth Rate:
50,890 in Year 2013

Method B
(Permit buildout by 2010 + 350 units/year after):
50,550 in Year 2013

2004 Special Census:
50,840 in Year 2010

2000 Census:
42,579 pop.

1% Growth Rate:
50,430 in Year 2021
As demonstrated in Figure 16, DeKalb’s population can be expected to reach approximately 50,000 in 2012-2013 given current trends. The projections using Method B “Pipeline Buildout” are consistent with the 2% growth rate that was discussed during the Growth Summit process. These projections suggest that a steady buildout of the permitted dwelling units, with modest, periodic increases in additional units, will advance the City toward its target population of 50,000 over the next 8-10 years.

**SCHOOL ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS**

Figure 17 shows the projection of school-age children that might be generated by the projected construction of new dwelling units. The projection is based on the population-equivalents table in the UDO and on the assumption that approximately two-thirds (2/3) of the new units will be single-family-detached, with the remaining one-third (1/3) being single-family-attached. The table shows the number of units constructed in 2004 following the Special Census certification; the buildout of the “pipeline” units not yet built, and the construction of approximately 350 units per year thereafter.

**Figure 17. DeKalb School Enrollment Projections Based on Projected Dwelling Units 2004-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units Constructed Jan. 2004 – Feb. 2005</th>
<th>Students Generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family-Detached</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family-Attached</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildout of “Pipeline” Units (2005-2009)</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>K-4</th>
<th>5-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family-Detached (2/3)</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family-Attached (1/3)</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected New Units (2009-2014)</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>K-4</th>
<th>5-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family-Detached (2/3)</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family-Attached (1/3)</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Total Students Added**

|                | 914 | 710 | 517 |

*Source: City of DeKalb Building Permit Data FY 2004, FY 2005; Unified Development Ordinance*
The developments in which these units are located are required to contribute school impact fees in accordance with the requirements in UDO Article 8.01. Since 1996, the Bridges of Rivermist PUD was the only development that contributed land to meet its school impact requirements. The land and site improvements provided by the Rivermist development resulted in the construction of the Brooks Elementary School, which was constructed with proceeds from a successful School District referendum.

In planning for future enrollments, the DeKalb School District also prepared enrollment projections from 2005 to 2014. Figure 18 shows projected enrollments based on the survival-cohort method, which tracks changes in past years to affect future years' enrollments. To accommodate a community growth factor, the projections include a 1.88% annual increase in the size of the kindergarten classes starting 2009-2014.

**Figure 18. School District 428 Enrollment Projections Based on Historic Enrollments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Enrollment</th>
<th>K-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>4,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>4,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>4,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>5,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>5,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>5,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>5,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>5,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
<th>K-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>5,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>5,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>5,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>5,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>6,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>6,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>6,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>6,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>6,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2,917</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>6,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cumulative Change 2004-2014 | 378 | 130 | 241 | 749 |

Source: DeKalb School District 428 Enrollment Projections Through 2014
The two sets of projections are intended to provide general direction on the projected school impacts associated with both new development and with natural changes in annual class sizes. While both sets of projections attempt to address the same question, neither methodology is capable of encompassing the full impacts of changes in the community. Fluctuations in birth, mortality and migration rates, as well as changes in the region’s economy, all contribute toward discrepancies between projected and actual school enrollments.

Further difficulty in predicting school enrollments is reflected by Figure 19. This graphic compares the projected school enrollments from 2000-2003 based on the UDO school impact tables to the actual change in enrollment. As the graph shows, the UDO population tables appear to overstate the number of anticipated elementary students compared to actual enrollment change over the three-year period.

At the same time, the projections based on the UDO appear to undercount the number of high school students while slightly overstating the number of middle school students. However, it is possible that other community factors, such as natural growth and migration rates not associated with new construction, may also be adding high school students to the District’s enrollments. It is also possible that the building activity occurring in Cortland, which is not reflected in DeKalb’s building permit counts, is also having an impact on the High School’s enrollment.

The discrepancy is magnified when considering the changes in actual enrollment are for the entire district, including Cortland and Malta, while the projected enrollment is based on DeKalb’s building activity alone. While new construction has some impact on elementary schools, it appears that the recent developments are having a greater impact on DeKalb’s middle and high schools.

As discussed during the Growth Summit process, the School District’s capacity for additional students is a primary limitation on the size and speed at which the community may grow. Changes in housing construction rates, due to changes in the regional economy, affects the number of new households and potential school children added to the community each year. Planning for future years’ school capital needs is further influenced by fluctuations in natural birth, death and migration rates, compounding the difficulty in projecting future needs.
Figure 19. Comparison of Projected and Actual Change In DeKalb School District Enrollment 2001-2003

Figure 21 compares the existing school capital facilities to the 2004-2005 school year enrollment. This comparison shows that the School District has been able to manage the allocation of elementary school children to the available classrooms, primarily through periodic redistricting. Though new development may contribute to increased elementary school needs, the Jefferson, Lincoln and Littlejohn Schools are at or near their capacity limits. These schools are located in older, established neighborhoods in which new construction has not occurred for some time. This pattern suggests that DeKalb's older neighborhoods may be renewing themselves, as older households transition to younger households with school children.

Though it appears that there is adequate capacity for additional middle school students, the changes in enrollment from 2001-2003 (Figure 20) indicate that this student group will continue to grow. Over time, additional facilities will need to be added as new residential developments occur.
### Figure 20. DeKalb School District Comparison of School Capacity and Enrollment 2004-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class Rooms</th>
<th>Capacity*</th>
<th>2004-2005 Enrollment</th>
<th>Available Capacity (+ / -)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary (K-5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesebro</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>+47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littlejohn</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>+75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>+53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright (Malta H.S.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>+181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School (6-8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>+39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntley</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>+168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School Total</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>+207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DeKalb High School (9-12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>-164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>-164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* School Capacity as defined by School District projections
Source: DeKalb Community Unit School District 428 Enrollment Projections

As the current high school enrollment exceeds the School District’s desired capacity for the school, adding capacity to the School District appears to be the primary need. Though the enrollment exceeds the stated capacity, the School District is still able to accommodate the education of its students. High school students from households added by new construction or by natural birth rates may play roles in creating the capacity gap. The capacity gap may also be widened as the School District’s standards and requirements change. Limits on class sizes, increased space-per-student ratios, and new federal or state requirements may all contribute to the need for additional high school capacity.
CURRENT LAND USES

Figure 21 compares the acreages for each land use category for the 1995 and 2004 Current Land Use Maps. Since the last Comprehensive Plan update, the City’s developed land area increased by 1,868 acres (34% increase from 1995 total). The City’s residential areas expanded by 384 acres (20%), though residential uses were a smaller percentage of the total land area in 2004. The modest increases in Medium- and High-Density residential areas reflect the community’s transition from building out its multi-family areas to construction of low-density residential uses. The increases in Industrial and Transportation/Utilities mirror the City’s success in developing its industrial areas, particularly with the addition of several new distribution centers on the City’s south side.

Figure 21. DeKalb Land Use Comparison –1995-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>1995 Land Use (1996 Update)</th>
<th>2004 Land Use (Current)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Acres</td>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Single Family</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial / Office Research</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation / Utilities</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights-of-way</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Land</td>
<td>5,428</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers &amp; Ponds</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant &amp; Agricultural</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TRANSPORTATION

In 2002, the U.S. Census Bureau designed the DeKalb-Sycamore area as a new “urbanized” metropolitan area with a combined population exceeding 50,000. With this designation, the DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS), a new metropolitan planning organization (MPO), was formed to provide transportation planning and programming assistance to the area. DSATS also provides a forum for discussing regional transportation issues.

DSATS started the development of a Long Range Transportation Plan, which provides a 20+ year horizon for considering transportation investments and issues in the DeKalb-Sycamore area. The Long Range Transportation Plan integrates the comprehensive plans from DeKalb, Sycamore, Cortland, and DeKalb County with NIU’s and IDOT’s long-range plans to provide a foundation for considering future transportation decisions.

URS Inc. was retained to complete the Plan, which is to be completed in the Spring 2005 with assistance with DSATS staff, provided by the City of DeKalb Community Development Department. As a starting point for considering the City’s roadways, Figure 22 shows traffic counts taken in 2002-2003. Additional information including truck counts, bikeways and pedestrian routes, railroad information, and airport development will be presented in the final document.

RLS Associates was also retained to provide a detailed analysis of the transit services operating in the DeKalb area. This study will also be completed in Spring 2005 and will provide guidance for enhancing the area’s transit services.

Once the Long Range Transportation Plan is completed, the information and recommendations from the Plan may be adopted by the City of DeKalb as an element of its updated Comprehensive Plan.
Figure 22. DeKalb-Sycamore Area Daily Traffic Volumes – 2002-2003 Counts

Legend
- Future Minor Collector (Rural) ▲ Major Collector
- Proposed Major Collector (Urban) ▼ Minor Arterial
- Proposed Minor Arterial (Urban) ▲ Bike Trails
- Interstate ▲ Major Collector
- Major Arterial ▼ Minor Collector

Source: DSATS, IDOT

Source: URS Inc. – Draft DSATS Long Range Transportation Plan 2005
CHAPTER V. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The "DeKalb 3D" Comprehensive Plan update provides an opportunity to revisit the goals and objectives stated in the 1996 Plan, while also providing a forum for refining the strategies for realizing the community's desired development direction. The "Overall Goals" stated in the 1996 Comprehensive Plan, as stated below, remain valid in considering the community's present and future development trends:

- **Promote and protect public health, safety and welfare of the City's residents.**
- **Protect and enhance the local economic, social and cultural climate.**
- **Provide an appropriate amount and arrangement of land uses for the future expansion of the City.**
- **Conserve natural resources and protect natural floodplain.**
- **Efficiently provide for essential public services and utilities.**

Through both the "DeKalb 3D" and the Growth Summit processes, DeKalb's citizens and leaders have articulated policies and strategies that refine the goals stated in the 1990 and 1996 Plans. These complementary elements to DeKalb's community development practices reflect the community's involvement and concern with the future direction of the community.

The following sections categorize the policies and strategies articulated through both the "DeKalb 3D" and the "Growth Summit" processes. The stated goals and strategies are accompanied by an explanation of how these elements contribute toward the community's "desired development direction."
POLICY: OVERALL POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Through the Growth Summit process, community leaders identified a population of 50,000 as a desirable and realistic target to be reached within the next decade.

This target population is a quantitative measure that attempts to reflect the qualitative aspects of the community’s maintenance of its character, quality of life, and economic and fiscal well-being. Slow, steady progress toward this population total supports several of the goals stated in the 1996 Comprehensive Plan, including “promoting public health and safety,” “protecting local economic, social and cultural climates; and efficiently providing for essential public services.”

DISCUSSION

The target population number was partially derived from the number of approved, but yet unbuilt, dwelling units in the City’s building pipeline. As discussed previously, the desired target population of 50,000 is likely to be achieved within the next decade. Assuming that economic, social and migratory factors remain constant, additional building units, complemented by increased commercial and office/industrial development, would contribute toward a continued slow, stable growth rate for the community.

This approach helps assure that the community does not quickly outgrow its resources, though the community may grow beyond this threshold should it choose to do so. A continued moderate average growth rate of approximately 2% a year, as seen in the community over the past 14+ years, would help prevent stagnation in the community’s economic or social characteristics. This managed growth rate would also help the community to avoid outgrowing its capacity to provide education, recreation, services and utilities to its population.

Managing the number of total units available will affect the rate at which the community may grow, but attention will need to be paid to ensuring that DeKalb does not lose the ability to provide a variety of housing options to its residents. This caution is consistent with the principles of the Campaign For Smart Growth and other Smart Growth initiatives, which call for a mix of land uses, densities, and housing types in the community to maintain its long-term sustainability.

1996 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REFERENCE

“Goals and Objectives” section, p. 9.
POLICY: FISCAL AND ECONOMIC HEALTH

Through the Growth Summit process, community leaders adopted the following statements to address the fiscal and economic impacts to and by the community's development and its affected jurisdictions:

- Increasing the portion of the City's EAV derived from non-residential uses from its current 41% share to at least 50% should be a long-term objective of the City of DeKalb.

- The most effective way to increase non-residential EAV is to develop strategies and financial incentives for attracting new industrial development to the City.

- "Linked Development" was supported as a concept; "linked development" seeks to balance new housing construction with the simultaneous construction of new commercial or industrial development in order to build the tax base.

- Population growth resulting from new residential development should be kept at less than 2% per year until the EAV provided by industrial and commercial development is substantially increased.

- Analysis of the fiscal impact that development proposals may have on the city and other taxing bodies should become a regular part of the planning review process.

The application of a "linked development" strategy will support the taxing bodies' abilities to cover the costs of providing services. If the balance in property taxes were to reach 50% residential / 50% nonresidential EAV, the School District and other taxing bodies would be well-positioned to manage the costs associated with new residential development. The concept of "linked development" is not intended as a "no-growth" strategy. Instead it raises the expectation that nonresidential development will accompany residential projects, moving the community closer toward its desired 50%/50% EAV balance. Further examination will be required to determine the appropriate jobs-housing balance.

The fiscal impact analysis is one of several tools used to evaluate the potential impacts of a proposed project on the larger community. The development of a fiscal impact analysis model is included in the "Tool Box" recommendations of this Comprehensive Plan Update.
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POLICY: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

The following density ranges will be applied to Residential land use categories shown on the Development Plan Map:

**Low Density Single-Family Residential:** 0-4 units per net acre, with primary emphasis on single-family-detached units and owner-occupied single-family-attached units.

**Medium Density Residential:** 4-8 units per net acre, primarily intended for small lot single-family-detached units, two-family and townhouse units, condominiums, and small (8 units or fewer) multi-family developments.

**High Density Residential:** 8-12 units per net acre, inclusive of the existing multi-family residential developments that exceed this range.

The 1996 Comprehensive Plan Update established the current density ranges for the three residential land use categories shown on the Development Plan Map. The Plan called for density ranges of 0-7 units for Low Density, 7-12 for Medium Density, and 12-17 for High Density Residential. These ranges were accompanied by recommendations to reduce the maximum density permitted by right in the UDO from 17 units/acre to 12 or 14 units/acre. The Update also included a recommendation to consider creating a second multi-family zoning district with a higher maximum density to avoid making many of the existing multi-family developments nonconforming.

Since 1996, the City Council reduced the maximum density permitted in the MFR Multi-Family Residential district from 17 to 14 units per acre, and then from 14 to 12 units per acre. With this change, many of the existing multi-family developments are nonconforming, a status that has discouraged reinvestment and deters redevelopment. The creation of a second multi-family zoning district is one solution that would allow denser properties to remain as conforming uses. Restrictions could then be placed on the density at which those properties could be redeveloped.

Projects recently approved by the City Council have fit a model concept of single-family-detached residential units on 9,000-11,000 s.f. lots, consistent with the altered density ranges for Low Density and Medium Density Residential stated in this Update.
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POLICY: COMMUNITY CHARACTER

The Growth Summit Findings included elements that establish the "desired development direction" of the community's character. These policy statements provide guidance in balancing the influences of the university, suburban and rural elements of the community.

• There is a recognition that DeKalb is a university town and that fact makes the city fundamentally different from the Chicago suburbs and from nearby rural communities in the quality of life it offers. This difference should become part of the area's economic development and marketing strategy.

• Promoting infill development and revitalizing existing neighborhoods by focusing new capital investment to these areas is a preferred strategy for building the City's tax base.

Recognition of DeKalb as a university town lends itself toward supporting community and economic development strategies that maintain DeKalb's uniqueness. The presence of Northern Illinois University provides cultural and social opportunities that are broader than what may be found in a community of a comparable size. The City, the University, the Chamber of Commerce, Main Street/DeKalb, and other entities presently work together to promote DeKalb as a “communiversity,” a unique place that takes advantage of the best elements of the university, suburban, and agricultural heritage influences that shape the community’s development.

Managing the character of the community requires consideration of the quality of its housing stock, which will be the foundation for DeKalb's future historic districts or rehabilitation projects. Careful management of the number and the quality of new housing units will enable to the community to:

• provide opportunities for both new owner-occupied and rental units, particularly those of a higher value;
• preserve the quality, appearance and values of the existing housing stock;
• encourage master planning of larger tracts of land to ensure the efficient provision of infrastructure and services, and
• protect against large residential developments that lack quality or variety in design or appearance.
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POLICY: "SMART GROWTH" BEST PRACTICES

Consistent with current planning practice, the City of DeKalb will uphold the "Smart Growth" principles articulated by the American Planning Association (APA). The APA "Smart Growth" principles are applied to the community’s planning activities to guide, design, develop, revitalize and build communities that:

- have a unique sense of community and place;
- preserve and enhance valuable natural and cultural resources;
- equitably distribute the costs and benefits of development;
- expand the range of transportation, employment and housing choices in a fiscally responsible manner;
- value long-range, regional considerations of sustainability over short term incremental geographically isolated actions; and
- promotes public health and healthy communities.

Other organizations have adopted similar statements about growth management and “best practices” for implementing their goals. The Smart Growth principles employed by the City of DeKalb build upon policy statements by the Smart Growth Network (“Smart Growth Online”) and the Campaign For Sensible Growth (“Sensible Tools For Healthy Communities”). The Smart Growth principles employed by the City of DeKalb:

1. Create a range of housing opportunities and choices.
2. Create walkable neighborhoods.
3. Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place.
4. Make development decisions predictable, fair and cost effective.
5. Mix land uses.
6. Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty and critical environmental areas.
7. Provide a variety of transportation choices.
8. Strengthen and direct development towards existing communities.
9. Take advantage of compact building design.
Many of the Smart Growth principles articulated by the APA have been practiced by the City of DeKalb, though without being labeled as such. The following “best practices” will continue to be employed by the City as new developments and redevelopment projects are considered:

1. **Use of Planned Unit Developments (PUD)** – The City has required most new developments to be developed as PUDs. This process establishes customized zoning, flexibility in considering unique features of the property, and to apply greater control over the development’s design and appearance.

2. **Density Bonuses** – The City’s Planned Unit Development ordinance (UDO Article 5.13) identifies several density bonuses tied to performance criteria.

3. **Required connections to adjacent developments**, including interconnected streets and efficient extension of infrastructure – The City requires the streets and infrastructure for new developments to connect to existing infrastructure; this provides continuity between neighborhoods as well efficiency in providing urban services.

4. **Required sidewalks / pedestrian pathways** – All new developments are presently required to construct sidewalks and/or trails.

5. **Using overlay zones** – The City has established overlay zoning districts to protect the City’s floodplains and the South Annie Glidden Road Corridor; additional overlay zones may be applied to other sensitive areas in the City, such as the community’s primary entrances.

6. **Retrofit/redevelopment of existing development**, particularly the reuse of underutilized buildings – The City has several efforts presently underway, including the East Lincoln Highway corridor plan, plans for the Pleasant Street, Greek Row and North Fifth Ward neighborhoods, and programs for revitalizing the downtown through Main Street/DeKalb Inc.

7. **Mixed-income housing** – Many of DeKalb’s older neighborhoods provide ranges of homeownership and rental options and prices; recent new developments that provide mixed-income options include Eden’s Garden (integrates subsidized housing units) and Summit Enclave (provides a variety of configurations and prices for single-family-attached dwelling units).

8. **Prepare “special areas” plans** – Subsequent planning efforts will target specific corridors and neighborhoods in need of further evaluation.
9. **Minimizing impermeable surfaces** – The UDO identifies landscaping, open space, and setback requirements to avoid large expanses of impermeable surfaces, particularly parking lots; the City’s PUD and subdivision provisions also include open space and park requirements.

10. **Require adequate facilities and infrastructure** – New developments have been required to provide the infrastructure needed to serve their projects; the identification of needs continues to evolve in response to community expectations and, particularly in planning for future municipal and school capital needs.

11. **Strategic use of federal housing assistance programs** – The City continues to use its federal Community Development Block Grant (CBDG) funds to support housing rehabilitation, first-time homebuyers with down payment assistance, and assistance to area human services providers.

12. **Streamlined permitting processes** – The City’s building permit, site plan and development application processes have been streamlined to simplify processes for applicants and to improve administrative efficiency.

Other best practices recommended by the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Update:

13. **Urban Services Area** – The City establishes an Urban Services Area to ensure the development of a compact and contiguous community.

14. **Identify valuable natural features** – The City’s Visual Character Map identifies natural features to be incorporated into new developments.

15. **“Cluster” or “Conservation” development** – This practice attempts to maximize the amount of land set aside as permanent open space, while increasing the efficiency of providing and maintaining infrastructure. The same number of dwelling units are provided in a smaller geographic area, resulting in fewer lanes miles of road to plow, fewer lineal feet of water mains and sewers to repair, and opportunities for centralized amenities.

16. **Promotion of “transit ready” development** – The City will evaluate likely transit ridership from new developments and their relation to existing transit service routes; street design, such as turning radii and pavement thickness, will also be considered where ridership is likely to be higher, particularly in student-oriented and multi-family areas.
CHAPTER VI.  IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The Growth Summit Findings included elements that establish the “desired development direction” of the community's character. These policy statements provide guidance in balancing the influences of the university, suburban and rural elements of the community.

STRATEGY: URBAN SERVICES AREA
During the community discussions, City Staff and the Plan Commission heard concerns about “uncontrolled” development that may threaten the character of the community, as well as negatively impact the quality of services and quality of life experienced in DeKalb. To date, the City of DeKalb has only considered development requests that have been adjacent to the municipal boundaries and that could be efficiently served by infrastructure and public services. However, as new development pressures continue to bear on the DeKalb-Sycamore area, requests for the development of outlying properties not contiguous with the City’s boundaries could genuinely impair the provision of urban services and infrastructure.

To best manage new developments that may be proposed for the DeKalb area, an Urban Services Area boundary is shown on the City's Development Plan Map. The Urban Services Area (USA) indicates the areas that can be reasonably served by urban infrastructure and services within the next 5-10 years. Development will be directed toward areas within the delineated USA, resulting in a more compact and contiguous development pattern and in more efficient urban services.

The boundary shown on this map is not intended as an inflexible, definitive boundary of or restriction on future development, as might be reflected by an Urban Growth Boundary. A property within the Urban Services Area is not entitled to development rights, but its inclusion is a prerequisite for considering new development proposals. Conversely, areas outside the Urban Services Area are considered to be missing one or more basic infrastructure or service capacities needed to support urban development.

Over time, the Urban Services Area will be amended to reflect the extension of infrastructure and services to new, and to reflect the impact of market forces on the availability and affordability of developable land. Amendments to the Urban Services Area may be initiated by the City of DeKalb, the DeKalb Sanitary District or other government entities to reflect future infrastructure improvements, most notably water mains and sanitary sewers.
The Urban Services Area may also be amended to accommodate the development of a property not presently within the Area. The burden of demonstrating that an area presently outside of the Urban Services Area can be readily served by urban infrastructure will be placed on the applicant. The developer may be required to construct or contribute toward improvements beyond what would be typically required of a project within the Urban Services Area. If the developer can demonstrate that the proposed development can be efficiently served, and that the development will enhance the area's services and infrastructure, the City will consider amending the Development Plan Map to adjust the Urban Services Area accordingly.

The Urban Services Area complements DeKalb County's planning efforts to discourage rural developments not served by City services. The Urban Services Area channels development driven by the area's market forces toward properties to which municipal services may be made available. This mechanism helps direct potential development pressure away from remote agricultural areas not served by urban infrastructure and services, leaving larger tracts of undeveloped agricultural land located between the County’s urban areas.

**STRATEGY: ANNEXATION AGREEMENTS**

As there are few large tracts of annexed, undeveloped, zoned land available for development within the City limits, the City is empowered to annex and approve individual projects on a case-by-case basis. Individual proposals can be evaluated prior to the granting of development rights typically associated with properties with the City’s differentiated zoning districts (such as “Multi-Family Residential” (MFR), “General Commercial” (GC), etc.). This situation affords the City the luxury of being selective of which projects it chooses to add to its boundaries, at a timing that minimizes the new development’s impacts on the existing built environment.

The primary tools for considering development proposals on a case-by-case basis are the annexation agreement and the City’s planned development process. State statute (65 ILCS 5/11-15.1) allows municipalities to enter into agreements with developments prior to the annexation of property, and provides the flexibility to incorporate consideration of unique characteristics and requirements beyond what is typically found in the municipality’s zoning and subdivision regulations.

The annexation of individual developments allows the City to apply its planned development approval process, which establishes a customized zoning classification and subdivision plans for a particular development. This technique allows the City to consider
the unique features of the subject property when considering its appropriate density, appearance, and overall design.

The City's consideration of development proposals is consistent with DeKalb County's goal to "Encourage compact contiguous growth and development of the community," as stated in the 2004 DeKalb County Unified Comprehensive Plan. This policy was enacted to preserve large tracts of farmland by directing development toward existing urban areas. Continued application of this practice will result in development activity that is "compact" and "contiguous" to the County's existing urban areas and consistent with the County's growth management goals.

The City of DeKalb shall focus its development review process on the approval of an annexation agreement prior to annexing and rezoning property for any new development. When considering new proposed developments, the City of DeKalb will employ the following practices:

1. **Land will not be annexed by the City of DeKalb without an annexation agreement**, nor will land be zoned or planned for development without using the Planned Development process. In considering the potential impacts of the proposed development on the community, the annexation agreement will address the applicant's responsibilities for constructing (or contributing toward) improvements required to serve the development.

2. The Applicant will be required to provide a survey of the property noting **natural features** including, but not limited to, significant tree stands, water features, notable grade changes, or other elements that are unique to a particular tract of land or area. The appropriate development design for the property will preserve these features to the greatest extent possible, recognizing the importance of maintaining the integrity of natural features that may be present, as well as maintaining the appearance/character of the area in which the development is proposed.

3. The proposed development design will be required to consider the intent and elements of the Citizens' Environmental Commission's "Sustainability and Development" (Appendix D) recommendations. The implementation of these provisions will be tailored to the needs and circumstances of individual developments.

4. Annexation agreements are to include the payment of appropriate **capital and traffic impact fees** by the developer to the City of DeKalb.
5. New developments will be designed to be interconnected with existing neighborhoods, particularly by bikeway/sidewalk connections between residential neighborhoods and off-street internal circulation between commercial developments.

6. New residential developments will be expected to provide school and park facilities adequate to address the projected impacts from the development. The annexation agreement provides a mechanism by which the required exactions and capital facilities contributions can be tailored in anticipation of the likely impacts to DeKalb’s school and park systems. Through this approach, new developments will be required to bear the capital costs associated with facilities needed to serve their projects.

**STRATEGY: FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The City shall develop and maintain a Fiscal Impact Model for the community. The model will serve as a primary tool for evaluating a development's potential impact on City and service districts, and their ability to provide quality services.

The fiscal impact model will take into account both the immediate and the global fiscal impacts of a proposed development. A “foundation model” will be developed for the community as a whole, with an emphasis on identifying the ratio of residential to nonresidential tax base. Proposed developments will be entered into the model to identify potential impacts on the community's overall fiscal health.

The application of the model may provide an initial indication whether a project is “good” or “bad” for DeKalb’s fiscal health. The results from this model will also be used as a starting point for considering exactions, impact fees, etc. to be required of new developments. However, the model does not take social or economic factors into account, such as whether a project provides needed jobs with above-average wages or housing that is attainable to DeKalb’s resident workforce. Therefore, as useful as the model may be for evaluating a project’s fiscal impacts, a project will need to be measured against other community goals.

Given the potential impacts of residential development on the School, Park and Sanitary Districts, the fiscal model will need to consider the impacts of proposed developments on these taxing bodies. All of the taxing districts, including the City, can use the impact model as a tool for identifying appropriate staffing and service levels demanded by the new development. As the community continues to grow, the taxing bodies can identify thresholds at which new staffing or capital facilities may need to be added.
STRATEGY: UDO AMENDMENTS
The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) sets forth the City's zoning, development and subdivision regulations. The UDO is one of the principal tools for implementing the policies established by the Comprehensive Plan. Over time, amendments are made to the UDO to clarify inexact language, correct omissions, or adjust practices to better fit the community's development needs. Some of the potential UDO amendments that have been identified by the City Council, Plan Commission, Staff or the public will require policy direction from these groups.

The following policy-oriented UDO amendments are beyond the scope of this Comprehensive Plan update, but will be subsequently addressed:

1. Clarification of the boundaries for areas in which three or four unrelated persons may occupy a single dwelling unit.

2. Development of parking and multi-family density standards for older, existing neighborhoods (e.g. Greek Row, North Fifth Ward) that better serve the goals of those areas.

3. Review of the special use permit requirements for schools, parks, open space and recreational areas in residential zoning districts.

4. Review multi-family residential uses that may be permitted in the “LC” Light Commercial, “GC” General Commercial and “CBD” Central Business District zoning classifications.

5. Revision of the “NC” Neighborhood Commercial and “LC” Light Commercial zoning districts to make them more “transitional” between residential and higher-intensity commercial districts. Potential amendments may include building bulk/size, setback and design standards that retain a residential character.

6. Adoption of transportation impact fee, capital impact fee, and/or public services impact fee,

7. Amendment of UDO Article 8 “Impact Fees” to clarify that the residential impact fee structures are to be applied to properties that are rezoned from a nonresidential to a residential zoning classification.

8. Amendment of the minimum lot dimensions, setback and grade elevation requirements for lots created along collector streets, arterial streets, highways, railroads and interstates, as well as adjacent to more-intensive zoning districts.
9. Implement requirements to increase the minimum standards of quality and appearance through updating and codifying the Urban Design Guidelines. These requirements may include criteria establishing a minimum percentage of brick façade or other natural materials, or minimum landscaping requirements for individual lots.

10. Consideration of requiring overhead utilities, particularly major transmission lines, to be placed in a rear yard or underground. Such requirements may also necessitate updates to the City's franchise agreements with other utility providers.

11. Update of the Visual Character Map, and requirements for incorporating the features it identifies when establishing layouts for new subdivisions. It shall be the developer's responsibility to demonstrate compliance with these requirements, and it shall be the City's discretion to ascertain compliance.

12. Incorporation of Smart Growth principles and practices into the UDO. The City presently employs many of the Smart Growth practices, though they need to be added to the UDO formally in the appropriate sections.

**STRATEGY: SUBSEQUENT PLANNING EFFORTS**

The Plan Commission has identified a number of areas that warrant attention in greater detail than what can be provided through the update of the Comprehensive Plan. Each sub-area has particular needs and opportunities, requiring more-defined strategies for improving these areas. These sub-area plans will be adopted as elements of an evolving Comprehensive Plan, with the recommended strategies being incorporated into annexation agreements, planned developments, or capital programs, providing opportunities for realizing desired community improvements:

- Development of a "Community Entrance Plan/Program" to establish design criteria for properties located at entryways into DeKalb. Overlay zoning districts or other techniques are to be implemented to require increased landscaping and other aesthetic improvements along highly-visible entrances into the community. This recommendation is also consistent with the consideration of protected viewsheds, as identified on the Visual Character Map found in the City's Urban Design Standards and Implementation Plan (adopted 1997).

1. Completion of the East Lincoln Highway Corridor Plan, establishing policy direction and recommended strategies for improving the corridor's appearance and economic vitality.

2. Incorporation of the findings from the Pleasant Street, Greek Row, and North Ward neighborhood plans into the Comprehensive Plan.
3. Development of redevelopment/rehabilitation plans for the following areas: South Fourth Street, West Lincoln Highway, Dodge Addition, Pearl/Gurler, Charter/Culver, and Maplewood neighborhoods; Kishwaukee riverfront areas; C&NW Railroad Station.

4. Update, consolidation and implementation of multiple downtown redevelopment plans and programs. This area has been studied several times since the late 1960s, most recently through the ministrations of the Main Street/DeKalb Inc. organization. Consensus on the “desired direction” for the downtown has been difficult to achieve, and a comprehensive redevelopment plan for the downtown has yet to be formally adopted.

5. Development of the West Side Arterial Corridor Plan to establish the final location of the road alignment, subject to the optimal location for a grade-separated crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad and an at-grade intersection with West Lincoln Highway (IL Route 38). This corridor study will include discussion of the arterial’s design, speed, access management and adjacent land uses, including NIU’s Far West Campus area.

6. The DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the DeKalb-Sycamore area, will provide an opportunity and the resources for the comprehensive examination of this corridor, particularly as it relates to multi-jurisdictional cooperation (City of DeKalb, NIU, DeKalb Township, IDOT, Union Pacific Railroad, and Illinois Tollway Authority). The adoption of the Long Range Transportation Plan as a component of the updated Comprehensive Plan would maintain the City’s consistency in planning for its transportation systems.

7. Incorporation of the NIU Far West Campus Plan into the Comprehensive Plan. NIU Administration is in the process of developing a plan for the development of this 240+ acre area, commonly known as the “Far West Campus.” The development of the Far West Campus Plan provides the City and NIU the opportunity to share and mutually support the implementation of their respective plans, and to coordinate on the development of infrastructure and appropriate land uses for this area.

8. Development of a Comprehensive Bikeways Plan. To be led by the DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS), the Bikeways Plan will compliment a plan developed by the DeKalb County Greenways & Trails Coalition. The Bikeways Plan will identify trail segments that may be constructed by new development or with federal, state or local grant sources. Upon completion, the Bikeways Plan is to be adopted as an element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
9. Evaluation of truck routes and freight movement, including consideration of the impacts of the Rochelle Global III railport and changes the Illinois Tollway fee structures. The DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS) will facilitate the examination of the area’s truck route system and the development of recommendations for improved freight movement.

10. Update and codification of the *Urban Design Standards and Implementation Plan (1997)*. The plan also identified a Visual Character Map, which identified viewsheds and sensitive community elements that were to be provided for when considering new developments.

11. Development of a **Comprehensive Housing Market Study** to evaluate the supply, demand and value of DeKalb’s housing stock.

12. Creation of an “Airport” zoning classification, and incorporation of the “Airport Development Plan” recommendations into the Comprehensive Plan. The zoning classification or similar mechanism will address building height restrictions relative to approach zones, and building construction requirements relative to sound abatement.

**STRATEGY: FORCED ANNEXATIONS**

The City of DeKalb will annex properties that are eligible for forced annexation, unless they are subject to an annexation agreement with the City of DeKalb. State statute permits the forced annexation of properties that are entirely surrounded by the municipality and are less than 60 acres in size. City Staff will develop a comprehensive evaluation of properties eligible for forced annexation for the Plan Commission’s and the City Council’s consideration.

The owners of many of these properties are served by City services, most notably emergency response, though they are not within the municipal boundaries. These properties presently do not contribute to the City’s tax base, and are not subject to the City’s zoning or property maintenance regulations. The properties are currently under the jurisdiction of the County’s less-restrictive zoning requirements. Annexation will enable the City to provide greater protection from neighboring property owners from such uses as cellular antennae, billboards, or incompatible agricultural uses.
Strategic Plan Monitoring

The City will ensure the implementation of its Comprehensive Plan by monitoring the supply of developable land sufficient to meet its community goals. On a regular basis to be determined, the City will prepare a “development gas tank” report providing information about key elements of DeKalb’s development capacity, possibly including:

- Estimated number of units that have been approved but not yet built (i.e. “development pipeline”).
- Estimated remaining capacity at the Sanitary District treatment facility.
- DeKalb School District enrollments and available classroom capacity.
- Estimated ratio of per capita park/open space acreages.
- NIU enrollment numbers (annually).
- Estimated equalized assessed values (EAV) for residential and non-residential properties.
- Estimated number of acres available for industrial and commercial developments.
- Total and per capita sales tax receipts.
- Total and per capita restaurant & bar tax receipts.

To assemble this and other community information, City staff will work in cooperation with the DeKalb School, Park and Sanitary Districts, DeKalb County, and NIU. If these reports prove helpful to DeKalb’s decision makers, similar reports may be requested of the DeKalb Chamber of Commerce/Convention & Visitors Bureau, Main Street/DeKalb Inc., and DeKalb County Economic Development Corporation for their respective areas of responsibility.
CHAPTER VII. DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

The Development Plan map has been updated and expanded to consider the appropriate land uses of property within and outside of the City, should they be developed under the City’s jurisdiction. The Development Plan map provides guidance regarding the intended development direction for areas around the periphery of the community. The land use designation on the Development Plan is not intended as an entitlement of development rights. Instead, the map provides a starting point for considering what land uses the City might reasonably anticipate or approve, subject to compliance with all of the City’s applicable development regulations and policies.

The updated Development Plan map includes more land set aside for “residential” use than will likely be developed in the next 10-20 years. This land was included within the Urban Services Area in recognition of the properties’ proximity to sanitary sewer capacity, water mains, and other urban services. The City also recognizes that it would be unwise to limit its options for considering potential developments on land owned by a limited number of property owners. By including properties in varied locations under different ownerships, the City may entertain a greater range of options for its future development.

Figure 23. 2005 Comprehensive Plan Update - Land Use Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>City of DeKalb</th>
<th>Urban Services Area (Includes City of DeKalb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Acres</td>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Single Family</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Research</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation / Utilities</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,106</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 23 shows the land use allocations for the 2005 City of DeKalb Comprehensive Plan Update, reflecting the intended policy direction for future development patterns. The map does not entitle the development of the property, but provides a starting point for considering the appropriateness of new development proposals in these areas.

The table also does not reflect the potential change in Equalized Assessed Value (EAV), which will be a major factor in considering development proposals, particularly in light of the City’s use of a fiscal impact model, progress toward the City’s goal of achieving a 50%/50% balance in residential/nonresidential EAV, and the project’s potential impacts on other taxing bodies. Overall, the updated Development Plan reflects the following policies:

- **New residential developments** will be primarily directed to the north/northwest and the southwest quadrants of the City, consistent with current development trends and the efficient provision of urban services.

- The designation of **Low-Density Residential** areas is intended as an overall target density, with limited new acreage set aside for medium- or high-density developments. Within an individual development, portions thereof may be developed at higher densities within the overall range of 0-4 dwelling units per net acre, subject to the approval of the City of DeKalb.

- **Nonresidential development**, particularly office-research and light-industrial, will be directed to the City’s southeast quadrant. This direction takes advantage of higher water pressures/supplies needed for fire protection and the increased visibility of the property from the Tollway. Clustering the nonresidential uses around the two Tollway interchanges encourages the use of the Tollway by truck traffic, without needing to traverse the City’s residential areas or Central Business District.

- Placing **nonresidential uses adjacent to the Tollway and the Airport** discourages new residential development in these areas, which would be unnecessarily subjected to increased traffic, vibration and noise from the Tollway, the Airport and other nearby uses. The introduction of nonresidential uses in the southeast quadrant would alter the frequency and nature of police and fire protection calls to these areas. New residential-oriented service calls would potentially increasing service response times, coverage responsibilities and/or operating costs. Residential development adjacent to the airport will be subject to many of the same concerns, with the added distraction of the airport’s illumination.
• The City will direct Office-Research-Industrial developments toward the highly-visible areas with frontage onto the I-88 Tollway, Peace Road, and Lincoln Highway. The ORI designation conveys a higher design standard than “typical” industrial uses, which are to be directed toward locations that are not as visible from major corridors or community gateways. The ORI designation conveys a heightened expectation of aesthetic design, including masonry facades, landscaping, and other amenities not typically found in traditional industrial areas.

• The City continues to concentrate its retail-service commercial development to Sycamore Road and West Lincoln Highway, in proximity to the NIU campus. The City will continue to focus on redeveloping the Central Business District and the East Lincoln Highway corridor as two other primary commercial centers.

Location-specific changes from the 1996 Development Plan Map to the current map are enumerated as follows:

1. Establishment of the Urban Services Area, which identifies the properties to which urban services and infrastructure are reasonably available. The delineation will direct development activity to those areas that can be reasonably served, resulting in a more compact and contiguous development pattern and the more efficient provision of urban services. The urban services area does not entitle the development of properties within the area, but is a prerequisite for considering new development proposals. The urban services area complements DeKalb County’s growth management policy, which discourages rural developments not served by municipal services.

2. Relocation of the West Side Arterial to the west side of the NIU Far West Campus area. The final location is subject to the optimal location for a grade-separated crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad and an at-grade intersection with West Lincoln Highway (IL Route 38). The arterial is shown to extend from Rich Road to Gurler Road with square intersections with the east-west arterial and major collector streets.

2A. Preliminary engineering studies have identified the current West Side Arterial alignment as the optimal location for providing a grade-separated crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks with an at-grade intersection with Lincoln Highway (IL Route 38). This alignment would allow trucks and other large vehicles sufficient distance to clear the railroad tracks and safely reach the intersection. The alignment shown will only be adjusted marginally, based on final engineering.
3. Addition of **commercial nodes** at the intersections of arterial and major collector streets. These development areas will provide services-oriented commercial to nearby residential areas and workplaces, and more-intense commercial uses in nonresidential areas.

4. Amendment of the designation of properties on DeKalb’s **southeast side** from “Heavy Industrial” to “Office-Research Park.” The designation as “Office-Research” reflects the proximity of the properties to Interstate 88, from which the subject properties are highly visible. The “ORI” zoning district requires greater landscaping and building design than what would be typically required of an industrial development.

5. Removal of the road segment connecting **Taylor Street** across the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to Peace Road, in accordance with City Council direction (1999). A network of collector streets extending from the termini of Simmons and Industrial to intersect with Fairview Drive, and extending east to intersect with Peace Road, will provide needed access to the Park 88 development area, Lincoln Highway, Peace Road, and Fairview Road.

6. **Updated land use designations** for previously-approved planned developments, rezoning, and construction activity:
   a. **South Pointe Commercial Subdivision** and the **South Pointe Residential** planned development.
   b. **Former County Home site**, now rezoned to **Planned Development-Commercial (PD-C)** and approved for First Rockford Group’s DeKalb County Shopping Center.
   c. **Private property** that was previously mislabeled as “NIU-Institutional.”
   d. Change to “Institutional” to reflect the construction of the new **DeKalb County Home**.
   e. Expansion of park land reserved by the **Summit Enclave** development (formerly Greenwood Acres PUD).
   f. Change to “Institutional” to reflect the construction of the **New Hope Baptist Church**.

7. Designation of the area southwest of the Annie Glidden toll plaza as reserved for **regional stormwater management system** and permanent open space for the DeKalb-Sycamore area. This conceptual system will rely on the design of upstream management of the Kishwaukee River, starting with an enlarged water retention area southwest of the Annie Glidden/Tollway interchange.
8. Designation of existing wetlands and "low spots" into which stormwater drains are identified as being reserved for permanent watershed protection. These sub-regional facilities are to be set-aside to provide natural stormwater retention/detention ponds, integrated into the overall regional management system.

9. Identification of areas incorporated into the DeKalb-Taylor Municipal Airport property.

10. Identification of properties acquired by Northern Illinois University, commonly known as the "Far West Campus Area," as "Institutional".

11. Realignment of Dresser and Twombly Roads at Annie Glidden. Presently, the intersection is offset, with Dresser Road intersecting Annie Glidden Road north of the Twombly intersection. In the long term, the two east-west roads would be realigned to form a four-way, signalized intersection, bisecting the adjacent property, which is intended for "Commercial" development on the Development Plan Map. The realignment is shown on the Map as the dashed "proposed arterial" line.

In the interim, stoplights are planned for the two intersections, with turn lanes added should adjacent parcels be approved for development. The current alignment is reflected on the Development Plan Map as the solid line. Bethany Road provides an alternate east-west parallel to Dresser Road. Bethany Road extends from Annie Glidden Road through DeKalb into Sycamore, relieving some of the traffic pressure on the Dresser Road-Twombly Road pair.

12. Reflecting the existing residential uses along East Lincoln Highway between Eighth and Tenth Streets, this area is redesignated as "Medium Density Residential." This change is consistent with the draft recommendations for the East Lincoln Highway Corridor Plan.

13. The properties along West Lincoln Highway, between NIU and Nelson Road, are redesignated as "Commercial," reflecting the type of uses that will be more appropriate for along a state highway, adjacent to NIU's Far West Campus area and the future West Side Arterial alignment.

14. Removal of the "Medium Density Residential" from the periphery of the community in favor of "Low Density Residential." The City may consider proposed developments that include pods or subareas that are at a higher density. However, the overall project density is intended to remain within the 0-4 dwelling units/net acre range appropriate for "Low Density Residential" areas.
ROAD FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION AMENDMENTS
The development of the DeKalb-Sycamore Area Transportation Study’s (DSATS) Long Range Transportation Plan has provided the opportunity to reexamine the City’s transportation systems and designations.

- With the completion of Bethany Road from First Street to Annie Glidden, the Comprehensive Plan has removed the designation of this road as a “proposed” arterial.

- Taylor Street/South Malta Road is redesignated from arterial to major collector, a lower classification on the “hierarchy” of roads. This change is made in recognition of the road’s lower (30 mph) speed, numerous access points (e.g. driveways), and its function as a transition between the adjacent residential streets to the Annie Glidden Road, First Street, Fourth Street, and Nelson Road arterials.

- A “Minor Collector” classification is added to the Comprehensive Plan. This change corresponds to the redesignation of roads interior to residential areas as minor collectors. This new classification is intended to distinguish between lower-speed, lower-volume roads from the higher-speed, greater-volume roads with more restricted access control. This designation also reflects how minor collectors function as lower-speed, lower-volume roads providing greater accessibility to the residential streets they intersect.

The following roads are reclassified as minor collectors:

- Ridge Drive
- Moluf Street
- Glidden Street
- Gurler Street
- Pearl Street
- Sangamon Drive
- Beautiful Gate Drive
- Williams Way
- County Farm Road
- Franklin Street
- Cutler Drive
- Highpoint Drive
- Knolls Avenue North-West-South
- Locust Street (First Street to Seventh Street)
- Tenth Street (Taylor Street to Pleasant Street)
- Thirteenth Street (Pleasant Street to Sycamore Road)
PROPOSED SCHOOL SITES
The Updated Comprehensive Plan includes the addition of four potential elementary school sites and three potential middle school sites. The proposed locations are intended to provide policy direction for considering future school sites in the vicinity of the residential developments they will eventually serve. As individual properties near the planned school sites are considered for development potential, the City and the School District will evaluate the specifics associated with each school site.

- In consultation with the School District, elementary school sites of a minimum of ten (10) acres in size are to be located at the interior of new residential areas. This minimum size assumes that a park site of at least five (5) acres is immediately adjacent to provide recreational areas for the elementary school. The sites are intended to be adjacent to a minor collector road, if possible, to provide accessibility to the school without establishing barriers to pedestrians that might accompany higher-volume/speed roads. Consistent with current School District policy, the elementary schools are expected to provide capacity for up to 400 K-5 students.

- Three middle school sites of at least twenty (20) acres in size were placed to the north, northwest and southwest of the City in anticipation of long-term development potential of these areas. The middle school sites were placed adjacent to major collectors and outside the core of new residential areas, recognizing the larger size and greater automobile activity associated with these schools. The School District presently intends each new middle school to provide capacity for up to 750 students in grades 6-8.

- The Updated Comprehensive Plan further depicts the desired combination of school-park sites, particularly for elementary schools. The Brooks School serves as a primary example of land set aside for a school building and park facilities to serve both the school and the surrounding neighborhood. The combination of school and park facilities provides opportunities for maintenance and service efficiencies. The City intends to continue to work with the School and Park Districts to establish new school-park areas to serve as the foci of new residential neighborhoods.
CHAPTER VIII. APPENDICES

The following Appendices to the "DeKalb 3D" 2005 Comprehensive Plan are available in a supplementary document:

A. Population Projection methodologies
B. Growth Summit Findings
D. “Sustainability and Development” – Citizens’ Environmental Commission (May 2002)

Copies of the Appendices may be obtained from the City of DeKalb Community Development Department, 223 South Fourth Street, Suite A, DeKalb, IL 60115.