APPENDIX A
MAPS
### Table 1: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>UNDER 18</th>
<th>OVER 65</th>
<th>UNDER 18 PERCENT</th>
<th>OVER 65 PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>2567</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>2472</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5039</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 year ACS 2014 Table B01001

### Table 2A: Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Black</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Asian</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>2567</td>
<td>2302</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>2472</td>
<td>2396</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5039</td>
<td>4698</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014 Table B03002

### Table 2B: Race and Ethnicity, Percents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Black</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Asian</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014 Table B03002

### Table 3: Household Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Family Households</th>
<th>Percent Family Households</th>
<th>Percent Zero Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014 Tables B11001 and B25044

### Table 4A: Household Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>1 Person</th>
<th>2 Person</th>
<th>3 Person</th>
<th>4 Person</th>
<th>5 Person</th>
<th>6 Person</th>
<th>7+Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>353</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014 Table B11016

### Table 4B: Household Size, Percents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>1 Person</th>
<th>2 Person</th>
<th>3 Person</th>
<th>4 Person</th>
<th>5 Person</th>
<th>6 Person</th>
<th>7+Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014 Table B11016

### Table 5A: Educational Attainment for Persons Over Age 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Over 25</th>
<th>Less than High School Diploma</th>
<th>High School or GED</th>
<th>Some College/Associates Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Post-Graduate Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3503</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014, Table B15003

### Table 5B: Educational Attainment for Persons Over Age 25, Percents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>1 Person</th>
<th>2 Person</th>
<th>3 Person</th>
<th>4 Person</th>
<th>5 Person</th>
<th>6 Person</th>
<th>7+Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014 Table B15003
## Smithton Route 159 Census Data

### Table 6: Limited English Speaking Households as Percent of All Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Speak Spanish Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Speak Other Indo-Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Speak Asian Language Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Speak Other Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014, Table B15003

### Table 7: Persons who Speak English Less than Very Well as Percent of All Persons Over Age 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Speak Spanish Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Speak Other Indo-Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Speak Asian Language Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Speak Other Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014, Table B16002

### Table 8A: Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Under $25,000</th>
<th>$25,000 - $50,000</th>
<th>$50,000 - $75,000</th>
<th>$75,000 - $100,000</th>
<th>Over $100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014, Table B19001

### Table 8B: Household Income, Percents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Under $25,000</th>
<th>$25,000 - $50,000</th>
<th>$50,000 - $75,000</th>
<th>$75,000 - $100,000</th>
<th>Over $100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014, Table B19001

### Table 9: Labor Force Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Total Over Age 16</th>
<th>In Labor Force</th>
<th>Civilian Labor Force</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Not In Labor Force</th>
<th>Percent Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4041</td>
<td>2774</td>
<td>2774</td>
<td>2541</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014, Table B23025

### Table 10: Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Occupied</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Renter Occupied</th>
<th>Percent Occupied</th>
<th>Owner Occupied (Percent of All Occupied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014, Tables B25002 and B25003
### Table 11: Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracts</th>
<th>Individuals in Poverty</th>
<th>Individual Poverty Rate</th>
<th>Families in Poverty</th>
<th>Family Poverty Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014, Tables B17010 and B17021

### Table 11: Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracts</th>
<th>Population basis</th>
<th>Has a Disability</th>
<th>Disability Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>5509</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>4577</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10086</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5 Year ACS 2014, Table B18101

### Table 12: Employment (Place of Work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracts</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171635039063</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171635040011</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dun and Bradstreet
APPENDIX C

PRESENTATIONS & POLLING
Public Meeting # 1
Great Streets:

- Are Great places
  - local identity & walkability
- Integrate land use & transportation planning design to a vision
- Accommodate all users and modes
  - trip type - “to, through, & within” accessible for everyone
- Are economically vibrant
  - complementary uses
- Are environmentally responsible
  - practical
  - more than just storm water
- Rely on current thinking
  - adapting what works best
- Are measurable
  - performance measures
  - guide the process
  - relate to RTP & funding
- Develop collaboratively
  - multi disciplinary team
  - iterative community input
“To design a street according to its intended use is a reasonable but uncommon practice.”

- Harland Bartholomew

Great Streets Emphasize:

The Product
- The Plan
- Prepared Local Leadership
- Tools for Implementation

The Process
- Multi-disciplinary consultant team
- Iterative local input
- Envision land use – all else supports that
- Best Practices
Combining local knowledge (residents, owners, proprietors, leadership, etc.) with technical expertise (multi disciplinary team)

Iterative feedback loops

Benefits:

• Investments are made in a coordinated way – A consistent end goal
• A better balanced transportation “system”
• Enhanced community identity
• Economic vitality
• Reduced load on utilities
• Neighborhoods that work better for all ages and capabilities
“It is not necessary to change. Survival is not mandatory.”

W. Edwards Deming

Main Street - Study Area
Our Scope of Work:

- **The technical team** (urban and transportation planners) reviews existing conditions and **works with people who know the community** to define a vision forward and a means to achieve it.

- The end product is a technical planning report with specific recommended steps to implement the end goals.

Schedule:

1. **Preparation (February - May)**

2. | MONDAY       | TUESDAY       | WEDNESDAY      | THURSDAY       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Project Team Set Up</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>Design Team / Key Stakeholders Tour the Area (Open to the Public) Begin at the Village Hall</td>
<td>Individual and Focus Group Discussions (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Final Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Stakeholder Presentation / Interviews (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End Report finished in July**
Strategic Planning Report:

• The end document will record the “vision” for the corridor
• It will state the major issues and goals
• It will clarify what decisions were made during this process.
• It will detail recommended next steps
  Scope
  Additional Investigation
  Responsibility
  Likely Budget
  Sequence

EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Green Infrastructure – Street Trees

Benefits of Street Trees:
- Traffic Calming
- Buffer for Pedestrians
- Increased Property Values
- Community Character
- Air Quality
- Stormwater Infiltration
- Reduced Heat Island
- Reduced Energy Costs

Existing Challenges:
- Utility Lines
- Space
Storm water

Summary:
- Flooding in the corridor doesn’t seem to be an issue
- Some older storm water grates are being replaced due to maintenance issues

Human Health and Wellbeing

Gathering Areas
Streets are the public “rooms” for the community.
Energy and Materials

• Material Re-Use
• Efficient lighting
• Heat absorption
• Sound absorption
• Reflectivity / glare
• Maintenance costs

Community Character & Assets
Existing Land Use

- Transitions throughout
  - Rural
  - Suburban Commercial
  - Main Street Mix
- Neighborhoods immediately behind
- North and South
  - Larger lots
  - Auto-oriented
- Main Street
  - Smaller lots
  - Some Pedestrian Scale
  - Community destinations
North Area Features

- Rural
- Suburban
- Commercial
- Parking in front
- New sidewalks
- No trees, crosswalks
- Limited roadway lighting
- Grass drainage swales

Main Street Features

- Buildings closer to roadway
- On-street parking
- Older sidewalks
- Cross-walks
- Lighting
- Mature trees
- Nearby destinations
South Area
Features

Suburban Commercial & Residential

Auto-oriented

Village Park

No trees

Limited roadway lighting
**Douglas Road to North Hickory**

- **Rural to Suburban Transition**
- **Speed**
  - Posted = 55 mph
  - Average = 50 mph
  - 85% = 58 mph
  - 35 mph S. of N. Hickory
- **ADT**
  - 9,850 VPD
- **Crashes**
  - 25 Crashes
    - (18 @ Douglas Road)
  - 8 Injuries
    - (7 at Douglas Road)
  - 1 Ped (Douglas Road)
- **Notes**
  - AM Congestion at Douglass Road

**North Hickory to Fischer**

- **Suburban to Downtown Transition**
- **Speed**
  - 35 mph S. of N. Hickory
  - Average = 32 mph
  - 87% = 37 mph
- **Volume**
  - 10,100 VPD
- **Crashes**
  - 29 Crashes/20 Injuries
  - 6 (1 Injury) at N. Hickory
  - 7 (6 Injuries) at Sunset
  - 11 (3 Injuries) Center/Brevo
Fischer to Memorial

- Downtown Area
- Special Uses
  - Turner Hall
  - St. John School
  - City Hall/Library
  - Smithton Elementary
  - Village Park (access from Memorial)
- Ped Flashers
  - Breckenridge /Stoerger (St. John School)
  - South/Graner (Smithton Elementary)
- Speed
  - Posted = 30 - 35 mph
  - 30 mph between Breckenridge/Buchanan & South/Graner
    - Average = 33 mph
    - 85% = 39 mph
- Volume
  - 8,700 VPD
- Crashes
  - 14 Crashes (4 at Memorial)
  - 11 Injuries (6 at Memorial)
  - 1 Pedestrian (Memorial)

Memorial to Knab

- Rural/Suburban/Downtown Transition
- Speed
  - Posted = 35-55 mph
  - 45 mph S. of Sand Rock Road
  - Ave = 45 mph (S. of Sand Rock Road)
  - 85% = 51 mph (S. of Sand Rock Road)
  - 55 mph S. of Knab Road
- Volume
  - 7,400 VPD
- Crashes (Memorial to Sand Rock Rd)
  - 7 Crashes
  - 4 Injuries
Smithton
Complete Streets
Phase One & Two
Walking-Jogging-Biking Route

- Strong Connections on West Side of IL 159
- Needed:
  - Continue to Southern Neighborhoods
  - Connection of East Side of IL 159 (Create Loop)
  - Improved Crossings of IL 159

Complete Streets

- Make a loop including the east side of 159
- Improve and add crosswalks
- Gives better access to:
  - Both schools
  - The Park
  - Main Street
How long have you lived in Smithton?

- 0% 1. 0 – 5 years
- 33% 2. 5 – 10 years
- 7% 3. 10 – 15 years
- 40% 4. 15 plus years
- 20% 5. I don’t live in Smithton

What’s your age?

- 0% 1. Under 20
- 7% 2. 21-30
- 0% 3. 31-40
- 20% 4. 41-50
- 27% 5. 51-60
- 33% 6. 61-70
- 13% 7. Over 70

Where do you live?

- 20% 1. North of Sunset Drive
- 7% 2. Between Sunset and South, west of 159
- 13% 3. Between Sunset and South, east of 159
- 20% 4. South of South St, west of 159
- 13% 5. South of South St, east of 159
- 7% 6. Elsewhere in St. Claire County
- 20% 7. Somewhere else

Where do you work?

- 40% 1. In Smithton on 159
- 0% 2. Elsewhere in Smithton
- 20% 3. Elsewhere in St. Claire County
- 0% 4. Elsewhere in Illinois
- 20% 5. St. Louis City
- 7% 6. Elsewhere in Missouri
- 13% 7. I’m not currently employed
Do you think Smithton has an identity or a “brand”?

- 27% Yes
- 7% Maybe – don’t really care
- 67% No
- 0% No, and it really shouldn’t have one

We’re thinking of “downtown” Smithton extending between Sunset and South. Do you agree?

- 27% Yes
- 73% Maybe with some adjustment
- 0% Not even close
- 0% I don’t really care

What businesses would you like to see on Main St.? (pick 3)

- 20% Family restaurant
- 33% Fast food
- 67% Small eatery (coffee shop, diner, ice cream)
- 33% Brew pub
- 53% Small local retail
- 7% Chain retail
- 33% Boutique shopping
- 27% Convenience services
- 13% Skilled labor shops
- 7% Outdoor sporting supplies

Future housing should be . . .
(Select all that apply)

- 50% More single family
- 63% Townhouses
- 6% Subsidized rental
- 31% Market rate rental
- 81% Senior housing
- 13% Something else
How do you think Smithton should grow?

- 13% More businesses, no housing
- 0% More housing, no new businesses
- 60% New businesses and more housing
- 0% I don’t care
- 27% Don’t grow, I love it the way it is

Turning onto or off of 159 . . .

- 0% Very safe everywhere all the time
- 33% Safe, except during rush hour
- 47% Generally safe except for some hot spots
- 13% Usually not very safe
- 7% I avoid it.

How safe do you feel driving through on 159?

- 27% Very safe everywhere all the time
- 13% Safe, except during rush hour
- 60% Generally safe except for some hot spots
- 0% Usually not very safe
- 0% I avoid it.

On street parking between Sunset and South on 159 . . .

- 27% Is fine, no problems
- 40% There is enough but it doesn’t seem safe
- 7% There doesn’t seem to be enough
- 27% There is enough, but not where I want it
I walk on Main St. more often if:

(Select all that apply)

1. Traffic were slower 2. I had better crossings
3. There were more places to go 4. Downtown parking were more convenient
5. It were better lit 6. If the sidewalks were nicer
7. There were more trees or shading 8. Other 9. I would never walk downtown

I walk on the neighborhood streets...

I walk on Main St. . . .

I would walk Main St. more often if:

1. Traffic were slower
2. I had better crossings
3. There were more places to go
4. Downtown parking were more convenient
5. It were better lit
6. If the sidewalks were nicer
7. There were more trees or shading
8. Other
9. I would never walk downtown

Crosswalks on 159:

1. Are fine, no problems
2. Need more locations
3. Need to work better (visibility, compliance, crossing distances)

I walk on Main St. . . .

I walk on the neighborhood streets...

I would walk Main St. more often if:

1. Traffic were slower
2. I had better crossings
3. There were more places to go
4. Downtown parking were more convenient
5. It were better lit
6. If the sidewalks were nicer
7. There were more trees or shading
8. Other
9. I would never walk downtown

Crosswalks on 159:

1. Are fine, no problems
2. Need more locations
3. Need to work better (visibility, compliance, crossing distances)
Do you agree that bikes should use the neighborhood streets instead of 159?

- 53% Yes
- 0% No
- 47% Maybe, let’s talk

Places I do or would like to walk or bike to: (select all that apply)

- 7% The park
- 13% Downtown Main St.
- 7% Businesses on 159 north of Sunset
- 13% Businesses on 159 south of South
- 7% St. John School
- 0% Smithton Public School
- 0% Turner Hall
- 47% To large, organized picnics or events
- 0% Church
- 7% I drive everywhere
Public Meeting # 2
Smithton Main Street

Main Street - Study Area
Schedule:

1. Preparation (February - May)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Project Team Set Up</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>Design Team / Key Stake Holders Tour the Area (Open to the Public Begin at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Individual and Focus Group Discussions (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Final Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Debrief (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Stakeholder presentations / Interviews (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Community Kick-off / Existing Conditions / Issues Workshop (Open to the Public at the Senior Center)</td>
<td>Community Presentation and Feedback (Open to the Public at the Senior Center)</td>
<td>Public Wrap Up and Next Steps Session (Open to the Public at the Senior Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. End Report finished in July

What we’ve heard...

- It’s difficult to make a left turn or cross Main Street during rush hour
- Most feel safe driving on Main Street with exceptions at Rush Hour and Hot Spots
- Completing a Complete Streets loop makes sense
- A lot of businesses come and go, a few have been successful longer term
- Downtown needs to be spruced up – pedestrian lights, plantings, trees, etc.
What we’ve heard...

• Smithton is a very safe community
• There is a lot of cooperation between civic organizations for multiple annual events
• Traffic backs up for several cycles at Douglas Road during rush hour
• Senior housing is needed (81% in favor)
• Most of you aren’t walking on Main Street, but would with some improvements

Here are some ideas...
Complete Streets Loop

Make a loop including the east side of 159

- Activity Centers
- Improved/added crosswalks
- Possible Rest Areas

Signage and Markings

- Share the Road
- Speed limit 25
- Share the Road
- Bicycles designated route
Possible Parklets/Rest Areas

Improved Main Street Crossings
High-quality Rental Housing

Senior Housing
Entire Length of Main Street

Q & A
159 at Casey’s

Existing Section

With Left Turn Lane

Stonefield and Hickory
Near Casey’s

North of Downtown

Q & A
Smithton Great Main Street Project Area

DOWNTOWN

Characteristics of a Main Street

• Walkable & Drivable
• Variety of Destinations
• Consistent (But Unique) Character
• Amenities
Smithton Is Walkable

Main Street Over Time

Public & Private Investment

- Spot redevelopment
- Reuse of old, historical buildings
- Commercial use of residential houses
- Infrastructure

How Do You Introduce:

- Consistent character
- Signage that is useful & appropriate
- Pedestrian amenities
Building Siting

- Up to the sidewalk
- Enhances visibility
- Emphasis is on the pedestrian
- Convenient for many destinations

Building Siting

- Typically a matter of zoning/regulation
  - Build-to Lines
  - Smaller/no side yards
Facades and Signage

- Typically regulated by zoning/regulation
  - Location, height, size
  - Design guidelines

Amenities
Amenities

- Typically installed as infrastructure is improved
- Though can be through private investment

Parking Around Main Street
Parking Around Main Street

<5
5-10
10<

Parking Around Main Street

<5
5-10
10<
Parking Around Main Street

- On-street
- Some on-site
- Shared, common lots

- Typically done through zoning/site review
- In this Main Street area, parking should not be a condition of redevelopment
  - Amount should consider on-street, shared, and pedestrian accessibility

Recommendations

- Update to Zoning and Site Development Regs
  - Build-to lines
  - Smaller/zero sideyard
  - Signage basics
  - Parking

- Design Guidelines
  - More aesthetic
  - Signs
  - Awnings
  - Streetscape infrastructure
    - Design
    - Location
    - Type
Downtown Area
Potential Contributing Historic Building Stock

Historic District? (1850’s - 1940’s)
Main Street Downtown

Existing Condition

Main Street Downtown

Adjusted Parking / Sidewalks

Reverse angled parking east side
South of Downtown

Q & A
The Complete Streets Network as shown:

1. Looks fine – implement it
2. Would be great with some changes
3. Seems OK, but isn’t a priority
4. Doesn’t look like a good idea
5. I don’t have an opinion about this.

Providing shade trees and rest places along the 159 sidewalks and the complete streets paths:

1. Is important and necessary
2. Would be a good thing to do with some exceptions
3. On Main St. only, not the loop
4. On the Complete Streets loop, not Main St.
5. Is not a good idea
6. I don’t really care.

I would like Metro Bus service on 159

1. Yes
2. I’m interested, but need more information
3. No
4. I don’t really care

A dedicated right turn lane from northbound 159 to east bound Douglas:

1. Would be a huge improvement. Do it
2. Doesn’t seem important
3. Is a terrible idea. Don’t do it
4. On Main St. only, not the loop
5. I don’t care
6. I don’t really care.
### North of Downtown

#### The Center Left Turn Lane
- **82%**: Is a great idea – make it happen
- **12%**: Would be fine with some changes
- **6%**: Seems OK – not a priority
- **0%**: Looks like a terrible idea – don’t do it
- **0%**: I don’t have an opinion

1. Is a great idea – make it happen
2. Would be fine with some changes
3. Seems OK – not a priority
4. Looks like a terrible idea – don’t do it
5. I don’t have an opinion

#### The proposed additional crosswalk for the Complete Streets loop:
- **44%**: Looks fine as shown
- **25%**: Is in the right spot but needs to work differently
- **31%**: Needs to move, but otherwise OK
- **0%**: Is the wrong type in the wrong place
- **0%**: Should not be done
- **0%**: I don’t have an opinion about this

### North of Downtown

#### At Stonefield / Hickory, I would like to see
- **0%**: A cross intersection (only if we can get a signal)
- **12%**: A cross intersection (with or without a signal)
- **76%**: A Round-a-bout
- **0%**: A new pedestrian crossing only
- **12%**: No change
- **0%**: I don’t really care what happens there

#### At Stonefield / Hickory, I would like to see
- **0%**: A cross intersection (only if we can get a signal)
- **12%**: A cross intersection (with or without a signal)
- **76%**: A Round-a-bout
- **0%**: A new pedestrian crossing only
- **12%**: No change
- **0%**: I don’t really care what happens there

### Downtown Area

#### The Downtown area is distinct and should look and feel unique on 159
- **81%**: Yes, certainly
- **19%**: Maybe, but it’s not important
- **0%**: No. It’s not a distinct place
**Downtown Area**

**The Main St. section...**

1. Should stay the way it is
2. Should keep parallel parking, but adjust the sidewalks to add plantings, lighting, etc.
3. Should use angled parking on one side

69%
31%
0%

**Design Guidelines for Downtown sidewalks and building fronts...**

1. Would be helpful, let's see what makes sense
2. Seems OK, but isn't a priority
3. Isn't right for Smithton

81%
19%
0%

**Administering the Downtown area:**

1. Needs to be formalized
2. Should be done informally / volunteer basis
3. Is the wrong approach — leave the businesses alone
4. Should be done, but should include areas north and south of the Downtown area

25%
31%
0%
44%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown Area</th>
<th>South of Downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forming an assessment district Downtown . . .</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47% 1. Is a great idea to develop / invest in Main St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53% 2. Is worth investigating. I need more info.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 3. Is not right for Smithton. Don’t do it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 4. I don’t really care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown Area</th>
<th>South of Downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establishing a historic district downtown . . .</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% 1. Is a great idea – let’s do it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87% 2. Is worth investigating. I need more info.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% 3. Doesn’t seem important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 4. Is a bad idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South of Downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Center Left Turn Lane . . .</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% 1. Is a great idea – make it happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 2. Would be fine with some changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% 3. Seems OK – not a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 4. Looks like a terrible idea – don’t do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 5. I don’t have an opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South of Downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The proposed additional crosswalk for the Complete Streets loop:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 1. Looks fine as shown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% 2. Is in the right spot but needs to work differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93% 3. Needs to move, but otherwise OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 4. Is the wrong type in the wrong place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 5. Should not be done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 6. I don’t have an opinion about this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Meeting # 3
Smithton Main Street

Main Street - Study Area
Schedule:

Preparation (February - May)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Project Team Set Up</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>Design Team / Key Stake Holders Tour the Area (Open to the Public) Begin at the Village Hall</td>
<td>Individual and Focus Group Discussions (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Final Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design Team Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Debrief (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Stakeholder Presentations / Interviews (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Design Team Working Session and Follow-Up Interviews (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design Team Working Session (Open to the Public at the Village Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Kick-off / Existing Conditions Issues Workshop (Open to the Public at the Senior Center)</td>
<td>Project Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Presentation and Feedback (Open to the Public at the Senior Center)</td>
<td>Public Wrap Up and Next Steps Session (Open to the Public at the Senior Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End Report finished this summer

What we’ve heard

- Downtown should have its own character
- Design guidelines make sense for downtown
- A historic district is worth looking into
- Transit is not really a priority
- Smithton doesn’t really have an identity or “brand” (anymore) – or does it?
- A right turn lane going east at Douglas is a good idea
- Center left turn lanes north and south of downtown are a good idea
What we’ve heard

• Downtown (and other areas?) could benefit from formal administration
• People seem in favor of a roundabout at Fieldstone/Hickory
• An assessment district could be beneficial and has support of community
• Better crossings are needed downtown -
  • Safety for kids is the priority, but also need to allow for large vehicles
What is Smithton’s “Brand” or “Identity”

Bedroom Community?

Quarter Horse Capital?

Bars?

The Place to Go for Great Fish?

Examples of Towns with Identities

Hermann = Wine Country

Kimmswick = Quaint Shops

Galena = Bed & Breakfasts
We Keep Hearing...

Festivals  Picnics  Families

Something to Build On

Revised Complete Streets Loop

• Crossing at Sunset (moved from Center)
• Southern portion to go near Community Garden area – add Rest Area
• Additional Rest Area at Elementary School
• Southern Crossing just south of Cletus and additional crossing near Senior Center

★ Activity Center
▲ Rest Area
★ Improved/New Crossing
Loop Implementation -

- **Signage & Paint**: Images of signs with messages like "Share the Road" and "Speed Limit 25".
- **Rest Areas**: Images of rest areas with benches and shaded areas.
- **Main Street Crossings**: Images of crosswalks with signs and signals.

---

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB)

- Images of RRFB signs installed at road crossings.

---

**Smithton, Illinois**

**Great Streets Initiative**
Overall Roadway Plan

- Turn lanes at Douglas
- Improved intersection
- Hickory realignment
- Downtown street
- Additional crosswalk
- Additional crosswalks
- Roundabout at South end?

NORTH SECTION
159 at Casey’s

Existing Section

With Left Turn Lane

DOWNTOWN
Why Zoning?

- Protect character and stability
- Promote orderly and beneficial development
- Fix reasonable standards for buildings and structures
- Tool for creating vision
- Sets expectations for leaders and property owners
- Rules for everyone to work within
- Help the Mayor do his job
Smithton’s B-1 District

- New development as well as redevelopment
- Must account for:
  - Lot sizes
  - Vacant vs. Existing
  - Parking
- Requires variances
- Don’t want regulations to be a barrier

3 Options to Address Zoning

- Create a New District
- Create an Overlay District
- Regulatory Design Guidelines
Create a New District

- Start with B-1
- Adjust to reflect
  - Desired uses
  - Existing lot sizes
  - Building character
  - Parking
  - Signs
- Start small, evolve

Create an Overlay District

- Keep underlying zoning
- Regulations are optional
- Flexibility with guidance
- Often include form-based elements
- Adds a level of complexity in admin
- More up-front thinking needed
Regulation Design Guidelines

- Visual representation of regulations
- Stand alone or integrated into ordinances
- For specific area (overlay)
- Can help inform variance process (short-term)
- Can set direction for future ordinance changes
- Not enforceable without regulations, but sets expectations

That’s zoning – how about design?
Streetscape Design Guidelines

• Public Infrastructure
  – Sidewalks
  – Signs
  – Street lights
  – Street furniture
  – Street trees & plantings

• Private Design Elements
  – Facades
  – Signs

Streetscape Design Guidelines

• Identity of the public space
• Works for all, focused on pedestrians
• Aesthetics
• Safety
• Comfort
Lemay Streetscape

District Administration

Structures
- Citywide or District
- City-run, Non-Profit, Volunteer
- Grant-funded, City Revenue, Investments

Activities
- Marketing
- Special Events
- Streetscape Improvements
- Beautification
- Security
- Economic Development
Red Bud
Economic Development Commission

- Economic Development Commission
  - Advisory to City Council
- State/Fed Economic Development Funds
- City General Funds

- Micro Loan Fund
  - $10k (max) revolving loan fund
  - Small business focus
  - Small improvements, façade upkeep
  - $50k RBDG
  - $40k city funds

Lemay Development Corp

- 501c3 division of Chamber, now independent
- Initial funding from Economic Dev. Initiative grant (HUD)
- State & Local programs

- Property acquisition, site prep, reduce development costs
- Purchase for future lease/sale
- Streetscape Guidelines
- Market Analysis
- Many community partners
Downtown Area
Potential Contributing Historic Building Stock

Historic District? (1850’s - 1940’s)
Historic District???

- Individual listings or District designation
- Collection of buildings or
- Development tools – 25% tax credit
  - “Entitlement”
  - Qualifying hard and soft costs
  - Process takes time and money
  - If using the tax credits, must follow the rules
  - Period of compliance
  - Credits are transferable
- Designation process takes some time and $
  - Hire a consultant – identify pros and cons

Market Study – Basic needs

- Identify local buying “leakage”
- Identify holes in local commercial / retail markets
- Estimate viable Downtown square footage by type
- Categorize types of businesses that can fit Main St. buildings
- Model the administrative “district” options
  Types, scope, revenues, start-up, phasing
- Identify redevelopment barriers and solutions
- Identify catalyst project and district phasing strategy
- Clarify complementary strategy of Downtown area
  and north / south areas
Additional considerations

- Identify holes in housing market
- Identify holes in senior housing market
- Identify potential properties and sites

Downtown (North End)
Downtown (South End)

Main Street Downtown

Existing Condition

- Keep the 12’ wide travel lanes
- Narrow parallel parking
- Better organize parking
- Add corner bump-outs at pedestrian crossings
- Accommodate pedestrian lighting both sides of street
- Add plantings / trees
- Widen sidewalk on east side of street
  - Space for dining
  - Space for furniture, poles, trash cans, etc.
  - Room for ADA access

Adjusted Parking / Sidewalks
SOUTH SECTION

South of Downtown
Park and Senior Center

Doing what when?
Short Term Goals
(1-5 years)

• Complete the Loop (signage, rest spots)
• Do a Market Study
• Form Districts (administrative and historic)
• Update Zoning
• Coordinate with IDOT
  • Left turn lane
  • Center turn lanes
  • New / updated pedestrian crossings
  • Implement Douglas Rd. intersection turn lanes
• Plant street trees
• Pave path along chip/seal sections of Loop

Mid Term Goals
(5-10 years)

• Coordinate with IDOT
  • Curbing, bulb outs, sidewalks Downtown
• Implement storefronts / streetscapes downtown
• Install pedestrian lighting
• Install additional rest areas on Loop
• Finalize improved crossings
• Additional pedestrian connections to south neighborhoods
• Redevelop under utilized Downtown properties
• Additional zoning revision
Long Term Goals
(10 plus years)

• Coordinate with IDOT
  • Investigate round-a-bout at Sand Rock Rd.
• Strategic Downtown infill development
• Let Mayor Klein retire

When Possible
(Be opportunistic)

• Coordinate with developers
  • Hickory realignment / improved intersection
  • Identify parcels to match market study recommendations
• Coordinate with property owners
  • Implement additional sidewalk / streetscapes
• Complete left turn lanes – Developers to add pavement where needed when projects developed
Do you agree with the proposed complete streets Loop as shown?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Sure, with a few adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>I don’t really care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you agree with the proposed downtown roadway / sidewalk changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Yes, looks good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Maybe with some adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North end – Do you agree with the proposed roadway changes? (pick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>I like the center turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>I like the Hickory / intersection ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>I like the recommended crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>I don’t like any of it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you agree with the ideas to manage the commercial “district”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>Yes, let’s figure out the details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Only if it doesn’t cost anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No – a bad idea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My top three priorities are:

(Select 3)

1. Form an administrative district
2. Form a historic district
3. Complete the Loop
4. Update zoning
5. Turn lanes north and south of Downtown
6. Street / sidewalk changes in Downtown
7. Pedestrian lighting
8. Hickory realignment / intersection
9. Senior housing
10. Other – let’s talk
Land Use / Urban Design
The Village of Smithton, Illinois, is a rural community approximately 25 miles from Downtown St. Louis, Missouri. Located on Illinois Route 159, the town is situated between the City of Belleville and the Village of Hecker. With an estimated population of approximately 3,700 people, Smithton has experienced significant growth in the past 35 years, more than doubling in size since 1980, and adding more than 1,400 people between 2000 and 2010. Though the Village has a rich history (as seen in “A Smithtonian History 1850-2000: A Sesquicentennial History Book”), the town currently thrives as a bedroom community in the St. Louis Metropolitan Area.

Community Context

While the Smithton Great Main Street Strategy is focused on the IL 159 corridor, it is influenced by the neighborhoods adjacent to the corridor and considers the interaction between the corridor and the broader community. The existing housing and commercial building stock has significant implications for the future growth of the village and for the viability of various strategies employed within the corridor to address specific issues and meet community goals.

The housing in and around the corridor is predominantly single-family residential. While the newer subdivisions in the northern and southern parts of the village are entirely suburban style single-family homes, in the older, central part of the village there is more of a residential mix – older single-family houses are interspersed with some duplexes, several individual mobile homes as well as a mobile home park, and a couple of two-story multi-family apartment buildings.

While the housing stock reflects a range of affordability, the predominantly single-family housing supply does not include the full range of characteristics and amenities that the spectrum of residents may want. For example, there is no supply of attached single-family (e.g., townhomes or villas) or any new multi-family housing that may be desirable to young people who are not ready to buy a house, or for older residents to move into when they desire more maintenance-free housing. Such housing, oriented toward the corridor and focused near the downtown area, would not only provide additional options for those at the early and later stages of home rental or homeownership, but would also provide additional residential density that could support businesses in the nearby commercial areas.

One additional note on housing, it was noted in informal and formal discussion as well as at the public meeting that there was a lack of independent and assisted housing for older adults. Several residents indicated having parents that were living in senior housing facilities in nearby communities, and voiced a desire for such housing in Smithton. Even some older Smithton residents expressed a desire to remain in Smithton and wanted other low-maintenance, affordable housing options.
Just as the residential building stock reflects the development history of the village, so too does the commercial building stock – newer commercial development at the northern and southern ends of the corridor, with older buildings in the central, downtown area. The newer commercial building stock outside of the downtown is more flexible space, “move-in ready,” and generally maintenance-free. The older building stock in the downtown is generally smaller, with older building facades, and interior layouts that may not meet current market demands. The age of the downtown buildings often means greater cost for maintenance and a greater investment needed to create desirable space. This contributes to the mix of factors that result in the older commercial building stock not competing as well with the newer stock.

Among the other factors contributing to the challenges of redeveloping the older commercial building stock include the land/parcel constraints. The lots in the downtown area are smaller, often narrow, and may rely on on-street parking for patrons. Given the current zoning regulations, this creates a need for variances to setbacks or parking when redevelopment occurs, adding some level of uncertainty as well as additional cost and time in the redevelopment process. The building siting, parking and density issues need to be systematically addressed in order to support the walkable nature of downtown.

Project Area Land Use
Land use and design looks at how the space is used in a particular area, how land uses relate to one another to define and give character to a place, and how people experience that place. It not only takes into consideration the layout of the uses, but the types of buildings and open spaces that contain the uses, as well as the public space, such as sidewalks and roads that often define and connect neighborhoods.

The project area for the Village of Smithton Great Main Street Strategy runs along the IL 159 corridor from Douglas Road south to Sand Rock Road. Land use within the project area includes large-lot rural/farmland; single-family residential, mobile homes, and duplexes; commercial; industrial; and civic and religious uses.

Based in large part on lot size and style of development, the project area can be broken up into three distinct areas. The northern section, from Douglas Road to Fischer Street, has large undeveloped parcels; newer, more auto-oriented commercial development; and the new Village fire station. From Fischer to Franklin streets is the older part of town, the Village’s “Original Business District”, with smaller lots; a variety of commercial, residential and civic uses; and several of the town’s older, more historic buildings. South of Franklin to Sand Rock Road, lots again begin to get larger and take on more of a suburban/rural feel, with more residential and less commercial uses. The Smithton Community Park anchors the southern part of the project area. Using sub-areas allows for more detailed and nuanced exploration and understanding of the corridor, and more targeted recommendations.

Land use and design significantly influence how people get around their community, for example whether someone needs a car to get around, or is able to get to various destinations on foot or bike. The term active transportation is used to refer to non-auto means of travel, and is often used when
talking about bike lanes, sidewalks and other paths and trails. In Smithton, the active transportation infrastructure includes share the road signs and pavement markings for a complete streets bicycle route connecting the western side of the Village, as well as sidewalks throughout the village, including new sidewalks installed as part of the Safe Routes to School grant program. These new sidewalks were installed along Hickory Street at Arlington Court, along South Street from Main to High streets, and along Main Street from Memorial Street to Sand Rock Road.
North Area Land Use & Design

The northern most portion of the project area, near Douglas Road, is rural in nature, with large, undeveloped lots. Heading south, the corridor quickly becomes suburban in character, with newer strip center commercial development and entrance streets to newer single-family subdivisions. The commercial uses have ample parking lots in front of the buildings.

There are new sidewalks along the front of the commercial lots, with wide drainage swales between the sidewalks and the roadway. There are no trees along the sidewalks or along the road, and lighting along the corridor is designed for illuminating the roadway and not necessarily the sidewalks.

Existing newer commercial strip development at north end of corridor

Existing commercial with ample on-site parking, new sidewalk, no trees or pedestrian-scale lighting along sidewalk
Downtown Area Land Use & Design

South of Fischer Street, the corridor changes character and exhibits more Main Street features. There is a greater mix of commercial uses, with restaurants, neighborhood services, pubs, early childhood center, lumber yard, and flooring supply, to name a few. There are a few new and several old single-family residential homes, as well as civic uses like the Village Hall, Library, and Police Station. Physically, the lots are smaller, buildings are built closer to the roadway, and buildings are generally closer together. Some of the buildings have design features such as awnings or signage, but the character is inconsistent.

There are older sidewalks along both sides of IL 159, with some trees on private property offering shade in some spots. The lighting is still auto-oriented. While some lots have side or rear-lot parking, the corridor and side streets are lined with on-street parking.
South Area Land Use & Design

South of Franklin Street, the corridor changes once again to a more suburban character. There is another commercial strip development with ample on-site parking. There are single-family residential homes, a senior center, and cemetery. The Smithton Community Park anchors the corridor on the south end. There are sidewalks connecting the south end to the Downtown area, including a new one built along the west side of IL 159 from Sand Rock Road to Memorial Street. Wide drainage swales line the roadway, and lighting is designed for cars.

Existing commercial strip development to the south, with ample on-site parking

Existing older housing along southern end of corridor, with on-site, non-profit business

Existing large drainage swales and new sidewalk along southern end of corridor
Zoning

The Village of Smithton Zoning Code regulates the type and intensity of uses and location of structures, and also provides standards for signage and parking on land within the Village of Smithton. The intent of the zoning code is to protect the character of the Village and promote orderly and beneficial development. A well-crafted zoning ordinance can be a tool to create a vision for the future development of the town. It sets expectations for community leaders and property owners of how land can be used. It provides a consistent set of rules for everyone to work within when developing property.

Much of the Smithton Great Main Street Strategy project area is zoned B-1 General Business (orange on the map). The B-1 District is intended to regulate commercial uses all along the corridor, from new development in the north and south to redevelopment in the Downtown area. The zone district must account for very different land characteristics and development types, for example different lot sizes, whether a parcel is vacant or built, whether parking is on-street or on-site. So, while the regulations may work for newer developments on larger lots, they may not be able to address the issues that arise from in-fill redevelopment of smaller lots. This results in the need for variances to make the regulations work, which muddies expectations and can be a barrier to continued redevelopment of the Downtown area.
Walking & Biking

One of Smithton’s greatest assets is its walkable Downtown. As you can see from the map, a significant portion of Smithton’s older Downtown area is within a quarter-mile, roughly a 5 minute walk, of Village Hall and the Library. Other community destinations, such as Turner Hall, St. John’s Catholic Church and School, St. John’s UCC Church, and Smithton Community School are within the Downtown walking area. Just south of the quarter-mile walk area is the Smithton Community Park, which is connected by both the Complete Streets network as well as new sidewalks from the Safe Routes to Schools program.

Walking and biking in Smithton is supported by a variety of infrastructure features, such as yellow pedestrian flashers, crosswalk markings, painted share the road markings and signage. Currently there are two marked crossings across IL 159 that have old flashing yellow lights, one at Stoerger/Breckenridge Street and one at Graner/South Street. The share the road signs and markings are spaced along the Complete Streets route running along Lincoln Street to Fieldstone subdivision.
Land Use & Design Opportunities
Throughout the charrette week, several goals and opportunities were identified for improving the IL 159 Main Street corridor. These were collected from field observations, stakeholder interviews, and input from focus groups and keypad polling during the public meetings. Following are the significant land use and design opportunities that were identified for the corridor.

Enhance Walkability
The Village of Smithton has already recognized the benefits of supporting walking and biking in the community. It has developed a Complete Streets policy, identified a route, and invested in pavement markings and street signs along the route. It continues as a trail connection from the Community Park south into new subdivisions. It has invested in sidewalk projects to fill gaps in the sidewalk network.

Attendees at the public meetings expressed a desire to continue the Complete Streets network on the east side of IL 159. Connections from Stonefield Drive to Hickory Street were explored, as were options for getting around the school and connections to the Park. The map shows a possible eastern route to complete the loop, including locations for possible rest areas.

In addition to completing the Complete Streets loop, the study team also explored adding street crossings at various locations up and down Main Street (see map). The crossings were considered as ways to tie the two halves of Smithton together and provide safer access to community destinations such as Turner Hall,
St. John’s, the schools and the Park, as well as connections for the Complete Streets loop. These new crossings, along with the existing crossings, would be upgraded and enhanced with more visible line markings and brighter, more noticeable rapid flashing beacons to alert drivers to the presence of pedestrians and cyclists. These crossings might also have bumpouts, which would define the on-street parking areas and shorten the length pedestrians have to cross unprotected roadway. Further details of the crossings, including issues to address such as improvements to access management to help better define the pedestrian space, are outlined in the transportation whitepaper.

Preserve & Enhance Downtown Character
For most Downtowns and Main Streets, the primary focus is on the pedestrian. The design of buildings, location of buildings on their lots, amenities such as benches and lighting, presence of on-street parking, and design of the public realm (sidewalks, roadways, parks and other civic spaces) often contribute to people being able to move easily and safely between various destinations without having to get into their car for every trip.

The Village of Smithton’s Downtown area, defined for the project as being between Fischer Street and Franklin Street, is the heart of the community. It is a walkable area with several old buildings, smaller lots, a grid street network, and a mix of commercial, residential and civic uses. Sidewalks line the streets and connect important community destinations such as the Village Hall and Library, Turner Hall, churches and schools. Throughout the stakeholder interviews, focus groups and public meetings, residents expressed an interest in preserving and enhancing Smithton’s Downtown character. Opportunities to address include:

Building Siting
How buildings are situated on a lot contributes greatly to the function, character and experience of an area. In Downtowns and on Main Streets, buildings are typically built up to the sidewalk, with little or no front yard. Situated this way, the buildings define the edge between the private and public spaces. People, not vehicles, occupy the space along the buildings, and it becomes easier for people to get from one use to the next when they don’t have to cross wide expanses of parking.

Consistency of building siting is important in a Downtown area. It helps create a uniform feel, and enhances visibility of pedestrians. Consistent, sidewalk-facing building faces also promotes walkability by creating a connected and cohesive place for shoppers to access many storefronts without needing to drive to each destination. This “park once and walk” nature of a well-designed downtown is key to the economic success of any “main street” commercial district. Without it, properties that are setback from the sidewalk can get “lost” in the Downtown setting, and the space in front can be seen as a barrier to pedestrians (unless the space is designed as a public gathering space). This is especially true if parking or driving is permitted in the front space.
Building siting is typically a matter addressed in zoning and site plan regulations. In Downtowns, setback requirements are often exchanged for “build-to” lines, where buildings must be built up to the sidewalk to create a uniformity in pedestrian-scale design. Additionally, many older Downtowns were platted with smaller lots, often resulting in little or no side yards between buildings, and greater lot area coverage than typically allowed in suburban style development. Zoning regulations should recognize the unique site limitations often found in Downtowns and should have regulations that reflect the existing conditions. To some extent, this can be handled through minor adjustments in the Downtown zoning regulations. A more dynamic (and labor intensive) way to address the building siting issues is through form-based codes. These are regulations that comprehensively detail the building layout requirements as well as elements that contribute directly to the public realm. While more complex in their administration, form-based codes offer greater guidance and control of physical form. They are regulations, not merely guidelines, and are adopted into the Village ordinances.

**Facades & Signage**

Building facades and signage are another way to define a Downtown area. Consistency in building materials or architectural design elements such as awnings, bay windows, or shutters can contribute greatly to the look and feel of a Downtown area. Signage should be designed first with the pedestrian in mind, and then with the auto-traveling public. Signs should be easily viewable from people walking along the sidewalk or from across the street, as well as to those driving along the corridor. Care should be taken to make sure the size and location does not interfere with the businesses or otherwise detract from the pedestrian experience.

Facades and signage are often regulated through the zoning and site development review process. Often, ordinances simply address the size, location and presence of certain features, with little regard to consistency in design. At the least, regulations benefit from being accompanied by pictures or renderings as a way to illustrate the desired goal of the regulations. A more robust step is having design guidelines which go even further to prescribe very specific design elements in a variety of circumstances. While some design guidelines do not carry the authority of the development regulations, the more integrated the two are, the more likely the Village is to achieve its desired vision.
Pedestrian-scale Amenities
As previously mentioned, Downtowns and Main Streets are typically pedestrian-oriented places. The public realm, the spaces between the buildings, are designed with a focus on the pedestrian experience. Elements such as wide sidewalks, street trees, lighting, and even parking along the street are designed to provide a safe and enjoyable pedestrian experience. Street furniture, such as benches, water fountains, and trash receptacles address basic needs and add to the overall comfort. These amenities are important to have along the corridor as well as strategically into nearby neighborhoods.

As with facades and signage, amenities add to the character of a Downtown and should be considered whenever new investment takes place along the corridor. Amenities such as street trees and lighting are often considered whenever new investments in infrastructure take place, for example sidewalk, street, or utility repair. Elements such as bike racks and benches are smaller investments that can be made any time funds are available. With a plan and design guidelines in place, the Village, business owners, or other community groups can install amenities whenever time and resources permit.

Parking
Parking in the Downtown area of Smithton mirrors that of other rural Main Street locations – there is on-street parking along the corridor and the side streets, there are a few parcels with small, on-site parking areas, a few with larger parking areas, residences with personal driveways and garages, and many that have no on-site parking. This variety and distribution of parking is indicative of places that are designed around people rather than cars. While the
lack of on-site parking may be seen as a negative by some, it actually promotes walkability by bringing uses closer together. Neighborhoods with uses close together, supported by a well-connected grid street network and sidewalks, encourage people to park nearby and walk to one or more destinations within a short distance.

Typically, parking requirements are handled through the zoning ordinance and site plan review. Traditional zoning ordinances designed for greenfield development in suburban settings often require ample on-site parking. The parking calculations fail to account for the presence of on-street parking, the potential for shared parking areas, and that some traffic will be walkers and cyclists from nearby neighborhoods. In a Downtown setting, these requirements can become a barrier to redevelopment, as property owners are unable to accommodate parking on-site, and may require a variance to allow for a reduction in parking, which increases development time and cost. And while granted variances do not typically set a precedent for future action, such routine concessions become expected and can make consistent regulation difficult over time. Instead, parking regulations for Downtown areas should account for the lot sizes and development characteristics of the area, and offer parking requirements that promote downtown density and walkability. For example, some well-planned business districts use parking maximums rather than minimums, using parking calculations that account for the proximity of on-street parking and shared parking with adjacent uses. Others, seeking to promote more bicycle access to the district, will require bike racks in addition to the automobile parking.

**Attracting New Businesses & Housing**

Another factor to a successful downtown business district is attracting and retaining appropriate businesses and housing that can support and be supported by the inherent walkability of the area. For commercial, this means evaluating permitted uses within the downtown business zoning district and ensuring that the types of uses do not require significant, automobile-centric infrastructure (such as drive-through or large parking lots). It also means marketing toward complimentary uses, businesses that support one another as potential customers walk from establishment to establishment.

Residential uses downtown should be considered with greater densities than in traditional subdivisions. This includes permitting residential dwellings on the second floor of retail space and townhome-style, single-family attached dwellings. It is important that such housing preserves the character of downtown, adhering to the same building siting and façade standards discussed previously. The benefit of such housing downtown is it creates a density of potential customers for the business district, and helps create around-the-clock activity for the district, as residents are present after businesses close for the day.

It is important to note that the issue of business and residential attraction is not solely confined to the downtown area. Vacant buildings such as the old hardware store and vacant property such as the large parcel across from the new fire station, reflect the need to expand the housing and commercial assessment beyond downtown. A market analysis will be important to understand the market realities of the different types of businesses and housing potential in the different parts of the corridor.
A Brief Word on Historic Buildings

With its roots back to the mid-1800s, the Village of Smithton has a rich history, reflected in numerous buildings along the Main Street corridor as well as throughout the Downtown neighborhood. Buildings and residences from the late 1800s through the early and mid-1900s offer their unique style to the character of Smithton. While a formal survey of historical structures was not conducted as part of the Smithton Great Main Street Strategy, a scan of the building stock along the corridor of the Downtown area found numerous buildings with the potential to contribute to a formal historic district.

Challenges with older buildings in a Downtown area include maintenance and upkeep as well as the ability of older structures to meet changing uses and demands of contemporary life. Sensitive rehabilitation of the structures and regulations, such as the zoning code, that account for the unique characteristics of potentially historical buildings are necessary if the Village is to preserve its historical assets and enhance its historic qualities.

Creating a historic district is not merely a way to recognize the unique and historic nature of Smithton’s buildings. Such districts and designations for buildings within them can make available financial incentives for rehabilitation of residences and businesses. Financial incentives fall into four major categories: federal rehabilitation tax credits, local incentives, low-interest loans, and grants. Some of these programs are meant for income-producing properties, such as the 20% Rehabilitation Tax Credit for Historic Buildings; some are even available for old, but not historic, buildings built before 1936; and some help defray costs by freezing the taxes on owner-occupied historic residences. A full list of available financial incentives can be obtained from the Illinois Historic preservation Agency.

In addition to the financial incentives, the Illinois Main Street program is a state program that provides assistance to communities to help revitalize traditional commercial districts through a proven methodology to address design, organization, promotion, and economic restructuring.
Land Use & Design Recommendations

The Village of Smithton Comprehensive Plan, updated in 2009, recognizes and supports improvements to the Downtown area (called the “Original Business District” in the Comprehensive Plan). The plan sets out a variety of policies related to land use and design within the Downtown area, such as:

- Update the community’s sign ordinance
- Require quality design standards
- Preserve and revitalize the original business district
- Apply to become part of the Illinois Main Street Program
- Establish a design review board
- Provide a mechanism to identify and fund necessary capital improvements

These policies were validated during the stakeholder interviews, focus groups and public meetings. The following land use and design recommendations support the policies in the Comprehensive Plan and provide further detail and guidance for implementation.

Update Zoning Ordinance

The primary tools to guide development and redevelopment in the Village of Smithton are the Land Development and Zoning Ordinances. As discussed earlier in this whitepaper, the B-1 General Business zone district, the predominant zone district for the IL 159/Main Street corridor, is used to regulate new, suburban, auto-oriented commercial developments as well as redevelopment within the Downtown area. This presents a challenge for Village staff and officials charged with regulating land use and development to ensure that the type of development proposed is consistent with and helps advance the vision the community has for various parts of the Village. To address the unique characteristics and distinct needs of different parts of the Village, staff and officials should modify and update the Zoning Ordinance. The following are three ways that the Village could address their zoning issues, ranging in order of cost and complexity.

New District

One way to address the differences in character and desired vision is to create a new zoning district for the Downtown, call it a B-2 Downtown Business zone district. This would allow the regulations to reflect the desired uses, existing lot sizes, building character, parking requirements, and signage that are unique to Downtown.

This effort could start very simply, and evolve over time. Staff could start by taking the B-1 regulations and modifying them to address Downtown issues. Uses could be added and subtracted from the list of permitted uses; special uses such as outdoor dining could be added by conditional use permit. Yard setbacks and lot coverage could be adjusted to account for the smaller lots. Sign regulations could be adjusted to permit only the types and sizes of signs desired Downtown. Staff should review the
variances granted to Downtown property owners over the past three years as a reference for the sorts of changes that should be considered in the new zone district. While perhaps more detailed than what is needed at first, the town center district model ordinance of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, may provide guidance and inspiration as to what the village may do with a zoning update.

Though Village staff and officials could make several of the adjustments needed for the new zone district, they may want to consider hiring planning and design professionals to craft a comprehensive approach for the new district, especially the sign and parking elements. These elements have greater technical demands that may be better informed by planning and design professionals with current experience addressing these issues in a variety of similar places. Planning and design professionals are also able to identify pitfalls and offer solutions that have worked elsewhere to address unique circumstances. Costs can vary based on level of community outreach desired, as well as the comprehensiveness of the approach (a single element or a district framework).

**Timing:** The Village should consider creating a new zone district with the basic elements within the next 6 months.

**Cost:** Depending on Village resources and need:

- In-house – cost is staff time and minimal legal review.
- Planning & Design Professional – between $15,000 and $35,000, depending on whether a comprehensive crafting of the entire district is undertaken, or just technical elements such as parking requirements or sign regulations.

**Regulation Design Guidelines**

Another way to approach the differences within the Downtown area is through the use of design guidelines that support the Village’s regulations. Design guidelines are more detailed, visual representations of the regulations; a graphical representation of the vision behind the regulations. Design guidelines are often for specific areas, such as Downtown, where the Village is placing a greater emphasis on design elements as well as the standard regulator elements. Design guidelines can stand alone as separate reference documents, in which case they do not carry any legal authority. Or, they can be integrated into ordinances and provide further detail of the requirements. Design guidelines are very beneficial because they are a visual representation of the desired outcome for development, which can help property owners and officials better understand the expectations of the regulations. Design guidelines can help inform the variance process in the short-term, and can set direction for future ordinance changes. Ideally, design guidelines are developed by planning and design professionals and address such issues as architecture, landscape architecture, site design, and signage.

**Timing:** The Village should consider regulation design guidelines as part of a broader effort of community branding, historical preservation, or streetscape improvement plan. The process of developing design guidelines can take 6 – 9 months depending on the level of public engagement and desired integration with development regulations.

**Cost:** Cost for design guidelines could range from $40,000 to $55,000 and depends heavily on the level of community input desired and the extent of the elements included (i.e., architecture, landscape architecture, site design, and signage).
Overlay District

Another way the Village could approach addressing the unique zoning and development issues in its Downtown area is through the creation of an overlay district. Though there are a variety of ways to administer an overlay district, the simplest is to keep the underlying zoning that property owners can do by right, and then overlay a set of new regulations that are optional, but which give property owners some built-in flexibility when going through the zoning and site plan review process. Often, overlay districts offer a series of “give and take” elements, where a property owner or developer might be granted certain variances from the underlying zoning in exchange for providing certain amenities to benefit the Village. For example, outdoor dining may not be permitted in the underlying zoning, but may be permitted in the overlay regulations in exchange for beautification and streetscape improvements in the vicinity of the development. Overlay districts can address a variety of elements, including building siting, facades and architectural features, parking, and signage. Using an overlay district does add a level of complexity in the administration of the regulations, and a great deal more up-front thinking is needed to know what issues should be included. Without experienced staff, planning and design professionals should be enlisted to create the overlay district. Village staff may want to contact the St. Louis County Planning Department to discuss implementation of their new overlay zoning districts.

**Timing:** The Village should consider the creation of an overlay district as part of a comprehensive regulation overhaul, and put into place as future development pressures warrant a more sophisticated approach to redevelopment in the Downtown area.

**Cost:** Cost for creation of an overlay district, as part of an overall regulation overhaul, could range between $80,000 and $120,000.

Develop Streetscape Plan (for amenities)

As part of an overall beautification plan for the Downtown area, the Village may want to consider having a branding and streetscape plan developed. Similar to the regulation design guidelines mentioned above, the streetscape design plan is for the area called the **public realm**, the space between the buildings along the corridor that includes the sidewalks and roadway. A comprehensive approach to streetscape improvements helps create an identity for the public space. It reinforces the pedestrian-
scale of the neighborhood, and addresses issues of aesthetics, safety, and overall comfort of people within the corridor.

A streetscape design plan address features of public infrastructure, as well as private design elements. Public infrastructure features (e.g., enhanced sidewalks, wayfinding signs, pedestrian-scale streetlights, benches, and street trees) would be implemented by the Village or other community organization, while the private design elements (e.g., facades, awnings, and building signs) would be implemented by building owners and developers.

**Timing:** The Village, in partnership with the Chamber of Commerce and other community groups, should initiate the creation of streetscape design plan as part of a larger community branding effort or as an early task of a Downtown district organization.

**Cost:** Cost for developing a streetscape design plan will vary widely based on the level of community engagement and the range of elements to be included in the scope. Cost for a streetscape design plan could range $110,000 - $175,000, which could include guidelines, an implementation plan, and some engineering.

**Organizing for Action**

A variety of options were discussed during the charrette week for organizing and implementing the improvement efforts in Downtown Smithton. Different structures were discussed, whether formal or informal, city-run or non-profit, citywide or just a district. Examples of funding options were discussed, such as Federal and State grants, Village revenues, and funding through assessments and future investments. Activities to be undertaken by a Downtown organization included: marketing, special events, streetscape improvements, beautification, and economic development.

The Village has an active Chamber of Commerce, with a newly formed Economic Development Committee, that expressed an interest in working with the Village and being a central piece in organizing and administering a Downtown improvement program. This committee could take the first step in researching and developing a proposal. Below are two models that were discussed during the charrette week to provide some initial guidance for the creation and administration of a Downtown district.
City of Red Bud, IL – Economic Development Commission

Organization: Economic Development Commission, as an advisory body to the City Council. City staff taking direct action on administration of programs.

Funding: Initial funding from State and Federal Economic Development funds, supplemented by City general funds.

Key Program: Micro Loan Fund

- $10,000 revolving loan fund
- Given to area small businesses for needed improvements, including structural, façade, and upkeep
- Started with a $50,000 Rural Business Development Grant, and supplemented with $40,000 in City funds. Program earns interest on loans which helps build revenues for the program.

Contact: Pam Poetker, City Administration, (618) 282-2315, pam@cityofredbud.org

Community of Lemay, MO – Lemay Development Corporation

Organization: Lemay Development Corporation (LDC) started as a 501c3 division of the Lemay Chamber of Commerce, but has since spun off as an independent organization.

Funding: Initial funding for the LDC came from an Economic Development Initiative grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Ongoing funding comes from a variety of state and local sources such as Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, grants from the St. Louis County Port Authority, and stated economic development grants.

Key Activities: The LDC uses its funds for property acquisition and site preparation to reduce development costs for strategic properties within the community. It purchases land for future lease/sale, and uses the revenues to build a funding stream. St. Louis County conducted a market analysis for Lemay as part of the development of a Comprehensive Plan, and that market study and plan guide the LDC’s efforts. The LDC recently partnered on a community initiative, the Lemay Branding and Streetscape Plan, funded by the St. Louis County Port Authority.

Contact: Donna Baringer, President/Executive Director, (314) 638-9500, dbaringer@lemaydevelopment.org
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CBB conducted an evaluation of the existing conditions along the corridor. These items are discussed in the following sections and include:

- Traffic volumes and speeds
- Crash history
- Functional classification
- Physical characteristics such as lane configuration, on-street parking, lane width, access management (driveways/curb cuts), and traffic control such as traffic signals and stop signs
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities including sidewalks, crosswalks, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodations and the Village’s Complete Streets Loop

**Traffic Counts**

Traffic and speed data were provided by IDOT along Main Street (between Douglas Road and North Hickory Street, between North Hickory Street and Fischer Street, between Fischer Street and Memorial Street, and between Memorial Street and Knab Road). The results are presented below.

**Traffic and Speed Data**

IDOT provided traffic machine counts (traffic volumes and speeds) on Main Street from Tuesday, August 4, to Wednesday, August 5, 2015. Summary data is provided in the table and figures below as well as in the attached exhibits.

The data shows average daily volumes between 7,000 and 11,000 vehicles per day (vpd) in the study segment; between 9,000 vpd and 11,000 vpd north of Fischer Street and volumes between 7,000 vpd and 9,000 vpd south of Fischer Street. Traffic speeds are generally well controlled throughout the study area with average speeds lower than or equal to posted speeds. Between Douglas Road and North Hickory Street the average travel speed is 50 mph (posted is 55 mph); between North Hickory Street and Fischer Street the average travel speed is 32 mph (posted is 35 mph). We did note a higher average speed between Fischer Street and Memorial Street at 33mph, where the posted speed is lower (30-35 mph). Between Memorial Street and Knab Road the average travel speed is 45 mph (posted it 45 mph). The speed that 85% of drivers will drive at or slower than (the 85% speed) are 58 mph between Douglas Road and North Hickory, 37 mph between North Hickory Street, 39 mph between Fischer Street and Memorial Street, and 51 mph between Memorial Street and Knab Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADT (vpd)</th>
<th>Douglas to North Hickory</th>
<th>North Hickory to Fischer</th>
<th>Fischer to Memorial</th>
<th>Memorial to Knab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT (vpd)</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted Speed (mph)</td>
<td>55-35 (55 mph north of Douglas Creek)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30-35 (30 mph through downtown)</td>
<td>35-55 (45 mph south of Sand Rock &amp; 55 mph south of Knab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (mph)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% Speed (mph)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following ADT ranges are typical volumes for various facility types and show that Main Street fits in the range for either a 2 or 3-lane roadway:

- 2 – Lane Road: Under 15,000 vpd
- 3 – Lane Road: 10,000 to 20,000 vpd
- 4 – Lane Road: 15,000 to 30,000 vpd
- 5 – Lane Road: 20,000 to 45,000 vpd
Traffic Speeds - Northbound Main Street
Douglas-Freeburg to North Hickory

Posted Speed = 55 mph
Average Speed = 48 mph
85% Speed = 56 mph

Traffic Speeds - Southbound Main Street
Douglas-Freeburg to North Hickory

Posted Speed = 55 mph
Average Speed = 52 mph
85% Speed = 60 mph
Traffic Speeds - Northbound Main Street
North Hickory to Fischer

Posted Speed = 35 mph
Average Speed = 32 mph
85% Speed = 37 mph

Traffic Speeds - Southbound Main Street
North Hickory to Fischer

Posted Speed = 35 mph
Average Speed = 32 mph
85% Speed = 37 mph
Traffic Speeds - Northbound Main Street
Fischer to Memorial

Posted Speed = 35 mph
Average Speed = 32 mph
85% Speed = 39 mph

Traffic Speeds - Southbound Main Street
Fischer to Memorial

Posted Speed = 35 mph
Average Speed = 33 mph
85% Speed = 39 mph
Traffic Speeds - Northbound Main Street
Memorial to Knab

Posted Speed = 45 mph
Average Speed = 45 mph
85% Speed = 53 mph

Traffic Speeds - Southbound Main Street
Memorial to Knab

Posted Speed = 45 mph
Average Speed = 44 mph
85% Speed = 49 mph
Crash History

CBB obtained crash data from IDOT for IL 159 between Douglas Road and Sand Rock Road between 2010 and 2014. A total of 75 crashes occurred in the corridor, 27 involving injuries with 43 people injured. No roadway fatalities occurred during this period. Two crashes involving pedestrians were recorded. It should be noted that people generally feel safe driving along Main Street as keypad polling 27% of respondents stated that they felt “very safe driving on IL 159” and 60% felt that they felt “generally safe except for some hot spots”. A crash summary is provided in the table below and additional information is available in the attached exhibits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route IL 159</th>
<th>Injury Crashes</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Property Damage Only</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>PED Crashes</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Douglas Rd.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Between Douglas Rd. and N. Hickory St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Midblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 N. Hickory St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Between N. Hickory St. and Stonefield Dr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Stonefield Dr.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Between Stonefield Drive and Sunset Drive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Sunset Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Between Sunset Drive and Center St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Center St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Between Center St. and Brevo St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Midblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Brevo St.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Barker St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Between Barker St. and Fisher St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Fisher St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Buchanan St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Breckenridge St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Melinda St./ Cass St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Garner St./South St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School/Ped Signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Franklin St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Memorial Dr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Between Memorial Dr. and Cletus Dr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Cletus St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Suburban Pl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL 159 Sand Rock Rd.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Street Stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 27 43 48 75

Specific areas of concern:
- The traffic signal at IL 159/Douglas Road had 18 crashes, 7 involving injuries. While this is a higher crash location in the study corridor, the number of crashes is not untypical for traffic signals in this part of the St. Louis region.
The short segment between Sunset Drive and Brevo Street had 19 crashes, 4 involving injuries (9 total injuries). Rear ends, turning, and angle are the most common crash types at this location. These types of crashes are typically associated with access management issues (large numbers driveways resulting in turns/stops). The combined segment has a resulting crash rate higher than typical for St. Louis Metro area arterial roadways. Several recommendations are provided in this report for reconfiguration of this study segment.

Area Connectivity
Through IL159, and other state highways, the Village of Smithton is connected to many other communities. Residents frequent these communities for working, shopping, dining, and other amenities. Below are listed travel times and distances to nearby towns and attractions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg</td>
<td>8 minutes</td>
<td>5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>12 minutes</td>
<td>9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>14 minutes</td>
<td>8 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Bud</td>
<td>16 minutes</td>
<td>14 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>12 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>14 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch Stadium</td>
<td>32 minutes</td>
<td>22 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadway Inventory
Data was summarized for roadway width, lane configuration, on-street parking, access management (driveways/curb cuts), traffic control such as traffic signals and stop signs, functional classification, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The study corridor includes one minor arterial (Main Street) and one major collector (Douglas Road) as well as several local roads. Minor arterials offer connections to larger towns and cities. They provide service to other routes outside the local area. They are generally designed to provide relatively high travel speeds, with minimal interference to movement.

Main Street (IL 159) is an Illinois owned and maintained minor arterial and an important connection in the southern Illinois St. Louis Metro area. Main Street is the primary route through Smithton, providing regional access to businesses and other institutions. Main Street is two lanes wide, one lane in each direction. Left-turn lanes are provided at Douglas Road, North Hickory Street, and Stonefield Drive. Pavement widths range from 33’ to nearly 60’, depending on the presence of turn-lanes, shoulders, and on-street parking. A wide right-of-way (60’+) exists both north and south of the downtown area. The following section discusses various sections of the study corridor from north to south.

Douglas Road to North Hickory Street: The northern most section of the study corridor is a rural to suburban transition area. Speed limits are posted at 55 mph north of Douglas Creek and transition to 35 mph south of the creek. Traffic volumes are just under 10,000 vpd, and average speeds are about 50 mph. Northbound speeds are somewhat controlled as people leave the Village at 35 mph, and the curve south of Douglas Road helps to slow people entering the Village from the north. The intersection with Douglas Road has the corridor’s only traffic signal. Northbound traffic queues at this signal during the AM peak period as many students travel west to attend Freeburg High School. Douglas Road is a major collector in the study area, providing access to the Jefferson Barracks I-255 Bridge via IL 158 and IL 3. It is two lanes wide. There are no sidewalks or other pedestrian accommodations in this section of the corridor.
North Hickory Street to Fischer Street: The section of Main Street south of North Hickory Street is a suburban to urban transition area. Speed limits are posted at 35 mph. Traffic volumes are close to 10,000 vpd in this section, and average speeds are about 32 mph.

There are several traffic issues in this part of the corridor. During the charrette process local residents expressed concern about the ability to turn out of the Field Stone subdivision during heavy traffic periods, especially during the AM peak commuter period. Another issue is the large number of large and open curb-cuts between Sunset and Fischer Street. As previously discussed, this section of the corridor has a high crash rate likely caused by the largely uncontrolled business access.

There are sidewalks on west side of Main Street connecting the strip center north of Stonefield Drive to Bertille Drive. Pedestrians use Bertille Drive from this location to connect to Sunset Drive. There are Sidewalks on both sides of Main Street south of Sunset Drive.

Downtown Area: The downtown area of Main Street (roughly Fischer Street to Franklin Street) provides access to many critical uses in the Village (e.g., Turner Hall, St. John School, Village Hall/Library, Smithton Elementary, and Village Park). Speeds transition from 35 to 30 mph between in the area of Breckenridge Street/Buchanan Street on the north side of downtown and South Street/Graner Street on the south side of downtown. Traffic volumes are closer to 9,000 vpd in this section, and average speeds are about 33 mph. Businesses front Main Street with parking either on-street or in the side/rear of the buildings. On-street parking is generally allowed along Main Street and cross streets. However, this parking is not heavily used in that many people do not feel safe using it. Keypad polling during the charrette resulted in 27% responded that parking is fine, no problems, 40% responded that there is adequate parking but that it does not seem safe, and 27% said that there is enough parking but not where it is needed.
The downtown segment has sidewalks on both sides of Main Street. However, there is a need to enhance the opportunity to cross Main Street in this section. There are two marked crosswalks, one at Stoerger Street / Breckenridge Street (providing a crossing for St. John School) and the second at Graner Street/South Street (providing a crossing for Smithton Elementary). Both of these intersections have a push-button operated flashing beacon indicating the pedestrian crossing at the marked crosswalk. Additionally, as a part of a recent Safe Routes to School project, the Village improved the pedestrian routes around Smithton Elementary School by adding sidewalks along South Street from Main Street to South High Street.

Keypad polling shows people don’t walk much on Main Street. 29% reported walking a few times a month, 29% reported walking on Main Street less than a few times a month, and 43% reported never walking on Main Street. One of the problems is a lack of crosswalks. 60% of Keypad polling respondents reported the need for more crosswalk locations along the corridor. Additionally, 31% of people said that they would walk if there were more trees or shading and 25% said that they would walk on Main Street more if there were more places to go. In contrast, 33% of people said that they walk in neighborhood streets a couple of times a week and 27% reported walking on neighborhood streets at least a few times per month.

Franklin Street to Knab Road: The southern section of the study corridor is an urban to suburban to rural transition area. In the northern end of this section businesses tend to be set-back from the street with parking out front in a traditional suburban pattern. Business activity is limited south of the Village’s Senior Center. Speed limits are posted at 35 mph north Memorial Drive, transitioning to 45 mph just south of Sand Rock Road, and to 55 mph just south of Knab Road. Average traffic speeds generally follow the speed limit in this section. Traffic volumes are around 7,500 vpd in this section.

As a part of a recent Safe Routes to School project, the Village installed sidewalks along the west side of Main Street between Memorial Street and Sand Rock Road and along the south side of Sand Rock Road between Main Street and Wildhorse Road. This new sidewalk provides walking connections not only to local schools, but also to Village Park and the Village’s Complete Streets Loop. The Village intends to eventually extend these connections to the subdivisions south of the Autumn Ridge subdivision.
Complete Streets Loop

Smithton has created a “Complete Streets” walking and biking route along neighborhood streets. This trail is roughly parallel to Main Street, and runs along the west side of town. The route is marked with Share the Road signs and road markings. The loop provides strong connections on the west side of IL 159 from the Field Stone subdivision in the north to the Autumn Ridge subdivision to the south. The loop also has strong connections to the walking trails in Village Park. However, this system does not currently connect across IL 159 to the east side of the Village and does not connect to the subdivisions south of the Autumn Ridge subdivision.

Village Park
Hiking Trail

Moving Forward

Over the past several years, the Village of Smithton has been evolving from a rural farming community to a suburban “bedroom” community. In its historical core, the Village has many of the elements of a vibrant urban “downtown”, where residents and visitors can work, shop, and “play” within the community. It is clear that Smithton desires new quality development and a more inviting downtown to support the community and enhance the quality of life. Transportation is a major component to community development and fostering a strong sense of place. Studies across the country have shown that walkability improves the economy in multiple ways. First, it raises property values within the walkable area. Second, as transportation costs are cut, people will spend more money, and spend it closer to home. Third, walkable communities attract visitors, bringing money into the community. Fourth, walkable communities are more likely to attract new businesses. Fifth, as businesses grow, employment levels go up. In addition to these, walkability saves people money: the reduction in emissions creates a healthier community, lowering health costs and improving agricultural output, and less driving means lower costs for transportation as well as savings for collision and injury costs. In this light, Main Street needs to be a corridor that is safe and inviting for all users—pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. The recommendations provided in this report help to advance these goals and to work toward fostering a strong, successful, resilient, and healthy community.
Recommended Improvements

The recommendations provided below start with enhancing the road for all users, including pedestrians. With good regional connectivity, by foot, bicycle, and vehicle, it is important the corridor serve all users safely and efficiently. Recommendations are intended to enhance safety, improve user experience, and promote a better connected corridor. Furthermore, they are intended to provide a more attractive experience for shopping, dining, experiencing the community, and attending special events.

Extend the Village Complete Streets Loop

As previously discussed, Smithton has created a “Complete Streets” walking and biking route along neighborhood streets on the west side of the Village. This route is marked with “Share the Road” signs and road markings. This route should be expanded to the east side of the Village as shown in the figure to the right. The expanded route would follow North Hickory Street to the Smithton Elementary School, and then use South Street, Smith Street, and Franklin Street to go around the school property and connect back to South Hickory Street. The route would then connect back to Main Street via Cletus Street. This expansion would require a new crosswalk at a new intersection of Stonefield Drive and relocated North Hickory Street (discussed below). The expansion would also require a new crosswalk across Main Street on the south end of Smithton near Village Park (also discussed below). The expanded Complete Streets Loop would better connect the Village and would provide active transportation options to those living and working on the east side of Main Street. Ultimately, this route should be also expanded to the Village’s subdivisions south of the Autumn Ridge subdivision. This project would be popular with the Village’s residents. Keypad polling during the charrette process resulted in 100% of respondents stating that they agreed with the proposed Complete Streets Loop as shown or with a few adjustments. Moreover, “Completing the Loop” scored as the community’s second highest priority for “Great Street” improvements. The Village could likely install the Share the Road signs and road markings to “Complete the Loop” for less than $50,000. The costs to construct new crosswalks across Main Street at Stonefield Drive/ North Hickory Street and near Village Park are discussed in subsequent sections.

Douglas Road Intersection

As previously discussed, northbound traffic at the intersection of Main Street and Douglas Road queues during the AM peak commuter period as many students from Smithton travel west to attend Freeburg High School. The intersection could be improved by constructing a northbound right-turn lane. This would cost on the order of $100,000 to $200,000 and have a high-level of community support. Keypad polling during the charrette process resulted in 94% support of respondents for this improvement. Consideration should also be given to adding eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on Douglas Road. These improvements would also cost on the order of $100,000 to $200,000 and would improve traffic flow and safety at this intersection.
Relocated/Reconfigured North Hickory Street /Stonefield Drive Intersection

During the charrette process local residents expressed concern about the ability to turn out of the Field Stone subdivision during heavy traffic periods, especially during the AM peak commuter period. Also, North Hickory Street currently intersects Main Street at a skew, creating awkward geometry that can be difficult for drivers to negotiate. Finally, as discussed above, a new pedestrian crossing across Main Street is needed near the Field Stone subdivision in order to extend the Village’s Complete Streets loop. For these reasons the Village’s future land use plan shows a realignment of North Hickory Street to create a four-way intersection with Stonefield Drive. The Village’s original plan was to install a traffic signal at this location. A traffic signal would be able to accommodate both vehicular and pedestrian demands. The installation of a traffic signal at this location would require meeting traffic signal warrants as prescribed in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)\(^1\). It is unclear at this time if future traffic volumes will meet the MUTCD traffic signal warrant requirements.

Another option is to configure the intersection as a roundabout. Either option (traffic signal or roundabout) would “clean up” the intersection geometry, improve safety, and result in more efficient traffic flow. Benefits of a roundabout include 1) a center landscaped island that could serve as a “gateway treatment” for the Village, 2) a “hard” entry point into the Village slowing traffic, 3) improved safety for all users (including pedestrians and bicyclists)\(^2\).

Modern roundabouts are different from historical traffic circles. Modern roundabouts have counter clockwise flow and a circle diameter that encourages speeds of 20-25 mph through the intersection. Additionally, roundabouts have splitter islands in each approach to slow traffic entering the intersection and also providing a refuges for crossing pedestrians. The unique geometry of roundabouts provides opportunities for landscaping that can help to create a stronger sense of place, further enhancing the pedestrian experience. One-lane modern roundabouts are typically designed with a “truck apron” (raised and/or textured apron on the outside of center island) to provide wheel tracking for large vehicles such as trucks, busses, fire equipment, and farm vehicles.

This project would have a high-level of community support. Keypad polling during the charrette process resulted in 83% support of respondents for this improvement. This project would likely be undertaken in conjunction with the development of property on the east side of Main Street, which should also include extending the sidewalks in this section. A preliminary design study should be undertaken to determine the likely cost for these improvements, either of which would likely be on the order of $500,000-$750,000 excluding right-of-way needs.

---

\(^1\) [http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/](http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/)

Widen Main Street north of Downtown to Three-Lanes
(South of Douglas Creek to Fischer Street)

The traffic volumes on this section of Main Street are high enough to support a three-lane cross section (one through lane in each direction with a center left-turn lane). The area has a suburban character, with businesses set-back from the street with parking out front. This segment of the corridor has a high crash rate, primary involving rear end, turning, and angle crashes which are typically associated with high levels of business access (large numbers driveways resulting in turns/stops). The high traffic volumes, crash history, and commercial activity makes this section of Main Street a good candidate for widening to a three-lane cross section. Keypad polling during the charrette process resulted in 100% of respondents stating that they agreed with widening Main Street to three-lanes in this section. Further, “turn lanes north and south” scored as the community’s highest priority for “Great Street” improvements as a part of this plan. A preliminary design study should be undertaken to determine the likely cost for these improvements.

Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing at Sunset Drive

An enhanced pedestrian crosswalk across Main Street is needed near the intersection with Sunset Drive. During the charrette process, 60% percent of residents stated that there should be more crosswalks across Main Street. This plan proposes crosswalks at several locations on Main Street (relocated intersection with North Hickory Street/Stonefield Drive, three downtown locations, and two locations near Village Park). With the exception of the segment between Stonefield Drive and Fischer Street there no more than a quarter-mile between any of the proposed crosswalk locations. However, there is about one-half mile spacing between Stonefield Drive and Fischer Street, which is too far between crosswalk locations. Moreover, there is a child care center on the east side of Main Street at Sunset Drive, and the staff, parents, and children who use this facility cross Main Street during various times of the day. A safe crossing should be provided for their use making Sunset Drive an ideal location.

Installation would include ADA compliant curb ramps, a high-visibility (continental) crosswalk, signage, and possible Rectangular Flashing Beacon (RRFB). Continental crosswalks cost on the order of $500 each to install. Pedestrian crossings can be further enhanced through signage, flashers, or rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFB). Flashers and RRFB installations can cost between $10,000 and $20,000 to install at each crosswalk. Additional cost may be needed to complete curb and sidewalk work to bring the crossing to ADA compliance. Total cost for this installation could be on the order of $25,000 to $50,000. This project would have a high-level of community support. Keypad polling during the charrette process resulted in 94% support of respondents for an enhanced crosswalk at this location.
Access Management Improvements

As discussed previously, the short segment between Sunset Drive and Brevo Street has a crash rate that is higher than typical for St. Louis Metro area arterial roadways. This segment experienced 19 crashes from 2010 to 2014, 4 involving injuries (with 9 total injuries). Rear end, turning, and angle crashes are most common at this location. These crash types are often associated with access management problems (large numbers driveways resulting in turns/stops).

One of the problems is the off-set driveways between the Casey’s on the west side of Main Street and the Region’s bank on the east side of Main Street. This driveway off-set creates conflicts when two vehicles attempt to make left-turns out onto Main Street at the same time. Several Charrette participants expressed concern about this issue. One way to address this issue is to close the southern Casey’s Main Street driveway as shown in the figure to the right. This would leave Casey’s with three of their existing driveways (north drive on Main Street, Brevo Street, and Center Street).

Moreover, there are two very large open curb cuts on the section of Main Street between Fischer Street and Brevo Street. The Industrial Roller Company has a large curb cut (roughly 200 feet) on east side of the street, and All-Mart/ Renner Funeral Home share a large open curb cut (roughly 150 feet) on the west side of the street.

These large curb cuts create challenges for both vehicles driving down Main Street and pedestrians trying to walk along Main Street. First, the sidewalks along both side of Main Street are missing along this section of the corridor. Second, drivers pull in and out of businesses along the entire frontage of this segment, creating conflicts.

The proposed access reconfigurations are shown in the figure above. A landscaped/sidewalk buffer would be installed along the frontage with smaller driveway openings for business access. Since the building setbacks from the street are small (roughly 40-50’) parking would need to be reconfigured as angle parking and a one-way drive isle (northbound only traffic for the Industrial Roller Company and southbound only traffic for All-Mart). The Renner Funeral Home would be largely unaffected. The proposed access changes at Casey’s could cost on the order of $10,000 to $20,000. The proposed changes at the Industrial Roller Company and All-Mart could each cost on the order of $50,000 to $100,000. Coordination would be needed with the impacted businesses to ensure that any changes take into consideration essential business operations (e.g., example loading and docking).
Downtown

Main Street’s downtown area (roughly between Fischer Street and Franklin Street) provides access to many critical uses in the Village. Main Street businesses front the street with parking either on-street or in the side/rear of the buildings. As this is the Village’s central business district, it is important that the street design provide an environment where people are comfortable and feel safe walking to and between various establishments. Thus, while the overarching roadway plan Main Street in the downtown retains the existing basic street configuration (one lane in each direction with on-street parking), the street would be enhanced.

On-street parking will be maintained for several reasons. First, residents generally desire to keep on-street parking in the downtown. In keypad polling during the Charrette, 94% of participants responded that the Village should “keep parallel parking, but adjust the sidewalks to add plantings, lighting, etc.” Moreover, on-street parking provides access to business, slows traffic, and provides a buffer between sidewalks and moving traffic. Likewise, edge line striping should be retained as it clearly separates parking lanes from drive lanes. However, the limits of the downtown 30 mph zone should be adjusted (for clarity and consistency) to match the downtown zone (extending between Fischer Street Graner Street/South Street). The proposed 3-lane sections would be posted at 35 mph and the downtown 2-lane section would be posted at 30 mph. Moreover, parking spaces should be striped along Main Street to more clearly separate the lane from the drive lanes.

Bump-outs (or curb extensions) are a good tool that can be used to define the downtown area. Bump-outs improve pedestrian safety as they visually and physically narrow the roadway and shorten pedestrian crossing distances. Bump-outs limit the time a pedestrian is in the roadway, and provide a visual cue to motorists to slow down and be observant. Thus, bump-outs in this section of Main Street have several benefits: 1) define the downtown area, 2) slow vehicle speeds, and 3) enhance pedestrian crossings. Bump-outs are desirable at the intersections with Fischer Street, Stoerger Street/Breckenridge Street, and Graner Street/South Street. The bump-outs at Stoerger Street/Breckenridge Street, and Graner Street/South Street would support existing crosswalks at those locations. The bump-out at Fischer Street would support a new enhanced crosswalk.

Bump-outs can be created with raised curbs or they can also be created with paint and flexible tubular markers and/or planters for a lower cost option. The raised bump-outs can cost as much as $100,000-$150,000 per intersection to install while installing with paint, flexible tubular, and planters markers can cost on the order of $10,000-$20,000 per intersection. It should be acknowledged however, the lower cost options (e.g., paint, flexible tubular, and planters) require more effort to maintain as compared to raised bump-outs, which are a more permanent solution. In addition to costs, the design of the bump-out should consider the accessibility of farm equipment that travels through this corridor. Some farm equipment can be as wide as 16’.

These treatments would have a high-level of community support. Keypad polling during the charrette process resulted in 79% of respondents stating that they agree with the downtown roadway plan. Moreover, “Sidewalk changes in Downtown” scored as the community’s fourth highest priority for “Great Street” improvements.
Widen Main Street south of Downtown to Three-Lanes  
(Franklin Street to South of Sand Rock Road)

As with the area north of downtown, the traffic volumes on Main Street south of downtown are high enough to support a three-lane cross section (one through lane in each direction with a center left-turn lane). The area has a suburban character, with businesses set-back from the street and parking out front. The traffic volumes and commercial activity makes this section of Main Street a good candidate for widening to a three-lane cross section. This treatment would have a high-level of community support. Keypad polling during the charrette process resulted in 100% of respondents stating that they agreed with widening Main Street to three-lanes in this section. Further, “turn lanes north and south” scored as the community’s highest priority for “Great Street” improvements. A preliminary design study should be undertaken to determine the likely cost for these improvements.

Enhanced Pedestrian Crossings at Cemetery and Senior Center

New pedestrian crossing(s) across Main Street south of Downtown are needed to extend the Village’s Complete Streets Loop as is discussed in previous recommendations. Moreover, these crossings would better connect the residents on the east side of the Village with resources such as the Village Park, ball fields, and hiking trails as well as with the senior center. Enhanced pedestrian crossings near the Cemetery and the Senior Center would meet these community needs.

These enhanced pedestrian crossings would be designed similar to the crosswalk proposed at Sunset Drive. However, the proposed three-lane cross section (discussed above) provides an opportunity also install a center pedestrian refuge island at these locations. The center pedestrian refuge island provides pedestrians with an opportunity to cross one direction (and lane) of traffic at a time. Thus, installation would include ADA compliant curb ramps, high-visibility (continental) crosswalks, signage, center pedestrian refuge islands, and possible Rectangular Flashing Beacons (RRFB). Total cost could be on the order of $50,000 to $75,000 for each crossing. Also, a short section of new sidewalk will be required on the east side of Main Street between Suburban Place and the Senior Center. This project would have a high-level of community support. Keypad polling during the charrette process resulted in 89% support of respondents for an enhanced crosswalk at these locations.
The idea of a roundabout on the south side of Smithton was discussed during the charrette as a way to provide an entry treatment and slow traffic entering the Village from the south. While it was discussed, a preferred location for a possible “southern” roundabout was not determined during this effort. Ideally, this roundabout would be located at the 45 mph to 35 transition area, similar to the proposed roundabout on the north side of the Village. On the south side of the Village this speed limit transition occurs near Sand Rock Road, making this intersection a good candidate location for the roundabout. However, a roundabout at the intersection with Sand Rock Road would be costly due to the creek that runs under both Sand Rock Road and IL 159 at the intersection. Roundabouts can be constructed over creeks, but addressing the hydraulics adds length to drainage structures and cost to the project. Other possible locations could include Knab Road or Robinson School Road. However, neither of these roads have high enough traffic volumes at this time to justify the construction of a roundabout. Because of these reasons, this concept did not have enjoy a high-level of support from the meeting participants. Keypad polling during the charrette process resulted in 47% support of respondents.

Summary Exhibits
Summary exhibits of the existing conditions are provided in the following pages.
Functional Classifications

- Local Road
- Minor Arterial
- Freeway or Expressway

Village of Smithton Great Main Street Strategy

2013-2015 Crashes Involving Injuries

- Vehicles
  - 1 Crash with Injuries
  - 2-3 Crashes with Injuries
  - 4-10 Crashes with Injuries
  - 11-20 crashes with Injuries

- Pedestrians
  - 1 Crash
  - 2 Crash

- Bicycles
  - 1 Crash

Traffic Speeds - North end Main Street
DOUG-FREESING to NORTH HECHER

Traffic Speeds - Southbound Main Street
DOUG-FREESING to NORTH HECHER

General Legend

- Traffic Signal
- Side-Street Stop Control
- Pedestrian Push Button Crossing
- Edge of Pavement
- Sidewalk
- Bike/Walking Trail
- Crosswalk
- Pavement Width

2013-2015 Crashes Involving Injuries

- Pedestrians
  - 1 Crash
  - 2 Crash

- Bicycles
  - 1 Crash
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