Annotated Bibliography


A look into the extent that local governments can require private developers of new residential and/or nonresidential property to assume the cost of the increased demand of park and recreation facilities.


Lemont Mayor John Piazza asked his village staff to revise the ordinance that they use to assess impact fees for residential development. School and park district officials as well as trustee Peter Coules are in support of a fee increase.


An editorial from the mayor of Corona, Jeff Miller, discussing his views on economic development, keeping recreation programs affordable, while still looking into all option to increase park development and amenities.


Lavena Jones, secretary of the Planning Commission, discusses the preparation of a ordinance—which would have developers donate land or money (six acres per 1000 residents)—or a combination of the two—to expand the city’s parks. Developers argue that it is unfair and costly for the city’s residents.


Three years after the implementation of a parkland dedication ordinance has resulted in no parks dedicated to the city and a few private parks because developers have chosen to pay a fee in lieu of including parks in their plans, the city’s park department is meeting with residents to try and figure out a way to creative more livable neighborhoods.

Lavena Jones proposes a draft of the land ordinance specifying how the money and land will be used. Because Bryant has undergone such a growth, it is the main reason why the parks are needed.


Most developers in the San Antonio area are opting to pay the fee in lieu of providing a park or at least land for one. The City Council is asked to amend the ordinance so more developers provide a park rather than insufficient park funding for the city.


In Chula Vista, the ordinance—which has been on the books for 14 years—sets aside land for churches and “traditional family values.” Even though the ordinance was designed to set aside land and keep it affordable for churches and other community uses such as park, social services and day care centers—mayor Steve Padilla is uncomfortable with the language used. Still the ordinance has been successful.


The Parks and Recreation District unveiled several plans which could provide $25 million in funding—ranging from enhancements of current facilities to acquisition of land. There is no clear indication of a preferred method—property taxes, sales taxes or a park dedication ordinance aimed at new residential development.


“People, Parks and Places” was approved by the Bismarck Park Board including a park dedication which will be based on a development/impact fee, not a land dedication or cash in lieu of land.
According to the Atkins Group, they believe a land or cash dedication policy would double taxation and hurt development in Champaign. However, executive director of the Champaign Park District, Bobbie Herakovich, noted that residents are petitioning for new parks and trails while developers are not willing to donate the expensive property. Along with that, Champaign planning director, Bruce Knight says that if Champaign becomes uncompetitive with offering parks and recreation, it will definitely damage the economic developments in Champaign.

Normal wants more land and money for parks, but developer Steve Snyder say that requiring them to do that gives the Bloomington-Normal area no affordable housing to build as the expense would be passed on to the buyer. Normal assistant city manager Pamela Reece argues that their current policy of five acres per 1,000 people isn’t keeping up with demands and proposes that it be raised to 10.

The St. Paul Parks and Recreation Commission is voting on a “park dedication” ordinance so the city can ensure enough parkland for an expected population boom in the coming years. Developers think that the ordinance will make them stay out of the city—considering all the permits and regulations already. The article also includes the park dedication law in which they are voting on.

The St. Paul Parks Commission voted to move the park dedication ordinance—which will only affect new housing developments—to the City Council for review. The officials and park preservationists see the ordinance as a way for the twin cities to have necessary public parks for the future.