

**Table 1. Residential Neighborhood That Plans Most Closely Resemble**

	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT ( <i>n</i> =150)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS ( <i>n</i> =149)	
	<i>n</i>	Percent	<i>n</i>	Percent
Subdivisions commonly seen in the C-U area	28	18.7%	28	18.8%
Mixed-age/intergenerational residential community	94	62.7	43	28.9
Senior living facility	3	2.0	11	7.4
Graduate family housing	6	4.0	7	4.7
Other	19	12.7	60	40.3

**Table 2. How Well Plans' Building Height & Character Fit in with Surrounding Neighborhood**

(VALUE) HOW WELL	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT ( <i>n</i> =149)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS ( <i>n</i> =147)	
	<i>n</i>	Percent	<i>n</i>	Percent
(1) Not well at all	9	6.0%	63	42.9%
(2) Slightly well	14	9.4	26	17.7
(3) Moderately well	22	14.8	29	19.7
(4) Very well	49	32.9	16	10.9
(5) Extremely well	55	36.9	13	8.8
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.85</b>		<b>2.25</b>

**Table 3. Extent to Which Plans' Mix of Housing Types Achieve Vision of Intergenerational Community**

(VALUE) EXTENT	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT ( <i>n</i> =148)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS ( <i>n</i> =146)	
	<i>n</i>	Percent	<i>n</i>	Percent
(1) Not at all	10	6.8%	25	17.1%
(2) A little	13	8.8	43	29.5
(3) To a moderate extent	23	15.5	35	24.0
(4) To a large extent	60	40.5	27	18.5
(5) Completely	42	28.4	16	11.0
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.75</b>		<b>2.77</b>

**Table 4. Extent to Which Plans Incorporate Design Features for Individuals with Physical/Sensory Challenges**

(VALUE) EXTENT	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT ( <i>n</i> =111)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS ( <i>n</i> =108)	
	<i>n</i>	Percent	<i>n</i>	Percent
(1) Not at all	8	7.2%	15	13.9%
(2) A little	11	9.9	24	22.2
(3) To a moderate extent	29	26.1	45	41.7
(4) To a large extent	46	41.4	18	16.7
(5) Completely	17	15.3	6	5.6
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.48</b>		<b>2.78</b>

**Table 5. Extent to Which Plans Incorporate Energy-Efficient Features**

(VALUE) EXTENT	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=136)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=134)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) Not at all	5	3.7%	10	7.5%
(2) A little	6	4.4	22	16.4
(3) To a moderate extent	36	26.5	36	26.9
(4) To a large extent	65	47.8	52	38.8
(5) Completely	24	17.6	14	10.4
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.71</b>		<b>3.28</b>	

**Table 6. Extent to Which Plans Incorporate Renewable Energy Features**

(VALUE) EXTENT	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=133)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=131)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) Not at all	4	3.0%	11	8.4%
(2) A little	12	9.0	27	20.6
(3) To a moderate extent	42	31.6	38	29.0
(4) To a large extent	54	40.6	45	34.4
(5) Completely	21	15.8	10	7.6
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.57</b>		<b>3.12</b>	

**Table 7. Respondent Grading of Plans' Green Amenities: Water Retention Ponds**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=145)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=143)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	5	3.4%	10	7.0%
(2) D: Poor	5	3.4	26	18.2
(3) C: Average	22	15.2	35	24.5
(4) B: Good	44	30.3	40	28.0
(5) A: Excellent	66	45.5	28	19.6
<i>Not included in plan</i>	3	2.1	4	2.8
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.13</b>		<b>3.36</b>	

**Table 8. Respondent Grading of Plans' Green Amenities: Community Gardens**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=142)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=139)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	3	2.1%	25	18.0%
(2) D: Poor	8	5.6	22	15.8
(3) C: Average	22	15.5	33	23.7
(4) B: Good	33	23.2	32	23.0
(5) A: Excellent	71	50.0	12	8.6
<i>Not included in plan</i>	5	3.5	15	10.8
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.18</b>		<b>2.87</b>	

**Table 9. Respondent Grading of Plans' Green Amenities: Bike/Walking Paths**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=144)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=143)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	4	2.8%	12	8.4%
(2) D: Poor	6	4.2	30	21.0
(3) C: Average	31	21.5	43	30.1
(4) B: Good	33	22.9	30	21.0
(5) A: Excellent	68	47.2	24	16.8
<i>Not included in plan</i>	2	1.4	4	2.8
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.09</b>		<b>3.17</b>	

**Table 10. Respondent Grading of Plans' Green Amenities: Outdoor Gathering Spaces**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=142)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=140)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	4	2.8%	12	8.6%
(2) D: Poor	6	4.2	24	17.1
(3) C: Average	28	19.7	38	27.1
(4) B: Good	42	29.6	41	29.3
(5) A: Excellent	62	43.7	24	17.1
<i>Not included in plan</i>	—	—	1	0.7
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.13</b>		<b>3.29</b>	

**Table 11. Respondent Grading of Plans' Green Amenities: Existing Trees**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=148)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=147)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	4	2.7%	52	35.4%
(2) D: Poor	3	2.0	28	19.0
(3) C: Average	11	7.4	28	19.0
(4) B: Good	42	28.4	24	16.3
(5) A: Excellent	88	59.5	12	8.2
<i>Not included in plan</i>	—	—	3	2.0
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.40</b>		<b>2.42</b>	

**Table 12. Respondent Grading of Plans' Unique Amenities: Guest Housing Facilities**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=115)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=112)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	3	2.6%	6	5.4%
(2) D: Poor	3	2.6	18	16.1
(3) C: Average	31	27.0	34	30.4
(4) B: Good	38	33.0	20	17.9
(5) A: Excellent	26	22.6	6	5.4
<i>Not included in plan</i>	14	12.2	28	25.0
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.80</b>		<b>3.02</b>	

**Table 13. Respondent Grading of Plans' Unique Amenities: Pet-Friendly Amenities**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=105)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=104)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	2	1.9%	7	6.7%
(2) D: Poor	4	3.8	13	12.5
(3) C: Average	23	21.9	35	33.7
(4) B: Good	24	22.9	12	11.5
(5) A: Excellent	16	15.2	2	1.9
<i>Not included in plan</i>	36	34.3	35	33.7
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.70</b>		<b>2.84</b>	

**Table 14. Respondent Grading of Plans' Unique Amenities: Common/Shared Spaces within Residential Areas**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=139)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=137)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	3	2.2%	15	10.9%
(2) D: Poor	8	5.8	25	18.2
(3) C: Average	28	20.1	38	27.7
(4) B: Good	38	27.3	32	23.4
(5) A: Excellent	59	42.4	23	16.8
<i>Not included in plan</i>	3	2.2	4	2.9
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.04</b>		<b>3.17</b>	

**Table 15. Extent to Which Plans Encourage Pedestrian Traffic to Retail Centers by OD Residents**

(VALUE) EXTENT	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=141)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=140)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) Not at all	6	4.3%	20	14.3%
(2) A little	13	9.2	31	22.1
(3) To a moderate extent	30	21.3	40	28.6
(4) To a large extent	48	34.0	37	26.4
(5) Completely	44	31.2	12	8.6
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.79</b>		<b>2.93</b>	

**Table 16. Extent to Which Plans Encourage Pedestrian Traffic to Retail Centers by Those Outside OD**

(VALUE) EXTENT	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=138)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=136)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) Not at all	10	7.2%	28	20.6%
(2) A little	28	20.3	31	22.8
(3) To a moderate extent	57	41.3	48	35.3
(4) To a large extent	25	18.1	18	13.2
(5) Completely	18	13.0	11	8.1
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.09</b>		<b>2.65</b>	

**Table 17. Respondent Grading of Plans' Ease of Pedestrian Access to Walking/Bike Paths**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=139)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=136)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	2	1.4%	12	8.8%
(2) D: Poor	8	5.8	17	12.5
(3) C: Average	26	18.7	37	27.2
(4) B: Good	37	26.6	41	30.1
(5) A: Excellent	65	46.8	25	18.4
<i>Not included in plan</i>	1	0.7	4	2.9
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.12</b>		<b>3.38</b>	

**Table 18. Respondent Grading of Plans' Ease of Pedestrian Access to Mass Transit Facilities**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=131)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=127)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	1	0.8%	8	6.3%
(2) D: Poor	3	2.3	7	5.5
(3) C: Average	32	24.4	34	26.8
(4) B: Good	40	30.5	37	29.1
(5) A: Excellent	31	23.7	17	13.4
<i>Not included in plan</i>	24	18.3	24	18.9
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.91</b>		<b>3.47</b>	

**Table 19. Respondent Grading of Plans' Ease of Pedestrian Access to Community Center**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=130)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=128)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	2	1.5%	7	5.5%
(2) D: Poor	7	5.4	12	9.4
(3) C: Average	30	23.1	36	28.1
(4) B: Good	45	34.6	51	39.8
(5) A: Excellent	45	34.6	18	14.1
<i>Not included in plan</i>	1	0.8	4	3.1
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.96</b>		<b>3.49</b>	

**Table 20. Respondent Grading of Plans' Ease of Pedestrian Access to Community Gardens**

(VALUE) GRADE	PLAN OF...			
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=130)		VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=125)	
	n	Percent	n	Percent
(1) E: Very poor	2	1.5%	11	8.8%
(2) D: Poor	5	3.8	18	14.4
(3) C: Average	26	20.0	34	27.2
(4) B: Good	45	34.6	36	28.8
(5) A: Excellent	46	35.4	11	8.8
<i>Not included in plan</i>	6	4.6	15	12.0
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.03</b>		<b>3.16</b>	

**Table 21. How Well Plans' Access Points Minimize Additional Traffic on Busy Streets Bordering OD**

<b>(VALUE) HOW WELL</b>	<b>PLAN OF...</b>			
	<b>DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=145)</b>		<b>VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=143)</b>	
	<i>n</i>	<b>Percent</b>	<i>n</i>	<b>Percent</b>
(1) Not well at all	8	5.5%	49	34.3%
(2) Slightly well	7	4.8	19	13.3
(3) Moderately well	41	28.3	33	23.1
(4) Very well	41	28.3	34	23.8
(5) Extremely well	48	33.1	8	5.6
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.79</b>		<b>2.53</b>

**Table 22. Respondent Grading of Plans' Design & Layout of Community Center**

<b>(VALUE) GRADE</b>	<b>PLAN OF...</b>			
	<b>DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT (n=120)</b>		<b>VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS (n=118)</b>	
	<i>n</i>	<b>Percent</b>	<i>n</i>	<b>Percent</b>
(1) E: Very poor	2	1.7%	9	7.6%
(2) D: Poor	6	5.0	14	11.9
(3) C: Average	26	21.7	41	34.7
(4) B: Good	46	38.3	41	34.7
(5) A: Excellent	40	33.3	13	11.0
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.97</b>		<b>3.30</b>

**Table 23. Residential Neighborhood That Plans Most Closely Resemble, by Demographic Characteristics (in percent)**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...									
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT					VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS				
	Subdivisions commonly seen in C-U area	Mixed-age/intergenerational res community	Sr living facility	Grad family housing	Other	Subdivisions commonly seen in C-U area	Mixed-age/intergenerational res community	Sr living facility	Grad family housing	Other
<b>Marital Status</b>										
Married/Living with partner	18.2%	66.4%	1.8%	2.7%	10.9%	19.3%	29.4%	5.5%	3.7%	42.2%
Other	21.6	54.1	2.7 (n=147)	8.1	13.5	16.2	27.0	13.5 (n=146)	5.4	37.8
<b>Age</b>										
22–39	10.8	67.6	2.7	5.4	13.5	13.5	37.8	13.5	5.4	29.7
40–52	30.3	54.5	—	6.1	9.1	12.1	18.2	—	—	69.7
53–61	22.9	60.0	—	5.7	11.4	17.1	40.0	8.6	8.6	25.7
62–86	12.5	71.9	3.1 (n=137)	—	12.5	32.3	16.1	6.5 (n=136)	6.5	38.7
<b>UIUC Status</b>										
Current faculty/staff	16.4	67.1	—	2.7	13.7	23.6	22.2	5.6	2.8	45.8
Other	20.8	58.4	3.9 (n=150)	5.2	11.7	14.3	35.1	9.1 (n=149)	6.5	35.1
<b>Residence</b>										
Part of SE Urbana neighborhood assoc.	16.0	72.0	4.0	—	8.0	22.4	28.6	8.2	2.0	38.8
Part of W Urbana neighborhood assoc.	26.5	50.0	—	5.9	17.6	26.5	20.6	2.9	2.9	47.1
Resident of other area of C-U	10.6	68.1	2.1	4.3	14.9	12.8	34.0	10.6	8.5	34.0
Other	31.6	47.4	— (n=150)	10.5	10.5	10.5	31.6	5.3 (n=149)	5.3	47.4
<b>ZIP Code</b>										
Urbana	19.4	63.3	1.0	4.1	12.2	22.7	25.8	6.2	2.1	43.3
Champaign	13.9	61.1	2.8 (n=134)	5.6	16.7	8.3	36.1	11.1 (n=133)	13.9	30.6

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 24. Mean Scores of How Well Plans' Building Height & Character Fit in with Surrounding Neighborhood, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	3.96	2.30
Other	3.57	2.14
	(n=145)	(n=143)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.57	2.30
40–52	4.06	2.06
53–61	3.89	2.60
62–86	4.00	2.10
	(n=136)	(n=134)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		
Current faculty/staff	2.30	1.87
Other	2.29	2.60
	(n=149)	(n=147)
<b>Residence</b>		
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.15	2.02
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.86	1.85
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.68	2.66
Other	3.53	2.53
	(n=149)	(n=147)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	3.90	2.04
Champaign	3.75	2.72
	(n=133)	(n=131)

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 25. Mean Scores of the Extent to Which Plans' Mix of Housing Types Achieve Vision of Intergenerational Community, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>	*	
Married/living with partner	3.89	2.90
Other	3.43	2.44
	(n=144)	(n=142)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.50	2.61
40–52	3.84	2.65
53–61	3.80	3.00
62–86	4.00	2.90
	(n=135)	(n=133)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		**
Current faculty/staff	3.92	2.42
Other	3.60	3.08
	(n=148)	(n=146)
<b>Residence</b>		
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.06	2.62
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.62	2.47
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.67	3.11
Other	3.37	2.84
	(n=148)	(n=146)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		**
Urbana	3.81	2.56
Champaign	3.61	3.22
	(n=132)	(n=130)

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 26. Mean Scores of Extent to Which Plans Incorporate Design Features for Individuals with Physical Sensory Challenges, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	3.51	2.83
Other	3.46 (n=109)	2.68 (n=106)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.04	2.82
40–52	3.79	2.70
53–61	3.52	2.73
62–86	3.70 (n=103)	2.75 (n=101)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		**
Current faculty/staff	3.60	2.46
Other	3.38 (n=111)	3.03 (n=108)
<b>Residence</b>		**
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.46	2.82
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.58	2.25
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.62	3.16
Other	2.92 (n=111)	2.54 (n=108)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		**
Urbana	3.43	2.55
Champaign	3.61 (n=100)	3.19 (n=97)

\*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 27. Mean Scores of Extent to Which Plans Incorporate Energy-Efficient Features, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	3.73	3.40
Other	3.73 (n=134)	2.97 (n=132)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.54	3.29
40–52	3.83	3.21
53–61	3.61	3.30
62–86	3.78 (n=124)	3.41 (n=124)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		
Current faculty/staff	3.87	3.13
Other	3.58 (n=136)	3.42 (n=134)
<b>Residence</b>		**
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.77	3.24
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.64	2.75
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.82	3.73
Other	3.38 (n=136)	3.06 (n=134)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		**
Urbana	3.71	3.09
Champaign	3.75 (n=122)	3.67 (n=121)

\*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 28. Means Scores of Extent to Which Plans Incorporate Renewable Energy Features, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		*
Married/living with partner	3.61	3.25
Other	3.53 (n=131)	2.73 (n=129)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.34	3.11
40–52	3.89	3.30
53–61	3.48	3.15
62–86	3.52 (n=121)	3.00 (n=120)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		
Current faculty/staff	3.62	3.00
Other	3.53 (n=133)	3.23 (n=131)
<b>Residence</b>		**
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.58	3.20
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.63	2.48
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.62	3.43
Other	3.31 (n=133)	3.13 (n=131)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	3.55	2.98
Champaign	3.64 (n=119)	3.37 (n=117)

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 29. Mean Scores of Plans' Green Amenities: Water Retention Ponds, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>	*	
Married/living with partner	4.25	3.43
Other	3.86 (n=139)	3.25 (n=136)
<b>Age</b>	*	
22-39	3.84	3.31
40-52	4.30	3.32
53-61	4.03	3.38
62-86	4.52 (n=131)	3.52 (n=129)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		**
Current faculty/staff	4.25	3.08
Other	4.03 (n=142)	3.61 (n=139)
<b>Residence</b>		**
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.28	3.17
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.19	2.88
Resident of other areas of C-U	4.17	3.88
Other	3.53 (n=142)	3.47 (n=139)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	4.22	3.22
Champaign	4.09 (n=127)	3.70 (n=124)

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 30. Mean Scores of Plans' Green Amenities: Community Gardens, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	4.28	2.87
Other	3.91 (n=134)	3.00 (n=121)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.86	2.82
40–52	4.35	2.71
53–61	4.12	3.06
62–86	4.40 (n=125)	3.05 (n=114)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		
Current faculty/staff	4.34	2.40
Other	4.03 (n=137)	3.29 (n=124)
<b>Residence</b>		
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	** 4.50	*** 2.53
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.06	2.25
Resident of other areas of C-U	4.23	3.61
Other	3.44 (n=137)	2.88 (n=124)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	4.19	2.56
Champaign	4.15 (n=123)	3.65 (n=111)

\*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 31. Mean Scores of Plans' Green Amenities: Bike/Walking Paths, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	4.20	3.19
Other	3.92 (n=138)	3.18 (n=135)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.81	2.94
40–52	4.38	2.88
53–61	3.97	3.38
62–86	4.38 (n=129)	3.54 (n=127)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		
Current faculty/staff	4.19	3.01
Other	4.00 (n=142)	3.32 (n=139)
<b>Residence</b>		
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.27	* 3.05
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.09	2.85
Resident of other areas of C-U	4.15	3.60
Other	3.50 (n=142)	3.00 (n=139)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	4.13	* 3.00
Champaign	4.03 (n=126)	3.51 (n=123)

\* $p < .05$ .

**Table 32. Mean Scores of Plans' Green Amenities: Outdoor Gathering Spaces, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	4.14	3.32
Other	3.91 (n=139)	3.27 (n=136)
<b>Age</b>	*	
22–39	3.70	3.14
40–52	4.35	3.16
53–61	3.94	3.45
62–86	4.43 (n=130)	3.56 (n=128)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		*
Current faculty/staff	4.10	3.06
Other	4.04 (n=142)	3.51 (n=139)
<b>Residence</b>	**	
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.40	3.22
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.94	2.94
Resident of other areas of C-U	4.07	3.64
Other	3.41 (n=142)	3.24 (n=139)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	4.16	3.16
Champaign	3.91 (n=127)	3.54 (n=124)

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 33. Mean Scores of Plans' Green Amenities: Existing Trees, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	4.49	2.40
Other	4.22 (n=146)	2.51 (n=142)
<b>Age</b>	*	
22–39	4.03	2.43
40–52	4.64	2.06
53–61	4.29	2.82
62–86	4.66 (n=136)	2.55 (n=132)
<b>UIUC Status</b>	**	**
Current faculty/staff	4.61	2.06
Other	4.21 (n=148)	2.75 (n=144)
<b>Residence</b>	**	*
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.66	2.20
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.47	2.13
Resident of other areas of C-U	4.34	2.89
Other	3.74 (n=148)	2.33 (n=144)
<b>ZIP Code</b>	*	*
Urbana	4.53	2.26
Champaign	4.17 (n=133)	2.83 (n=129)

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 34. Mean Scores of Plans' Unique Amenities: Guest Housing Facilities, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	3.87	3.03
Other	3.57 (n=100)	2.94 (n=83)
<b>Age</b>	**	
22–39	3.38	2.93
40–52	3.90	2.94
53–61	3.91	3.06
62–86	4.37 (n=93)	3.20 (n=78)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		*
Current faculty/staff	3.95	2.72
Other	3.68 (n=101)	3.25 (n=84)
<b>Residence</b>	*	***
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.87	2.75
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.15	2.50
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.86	3.67
Other	3.13 (n=101)	2.93 (n=84)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		**
Urbana	3.88	2.78
Champaign	3.76 (n=88)	3.50 (n=73)

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 35. Mean Scores of Plans' Unique Amenities: Pet-Friendly Amenities, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	3.72	2.86
Other	3.63 (n=69)	2.79 (n=69)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.58	2.83
40–52	3.71	2.64
53–61	3.31	2.76
62–86	4.40 (n=64)	3.20 (n=65)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		***
Current faculty/staff	3.77	2.42
Other	3.64 (n=69)	3.18 (n=69)
<b>Residence</b>		**
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.94	2.40
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.61	2.50
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.85	3.33
Other	3.00 (n=69)	2.78 (n=69)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		**
Urbana	3.76	2.56
Champaign	3.79 (n=61)	3.20 (n=61)

\*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 36. Mean Scores of Plans' Unique Amenities: Common/Shared Spaces within Residential Areas, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>	*	
Married/living with partner	4.17	3.25
Other	3.64 (n=134)	2.93 (n=131)
<b>Age</b>	*	
22–39	3.71	3.09
40–52	4.34	2.90
53–61	3.97	3.45
62–86	4.27 (n=125)	3.46 (n=123)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		*
Current faculty/staff	4.19	2.93
Other	3.92 (n=136)	3.37 (n=133)
<b>Residence</b>		*
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.19	3.02
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.13	2.76
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.98	3.63
Other	3.67 (n=136)	3.22 (n=133)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		*
Urbana	4.11	3.00
Champaign	3.91 (n=122)	3.63 (n=119)

\* $p < .05$ .

**Table 37. Mean Scores of Extent to Which Plans Encourage Pedestrian Traffic to Retail Centers by OD Residents, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>	*	
Married/living with partner	3.93	2.93
Other	3.49 (n=138)	2.94 (n=137)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.71	2.81
40–52	3.81	2.97
53–61	3.71	2.94
62–86	3.93 (n=130)	3.11 (n=129)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		
Current faculty/staff	3.88	2.77
Other	3.71 (n=141)	3.07 (n=140)
<b>Residence</b>	*	
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.17	2.93
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.61	2.58
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.70	3.21
Other	3.27 (n=141)	2.75 (n=140)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	3.88	2.83
Champaign	3.64 (n=127)	3.17 (n=125)

\* $p < .05$ .

**Table 38. Mean Scores of Extent to Which Plans Encourage Pedestrian Traffic to Retail Centers by Those Outside OD, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	3.15	2.73
Other	3.00 (n=136)	2.45 (n=134)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.11	2.63
40–52	3.50	2.50
53–61	3.00	2.67
62–86	2.84 (n=126)	2.96 (n=125)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		
Current faculty/staff	3.26	2.45
Other	2.95 (n=138)	2.83 (n=136)
<b>Residence</b>		
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.36	2.76
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.00	2.38
Resident of other areas of C-U	2.93	2.82
Other	2.94 (n=138)	2.41 (n=136)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	3.20	2.56
Champaign	2.94 (n=123)	2.82 (n=122)

**Table 39. Mean Scores of Plans' Ease of Pedestrian Access to Walking/Bike Paths, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	4.20	3.40
Other	3.82 (n=136)	3.33 (n=130)
<b>Age</b>	*	
22-39	3.80	3.26
40-52	4.20	3.18
53-61	4.00	3.48
62-86	4.56 (n=127)	3.73 (n=121)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		*
Current faculty/staff	4.23	3.13
Other	4.03 (n=138)	3.59 (n=132)
<b>Residence</b>		
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.29	3.33
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.20	3.00
Resident of other areas of C-U	4.04	3.64
Other	3.76 (n=138)	3.40 (n=132)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	4.19	3.30
Champaign	3.94 (n=124)	3.51 (n=118)

\* $p < .05$ .

**Table 40. Mean Scores of Plan's Ease of Pedestrian Access to Mass Transit Facilities, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	3.97	3.53
Other	3.73 (n=104)	3.25 (n=100)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.57	3.43
40–52	4.17	3.67
53–61	3.96	3.13
62–86	4.05 (n=96)	3.74 (n=93)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		
Current faculty/staff	4.02	3.26
Other	3.81 (n=107)	3.64 (n=103)
<b>Residence</b>		
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.04	3.41
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.93	3.20
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.95	3.79
Other	3.46 (n=107)	3.15 (n=103)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	3.91	3.31
Champaign	3.97 (n=96)	3.73 (n=92)

**Table 41. Mean Scores of Plans' Ease of Pedestrian Access to Community Center, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	4.02	3.52
Other	3.76 (n=128)	3.40 (n=123)
<b>Age</b>	*	
22–39	3.61	3.36
40–52	4.19	3.54
53–61	3.91	3.45
62–86	4.30 (n=119)	3.82 (n=115)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		*
Current faculty/staff	4.07	3.23
Other	3.87 (n=129)	3.71 (n=124)
<b>Residence</b>		*
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.12	3.53
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.89	3.11
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.95	3.80
Other	3.71 (n=129)	3.25 (n=124)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	4.02	3.45
Champaign	3.82 (n=115)	3.58 (n=110)

\* $p < .05$ .

**Table 42. Means Scores of Plans' Ease of Pedestrian Access to Community Gardens, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	4.05	3.09
Other	3.93 (n=123)	3.39 (n=109)
<b>Age</b>		
22-39	3.76	2.97
40-52	4.14	3.00
53-61	4.03	3.34
62-86	4.25 (n=114)	3.50 (n=102)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		**
Current faculty/staff	4.17	2.84
Other	3.91 (n=124)	3.43 (n=110)
<b>Residence</b>		
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.17	3.12
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.96	2.74
Resident of other areas of C-U	4.15	3.51
Other	3.47 (n=124)	3.06 (n=110)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	4.08	3.04
Champaign	3.97 (n=113)	3.47 (n=99)

\*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 43. Mean Scores of How Well Plans' Access Points Minimize Additional Traffic on Busy Streets Bordering OD, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married/living with partner	3.89	2.54
Other	3.56 (n=142)	2.50 (n=140)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.44	2.69
40–52	3.97	2.09
53–61	3.80	2.63
62–86	3.97 (n=133)	2.74 (n=131)
<b>UIUC Status</b>		**
Current faculty/staff	3.87	2.19
Other	3.71 (n=145)	2.86 (n=143)
<b>Residence</b>	*	*
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.96	2.23
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.06	2.31
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.65	2.98
Other	3.17 (n=145)	2.56 (n=143)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		**
Urbana	3.93	2.29
Champaign	3.54 (n=130)	3.14 (n=128)

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Table 44. Mean Scores of Plans' Design & Layout of Community Center, by Demographic Characteristics**

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PLAN OF...	
	DEVONSHIRE DEVELOPMENT Mean	VERMILION/FOX/ATKINS Mean
<b>Marital Status</b>	*	
Married/living with partner	4.09	3.38
Other	3.69 (n=118)	3.14 (n=116)
<b>Age</b>		
22–39	3.79	3.24
40–52	4.12	3.17
53–61	3.97	3.52
62–86	4.00 (n=111)	3.26 (n=110)
<b>UIUC Status</b>	*	
Current faculty/staff	4.16	3.11
Other	3.80 (n=120)	3.46 (n=118)
<b>Residence</b>		
Part of Southeast Urbana neighborhood assoc.	4.15	3.49
Part of West Urbana neighborhood assoc.	3.88	2.88
Resident of other areas of C-U	3.98	3.50
Other	3.60 (n=120)	3.00 (n=118)
<b>ZIP Code</b>		
Urbana	4.00	3.25
Champaign	3.88 (n=107)	3.36 (n=105)

\* $p < .05$ .