Chapter 2
Demographics

Demographic analysis and projections are important in the formation of this comprehensive plan. The data and information generated enhances the community's capacity to prepare for the impact of future growth on such issues as land use, transportation services, housing demand, public facilities and services, and economic development.

A clear understanding of past trends serves as the basis for projecting future population sizes. By comparing past and present population and housing trends to the influences described in the Regional Influences section, an estimation of future trends emerges. The following information provides insight into characteristics and trends of the New Garden community and residents. This change is compared with that experienced by surrounding municipalities and in some cases with Chester County to provide a regional perspective. This Chapter identifies trends using US census data, supplemented by estimates and projections where available.

POPULATION PROFILE

Age, household size, and income levels all help to depict the character of New Garden residents. The size and composition of the population within the Township has changed during the last three decades. Since planning for future land use is based, in part, on population figures, estimates are used to indicate the current level at a given time. Population projections are calculated to determine potential future population levels based on current trends. The size and composition of the population are directly related to housing, and reliable information is needed to assess housing needs and to ensure that adequate housing opportunities are available to meet those projected needs.

Historic Population Trends

According to US Census data, New Garden has grown steadily since 1910 when it was reported there was a population of 1,875 people. The early increases can be partially attributed to the development of the mushroom industry in the 1920s. Current trends show that this historic population growth more than doubled from 1970-2000 and dominated the region between 1990-2000 when an additional 3,653 people moved into the Township; an increase of 67.3 percent for the 10 year period. This later increase was due to the expansion of the Wilmington urbanized area leading to residential subdivisions that have extended across the state line into the southern portion of the Township. Kennett Square is no longer the leading population center, but is now the fourth (5,273) largest in the region according to the 2000 US Census, behind New Garden (9,083), Kennett (6,451), and East Marlborough (6,317).

Numeric increases among the municipalities bordering Delaware were very similar during the decade. When reviewing these growth rates from 1970-2000, Franklin had the highest rate with 269.1 percent, compared to 118.7 percent for New Garden and 55.8 percent for Chester County; West Marlborough experienced a loss in population of 6.3 percent for the same time period. The County average was greatly affected by the dramatic growth experienced in the central and eastern portions of the County and in turn, have resulted in a high Countywide growth rate from 1970-2000.

Migration is responsible for population changes that are not naturally caused by births and deaths. In a growing community, a net influx of residents or in-migration can be expected. The opposite, a net out-

migration would normally be the reason for slow growth or population loss. In New Garden, a net in-migration was responsible for the gain in population from 1970 to 2000, as it was in the County.

The region around New Garden consists of urban (the boroughs), suburban, and rural areas. Trends in the urban areas often differed from those in the townships. In many cases, two differing demographic trends were occurring simultaneously in the boroughs and townships; the urban areas experienced little growth in population to 2000 while the townships increased. Considering the development occurring around New Garden, the availability of public sewage treatment, available developable land, and growth pressure exerted by New Castle County, Delaware, additional growth and development within New Garden is likely to continue.

Figure 2-1: Population Growth, 1970–2000; New Garden Township and Surrounding Municipalities

Municipality	1970	1980	1990	2000	Percent Change	
					1970-2000	1990-2000
New Garden	**4,153**	**4,790**	**5,430**	**9,083**	**118.7%**	**67.3%**
Avondale Borough	1,025	891	954	1,108	8.1%	16.1%
East Marlborough	3,031	3,953	4,781	6,317	108.4%	32.1%
Franklin	1,043	1,920	2,779	3,850	269.1%	38.5%
Kennett Square Borough	4,876	4,715	5,218	5,273	8.1%	1.1%
Kennett	3,394	4,201	4,624	6,451	90.1%	39.5%
London Britain	963	1,546	2,671	2,797	190.4%	4.7%
London Grove	3,109	3,531	3,922	5,265	69.3%	34.2%
West Grove Borough	1,870	1,820	2,128	2,652	41.8%	24.6%
West Marlborough	917	941	874	859	-6.3%	-1.7%
Chester County	278,311	316,660	376,396	433,501	55.8%	15.2%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1970-2000

Population Projections

Population projections are forecasted population totals that extend existing population trends into the future. Population projections are a primary indicator of anticipated future growth, and they help determine anticipated demand for housing, facilities, services, and roads. The projection techniques used in this analysis are based on carrying past trends into the future, and therefore can be influenced by variables in future development and actions by the municipality with respect to zoning, subdivisions, and the purchase of development rights. Therefore, a single projection should not be viewed as an exact figure on which to base planning policies. The following projections should only be used as a planning tool for informational purposes. Projections have been calculated to the year 2030.

The Chester County Planning Commission (CCPC) population projections were prepared using a ratio-share method. This is a US Census Bureau recommended methodology for small geographic areas. The CCPC calculated the share of the County population in each municipality in 1980, 1990, and 2000, and projected the municipal shares for 2010 and 2020 based on the trend of each municipal share. These initial projections were then adjusted considering various factors affecting growth, including utility and transportation infrastructure, proposed development activity, land constraints, and County and municipal development policies.

Figure 2-2: Population Projections, 2000–2020; New Garden Township and Surrounding Municipalities

Municipality	2000	2010	2020	Percent Change CCPC 2000-2020
New Garden	**9,083**	**11,560**	**13,710**	**50.9%**
Avondale Borough	1,108	1,210	1,340	20.9%
East Marlborough	6,317	7,860	8,980	42.2%
Franklin	3,850	5,130	6,090	58.2%
Kennett Square Borough	5,273	5,360	5,540	5.1%
Kennett	6,451	7,830	8,970	39.0%
London Britain	2,797	3,220	3,510	25.5%
London Grove	5,265	6,870	8,090	53.6%
West Grove Borough	2,652	2,840	3,100	16.9%
West Marlborough	859	860	850	-1.0%
Chester County	433,501	483,500	528,000	21.8%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000; and CCPC Population Projections 2000 to 2030

Projections calculated for New Garden, from the 2000 US Census figure indicate, according to the DVRPC figure, the population has the potential to increase by 50.9 percent to 13,710 residents by 2020. When compared to the surrounding municipalities and to Chester County, Franklin and London Grove should have the greatest increases with 58.2 percent and 53.6 percent from 2000-2020, respectively. Kennett Square should experience the lowest population growth from 2000-2020 with 5.1 percent, while West Marlborough may potentially loose some population. Chester County is projected to have an increase of 21.8 percent by 2020. The projected increases for New Garden, and for the surrounding municipalities, suggest a greater demand on municipal services, such as education, police and fire protection, road maintenance, traffic volumes, and sewer and water facilities.

Age Distribution

An analysis of age distribution provides information on what segments (age groups) are increasing or decreasing within a population. Consequently, it indicates if more services and what types of services and facilities, housing, and employment will be required. For the purposes of evaluation and to indicate the movement and distribution of age groups in New Garden from 1980 to 2000, ages for this subsection are broken down into five groups (cohorts). They are: Under 5, 5-17, 18-44, 45-64, and 65+. Generally defined as: pre-school age "Under 5"; school age "5-17"; younger worker, child-bearing, and first-time home buyer age "18-44"; older worker, "empty nesters", and second-time home buyer age "45-64"; and senior age "65 and Over".

Figure 2-3: Age Group Composition, 1980-2000; New Garden Township

Age Group	1980		1990		2000		Percent Change 1980-2000	Percent Change 1990-2000
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Under 5	338	7.1%	410	7.6%	726	8.0%	114.8%	77.1%
5-17*	977	20.4%	921	17.0%	2,274	25.0%	132.8%	146.9%
18-44*	2,218	46.3%	2,624	48.3%	3,634	40.0%	63.8%	38.5%
45-64	912	19.0%	1,024	18.8%	1,793	19.7%	96.6%	75.1%
65 and Over	345	7.2%	451	8.3%	656	7.3%	90.1%	45.5%
Total	4,790	100%	5,430	100%	9,083	100%	89.6%	67.3%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000 *Due to a change in counting methods, the 2000 US Census uses 5-19 and 20-44 age groups.

In **Figure 2-3** for 1980, the Under 5 and 65 and Over age groups were the smallest cohorts as a percentage of the total population, 7.1 percent and 7.2 percent, respectively; and the 18-44 age group the highest percentage of the total population (46.3%). This trend of smallest and largest percentage carried through the 1990 and 2000 Census'. For planning purposes, the 5-17 group indicated a significant positive growth rate from 1980 to 2000 at 132.8 percent, including a 146.9 percent increase from 1990-2000. The Under 5 and portions of the 5-17 age groups will be entering school during the first half of this decade. This is important when considering future school enrollment, funding, and facility/program needs. New housing growth is likely to further increase the number of school age children in the Township. At the age of 18, children begin to leave home for college, job opportunities, and to join the military services, and many of this demographic, the 18-44 group, typically from families. As this trend continues, especially with the increased number of children, housing demand may increase.

Two age groups of significant importance over the coming years will be 45-64 and the 65 and Over age groups. The 45-64 group, representing the largest of these cohorts with an increase of 96.6 percent from 1980-2000, will be moving into the 65 and Over group. The 65 and Older cohort experienced a growth rate of 90.1 percent from 1980-2000. This jump is common throughout the United States with the "baby-boom" generation growing older and the death rate is decreasing. Over the life of this Plan, the effects of a continually growing senior age population and the movement of the working age population into retirement will place pressures upon the local taxpayers as they deal with a larger percentage of their citizenry living on fixed retirement level incomes. There may be a need for additional elderly housing and services and an evaluation of the impacts on funding for public facilities and services.

Median Age

Unlike the mean or average age, which can be affected by extreme values either high or low, the Median Age is significant in that it is the "middle age" of all the persons in New Garden and makes comparing community data more reliable. In 1980, New Garden's median age was 28.8 years; the youngest median age of the surrounding municipalities. By 1990, the median had increased to 32.0 years, the third youngest behind Avondale (31.3) and West Grove (31.9); and in 2000 increased again to 33.6 years, once again the third youngest median age among the surrounding communities. The population as a whole is becoming "older" and is caused by an influx of older residents or an outflow of younger people. Indicative of affordability for younger people, the townships tend to have higher median ages than the boroughs, which are more affordable for younger people.

Figure 2-4: Median Age, 1980-2000; New Garden Township and Surrounding Municipalities

Municipality	Median Age			Percent Change 1980-2000
	1980	1990	2000	
New Garden	**28.8**	**32.0**	**33.6**	**16.7%**
Avondale Borough	29.2	31.3	32.5	11.3%
East Marlborough	31.6	35.9	38.2	20.9%
Franklin	30.1	34.1	35.9	19.3%
Kennett Square Borough	31.9	34.0	34.7	8.8%
Kennett	38.5	42.6	41.1	6.8%
London Britain	31.8	35.6	40.5	27.4%
London Grove	30.7	34.0	35.1	14.3%
West Grove Borough	30.6	31.9	32.1	4.9%
West Marlborough	31.0	35.3	38.5	24.2%
Chester County	30.5	33.8	36.9	21.0%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

The median age nationwide has been increasing due to the aging of the dominant age group, the "Baby Boom" generation. This older age group, buying homes and moving into the region, further affects the median age. Census age structure estimates indicate that the median age of the County population will continue its upward trend. As noted previously, the increasing median age and growing older age groups will have implications for the types of facilities and services needed by the residents of the Township and the region. Similarly, any increase in the younger age categories will have implications for demands on school and recreation facilities. These trends will be factored into forthcoming Plan sections.

Hispanic/Latino Population

One of the significant characteristics of the population in New Garden is the percentage of people of Hispanic/Latino heritage. This is due to the amount of Hispanics/Latinos involved in the mushroom industry. Approximately twenty-three percent (22.7%) of the 2000 Township population is Hispanic/Latino. In 1980 and 1990 New Garden had the greatest percentage of any Chester County municipality. However, by 2000 the Township had moved to third highest in the region (22.7%) behind Avondale (38.1%) and Kennett Square (27.9%). When looking at the 20 year trend, West Grove experienced an increase of 1,118.9 percent and Kennett Square 528.2 percent. While previously a large segment of the Hispanic/Latino population consisted of single males, current trends include more married men with families. A need for housing, bilingual services, school programs, and assistance with familiarity with the local culture are some of the impacts resulting from increases in the Hispanic/Latino population. It should be noted that accurate counts of immigrant groups in general can be difficult to obtain for reasons including tracking migration, non-traditional household composition, fear of government agencies, and language barriers. Therefore, counts obtained through the US Census are likely to be somewhat lower than the actual number.

Figure 2-5: Hispanic/Latino Population,* 1980 – 2000; New Garden Township and Surrounding Municipalities

Municipality	1980		1990		2000		Percent Change 1980 - 2000
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
New Garden	**729**	**15.2%**	**1,131**	**23.6%**	**2,065**	**22.7%**	**183.3%**
Avondale Borough	87	9.8%	168	17.6%	422	38.1%	385.1%
East Marlborough	180	4.6%	191	4.0%	250	4.0%	38.9%
Franklin	11	0.6%	16	0.6%	49	1.3%	345.5%
Kennett Square Borough	234	5.0%	662	14.0%	1,470	27.9%	528.2%
Kennett	224	5.3%	322	7.7%	593	9.2%	164.7%
London Britain	8	0.5%	32	2.1%	47	1.7%	487.5%
London Grove	236	6.7%	203	5.7%	695	13.2%	194.5%
West Grove Borough	37	2.0%	49	2.7%	451	17.0%	1,118.9%
West Marlborough	13	1.4%	41	4.4%	74	8.6%	469.2%
Chester County	5,799	1.8%	8,565	2.3%	16,126	3.7%	178.1%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000 * Does not include temporary or seasonal employees.

ECONOMIC PROFILE

Median Household Income

Median household income is the income figure of which one half of the total number of household incomes are above this figure and one half are below. By examining changes to this figure over time, the relative economic health of the residents can be determined. In addition, the median household income figure can be used to compare income levels between adjacent communities, and as one factor to determine the "standard of living" within a community. Communities "doing well" have high or steady increases in median household income.

In 1990, New Garden's median household income was $36,521. (See: **Figure 2-6**) By 2000, this figure doubled to $75,307, the highest median household income increase among the studied communities. (Note: comparison data prior to 1990 is unavailable. The 1980 US Census did not publish such data for communities smaller than 2,500 residents). In 1990, London Britain had the highest median household income of the studied communities at $66,424 and Avondale the lowest at $30,815. By 2000, East Marlborough was the highest at $95,812, an increase of 45.4 percent; and Kennett Square was the lowest at $46,523, an increase of 35.3 percent from 1990 to 2000. In 2000, Chester County had the highest median household income of any county in the state at $65,295, an increase of 43.1 percent over 1990.

Differences between the percentage increases in a given year between household and per capita incomes reflects a possible change in the number of people employed within that household, usually the addition or loss of workers within a household, or a significant wage increase. Per capita income figures for New Garden for 1990-2000 reflect an increase of 95.8 percent, from $15,508 in 1990 to $30,364 in 2000, the highest percent increase of the studied communities. In 1990, New Garden's per capita figure of $15,508 was in the middle of the surrounding communities; Kennett Township was highest at $28,432 and Avondale the lowest at $12,203. For 2000, New Garden was at $30,364, Kennett Township was again the highest per capita income at $46,669, an increase of 47.7 percent from 1990; and Avondale again the

lowest at $16,794, an increase of 37.6 percent. In 2000, Chester County had the highest per capita income of any county in the state at $31,627, an increase of 53.5 percent over 1990's figure.

Figure 2-6: Median Household and Per Capita Income, 1990-2000; New Garden Township and Surrounding Municipalities

Municipality	1990		2000		Percent Change 1990-2000	
	Household	Per Capita	Household	Per Capita	Household	Per Capita
New Garden	**$36,521**	**$15,508**	**$75,307**	**$30,364**	**106.2%**	**95.8%**
Avondale Borough	30,815	12,203	46,875	16,794	52.1%	37.6%
East Marlborough	65,880	26,695	95,812	38,090	45.4%	42.7%
Franklin	56,394	20,685	81,085	28,057	43.8%	35.6%
Kennett Square Borough	34,375	15,147	46,523	22,292	35.3%	47.2%
Kennett	58,853	28,432	85,104	46,669	44.6%	64.1%
London Britain	66,424	23,857	93,521	35,761	40.8%	49.9%
London Grove	38,667	15,575	74,337	27,654	92.2%	77.6%
West Grove Borough	35,417	14,009	56,875	19,967	60.6%	42.5%
West Marlborough	35,652	26,755	52,283	33,245	46.6%	24.3%
Chester County	45,642	20,601	65,295	31,627	43.1%	53.5%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1980-2000

Household Income

One reason to look at household income is to study the relationship between household income and home value. For example, those seeking to purchase a home generally tend to buy the highest priced house that they can afford to mortgage. Therefore, New Garden should have a diversity of housing to support the diversity of incomes. In order to maintain the diversity in household incomes in the Township, a variety of housing should be permitted, in upper as well as lower ranges. This will enable families in higher income brackets to move into New Garden and allow those currently in the Township to remain in the school district and maintain their ties to the community.

The following, **Figure 2-7**, reflects the percentage of occupied households within a range of incomes. According to the 2000 US Census New Garden had a total of 2,724 households, the most number of households of the studied communities. The largest percentage, 18.0 percent, made between $100,000-$149,000; followed closely with 17.7 percent of the total households with incomes of $50,000-$74,999. Avondale had the highest percentage of people with incomes less than $25,000 (22.9%), 8.3 percent higher than the County figure of 14.6 percent; and East Marlborough had the highest percentage of people with salaries greater than $100,000 at 46.7 percent. Clearly, the older more urbanized communities (the boroughs) had fewer households with incomes greater than $100,000 and more households with incomes less than $50,000. The more affordable housing stock available in the boroughs would be expected to attract more households with moderate incomes, particularly considering the high cost of housing in the surrounding townships.

East Marlborough had the highest median household income at $95,812, $30,517 higher than the County number; while New Garden was $75,307, $10,012 greater than the County and Avondale the lowest at $46,875, $18,420 lower than the County. In 2000, Chester County had the highest median household income of any county in the state at $65,295.

Figure 2-7: Household Income as Percent of Total Number of Households, 2000; New Garden Township and Surrounding Municipalities

Municipality	Less than $10,000*	10,000 - 14,999*	15,000 - 24,999*	25,000 - 34,999*	35,000 - 49,999*	50,000 - 74,999*	75,000 - 99,999*	100,000 - 149,999*	150,000 - 199,999*	200,000 or More*	Total Households	Median Household Income
New Garden	**4.7**	**1.8**	**4.2**	**7.2**	**14.1**	**17.7**	**14.3**	**18.0**	**7.3**	**10.6**	**2,724**	**75,307**
Avondale Borough	7.6	4.0	11.3	14.4	20.1	25.2	10.5	3.7	1.7	1.4	353	46,875
East Marlborough	1.8	0.5	3.1	6.7	7.5	18.5	15.2	25.2	7.7	13.8	2,133	95,812
Franklin	2.1	2.6	3.8	3.2	13.8	20.4	16.5	22.3	10.6	4.8	1,173	81,085
Kennett Square Borough	6.8	3.3	10.2	17.4	14.9	22.6	11.4	8.7	2.6	2.2	1,865	46,523
Kennett	2.8	2.8	6.5	4.9	8.2	17.8	13.8	19.4	8.7	15.1	2,454	85,104
London Britain	2.3	0.9	1.9	6.0	7.3	17.3	20.0	26.3	11.3	6.7	950	93,521
London Grove	1.5	1.8	4.4	10.1	11.0	22.1	23.2	18.1	3.6	4.3	1,644	74,337
West Grove Borough	4.8	3.2	7.6	11.1	13.2	33.6	15.8	7.6	2.4	0.7	872	56,875
West Marlborough	1.7	6.1	9.8	14.5	11.8	30.1	8.7	8.7	2.0	6.6	346	52,283
Chester County	4.2	3.3	7.1	8.9	13.3	20.5	15.2	15.7	5.6	6.0	158,025	65,295

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000. *Figures in these categories are percentages

Family Income

Overall, New Garden's families have a substantially higher median income than that of the County. Consistent with the housing prices in the area, the townships have a higher median family income than the boroughs. The more affordable housing stock available in the boroughs would be expected to attract more families with moderate incomes, particularly considering the high cost of housing in the townships. The following, **Figure 2-8,** reflects the number of families within a range of incomes. New Garden had 2,264 families, the most number of families of the studied communities, with the greatest number of these (21.9%) within the $100,000-$149,999 category. Avondale indicated the highest percentage of families with incomes less than $25,000 at 22 percent; 13.8 percent higher than the County figure; and East Marlborough had the highest percentage of people with salaries greater than $100,000 at 54.1 percent. East Marlborough had the highest median family income at $104,590, followed by Kennett with $104,097. Avondale had the lowest family median income at $48,833, $28,083 behind that of Chester County. In 2000, Chester County had the highest median family income of any county in the state at $76,916.

Figure 2-8: Family Income as Percent of Total Number of Families, 2000; New Garden Township and Surrounding Municipalities

Municipality	Less than $10,000*	10,000 - 14,999*	15,000 - 24,999*	25,000 - 34,999*	35,000 - 49,999*	50,000 - 74,999*	75,000 - 99,999*	100,000 - 149,999*	150,000 - 199,999*	200,000 or More*	Total Families	Median Family Income
New Garden	**0.4**	**1.6**	**2.0**	**5.5**	**12.0**	**20.1**	**15.9**	**21.9**	**7.7**	**12.7**	**2,264**	**89,812**
Avondale Borough	6.7	5.2	10.1	13.4	17.2	26.1	12.7	4.5	2.2	1.9	268	48,833
East Marlborough	1.3	0.0	0.8	5.3	4.7	17.2	16.7	28.1	9.1	16.9	1,749	104,590
Franklin	0.6	0.0	3.9	4.9	10.1	20.6	19.2	25.4	9.8	5.6	1,007	89,718
Kennett Square Borough	3.5	2.8	10.6	13.4	13.5	24.6	14.9	9.9	3.9	2.9	1,249	54,948
Kennett	0.9	0.8	3.2	1.8	5.9	17.3	17.0	24.1	9.6	19.3	1,799	104,097
London Britain	1.6	0.5	1.1	5.0	5.6	17.0	21.7	28.1	13.1	6.3	819	97,013
London Grove	0.7	0.0	2.3	9.8	8.7	24.8	25.9	19.6	4.3	3.8	1,381	78,635
West Grove Borough	3.4	1.5	5.7	10.4	13.8	34.5	17.0	11.0	1.8	0.9	681	60,274
West Marlborough	0.5	4.7	4.7	11.3	12.7	32.4	10.3	11.7	1.9	9.9	213	56,875
Chester County	2.0	1.6	4.6	6.9	11.5	21.7	17.9	19.2	7.0	7.6	114,091	76,916

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000. *Figures in these categories are percentages

Poverty Levels

The poverty level of a community is an indication of the general condition of that community. The poverty level is an income level, adjusted for the number of people and children within a household, established by the United States Department of Agriculture to identify how much income is necessary to provide basic food, shelter, and clothing for that household. The number of impoverished individuals is derived from the number of people living in impoverished households. A high poverty rate is an indication that many households do not earn sufficient income to ensure their health, safety, and welfare.

In 2000, New Garden had the highest number of people in poverty with 517 people or 5.7 percent of the total population. (See: **Figure 2-9**) Many of these people were non-family farm workers (individuals). On the other hand, New Garden had one of the lowest percentages of families in poverty at 0.8 percent (19 total families); only Franklin had a lower percentage at 0.6 percent (6 families). Of the 517 people in poverty in New Garden, 93.4 percent were over 18 years of age and 14.9 percent were 65 or older. Avondale had the highest percentage of people in poverty at 14.9 percent. Kennett Square and West Grove had the highest percentages with 9.0 percent and 8.3 percent, respectively. The boroughs also reflected the highest percentages of families in poverty with 9.7 percent, 7.5 percent, and 4.7 percent, respectively; Kennett Square had the greatest number of families in poverty with 94. This trend in poverty within the boroughs may be attributed to a decline of the mushroom industry and a subsequent drop in farm worker housing located in the townships.

The availability of affordable housing and easier access to needed services and facilities explains, at least in part, the higher poverty levels found in the boroughs. Somewhat higher poverty levels and lower median incomes in these communities, in comparison to the townships, is typical in Chester County and in many other areas of the state. The townships typically have lower poverty rates than the urban areas

because urban areas are usually more affordable for people with less income. Urban areas have higher densities of housing, which also reduces real estate costs. Transportation costs can be lower in urban areas than in suburban areas because goods and services are generally available within walking distances for those who cannot afford automobiles. Also, the greater densities within urban areas are more compatible with efficient mass transit service. In rural areas, owning an automobile is necessary to travel to work and to stores.

Although the poverty rate is static throughout the studied communities, the boroughs have a significantly higher percent and the townships a somewhat lower percent of both impoverished people and families than Chester County. A little over 5 percent (5.1%) of Chester County's residents and 3.1 percent of the families are impoverished.

Figure 2-9: Percent of Persons and Families Below Poverty Level, 2000; New Garden Township and Surrounding Municipalities

Municipality	Persons	Percent of Total Population	Families	Percent of Total Families
New Garden	**517**	**5.7%**	**19**	**0.8%**
Avondale Borough	163	14.9%	26	9.7%
East Marlborough	151	2.4%	30	1.7%
Franklin	63	1.7%	6	0.6%
Kennett Square Borough	468	9.0%	94	7.5%
Kennett	330	5.1%	48	2.7%
London Britain	48	1.7%	17	2.1%
London Grove	135	2.6%	21	1.5%
West Grove Borough	219	8.3%	32	4.7%
West Marlborough	41	4.8%	9	4.2%
Chester County	22,032	5.2%	3,529	3.1%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000

EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS

Employment characteristics provide an overview of the types of occupations in which the residents are employed, where the residents work, and how they travel to their job. Changes in these characteristics show trends in the overall economy of an area and changes in the types of employment available.

Employment by Occupation

An analysis of the labor force by occupation examines the types of jobs that are held by the residents. This analysis identifies the diversity of the labor force, and evaluates whether most of the residents are concentrated in similar or different occupations. Occupation, shown in **Figure 2-10**, is the type of work a person does on the job.

The residents of New Garden work in a diversity of occupations similar to that of the County, except for farming where 11.1 percent of the New Garden workers are concentrated, compared to only 1.0 percent for the County. This can be attributed to the presence of the mushroom industry and to the rural nature of much of the area. The majority of the workers of both New Garden and Chester County tend to be concentrated within the white collar, managerial, service, and sales occupations, when combined. Some

occupations are closely related to certain industries such as farming and machine operations, while others, such as managerial and sales, can apply to a wide range of industries. Work force occupations also reflect the education level of the residents. The white-collar professions typically require college degrees. Blue collar occupations typically do not require as much advanced education, although practical education and experience may be necessary.

Figure 2-10: Employment by Occupation, 2000; New Garden Township and Surrounding Municipalities

Occupation	New Garden	Avondale	East Marlborough	Franklin	Kennett Square	Kennett	London Britain	London Grove	West Grove	West Marlborough	Chester County
Management, Professional, and Related	**1,890**	94	1,949	864	710	1,688	858	1,022	510	203	99,985
Service	**537**	119	211	192	528	296	82	343	243	71	24,066
Sales and Office	**780**	118	729	402	640	546	314	615	349	100	58,170
Farming, Fishing, and Forestry	**471**	62	48	14	215	162	21	227	66	38	2,267
Construction, Extraction, and Maintenance	**213**	53	166	176	217	161	104	196	83	37	15,208
Production, Transportation, and Material Moving	**349**	65	224	165	364	180	82	380	156	45	21,559
Total Employment	**4,240**	511	3,327	1,813	2,674	3,033	1,461	2,783	1,407	494	221,255

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000

Place of Work

Figure 2-11, reflects resident destination to their place of work in 1990 and 2000. Place of work identifies whether people are working in New Garden, the county, and state and helps to identify employment opportunities within the Township. In 1990, there were 3,202 workers in New Garden. Of those, 992 or 30.9 percent worked within the Township, and 2,210 or 69.0 percent worked outside of the municipality. Seventy-one percent worked inside Chester County and 4.5 percent outside of the County. Seven hundred and eighty two residents or 24.4 percent worked outside of Pennsylvania and 75.6 percent or 2,420 residents worked within the state. As noted previously, 149 people worked at home.

In 2000, there were 4,183 resident workers in New Garden, an increase of 30.6 percent over the 1990 figure. Of those 4,183 residents, 991 worked within the Township, virtually unchanged from the 1990 figure; 3,192 residents worked outside of the Township, an increase of 44 percent over 1990; 2,276 residents (54.4%) worked outside of Chester County, in effect unchanged from the 1990 figure; 2,694 residents worked in Pennsylvania, an increase of 11.3 percent over the 1990 number; and 215 residents worked at home, an increase of 44.3 percent over the 1990 figure. Of note, in 2000, 32 percent of

Township residents worked in New Castle County, 93 people worked in Philadelphia, and 56 worked in Maryland.

The region's commuting patterns have implications for transportation planning, which will be discussed in more detail in a forthcoming chapter. These commuting patterns also indicate that the Township continues to serve as a bedroom community, with 76 percent outside the Township, 54 percent of the people working in the County, and 36 percent working beyond Pennsylvania, primarily in Delaware or Maryland. This commuting pattern is indicative of the increasing orientation to the south towards the Wilmington and New Castle County area.

Figure 2-11: Place of Work, 1990–2000; New Garden Township

Place of Work	1990		2000		Percent Change 1990-2000
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Total Workers Over 16	3,202	100.0%	4,183	100.0%	30.6%
Worked in Municipality	992	30.9%	991	23.7%	0.0%
Worked Outside Municipality	2,210	69.1%	3,192	76.3%	44.4%
Worked in Chester County	2,277	71.1%	2,276	54.4%	0.0%
Worked Outside Chester County	143	28.9%	1,907	45.6%	133.4%
Worked in Pennsylvania	2,420	75.6%	2,694	64.4%	11.3%
Worked Outside Pennsylvania	782	24.4%	1,489	35.6%	90.4%
Worked at Home	149	4.7%	215	5.1%	44.3%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1990-2000

Means of Transportation to Work

The means of transportation to work helps to identify commuting patterns. New Garden is a "bedroom" community with many employed residents commuting to jobs outside the Township and state. **Figure 2-12** shows how the residents of New Garden commute to work. In 1990, the vast majority of people (63.7%) commuted to work via a single occupant vehicle (SOV), with 14.9 percent carpooling. Six people (0.2%) used public transportation, 501 people (15.6%) walked to work (predominately farm workers), and 149 residents (4.7%) worked at home.

In 2000, these figures changed somewhat from the 1990 figures. Seventy-seven percent drove alone to work, an increase of 1,181 people or 57.9 percent over 1990; 10.1 percent carpooled, a decrease of 54 people or –11.3 percent; and 8 people used public transportation, a gain of 2 people or 33.3 percent. Surprisingly there was an 44.9 percent decrease (225) of people who walked to work (potentially a reflection of the reduction in the number of farmer workers); and 40 people found other means to get to work, an increase of 11 people over 1990 figures.

The average commuting time to work in 1990 was 17.3 minutes. Of note was the increase in travel time to work (an additional 7.4 minutes or a 42.8 percent increase in travel time) to 24.7 minutes. An indication that residents are either working further away from home or their means to work is getting slower (i.e.; more traffic congestion, more stopping, slower moving traffic, more vehicles, access management issues, sprawl, etc.) The mean travel time to work for Township residents (24.7 minutes) is lower than that of Chester County (27.5 minutes), primarily due to the Township's location to employment opportunities.

Interesting to note is the increase in people from 1990-2000 who worked at home. In 2000 this number increased to 215 people or 5.1 percent, an increase of 44.3 percent over 1990. This is a category of

residents that increased in numbers during the 1990s with the expansion of the Internet and web-access (telecommuting) and probably will continue to expand.

Figure 2-12: Means of Transportation to Work, 1990-2000; New Garden Township

Means to Work	1990		2000		1990-2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Drove Alone	2,040	63.7%	3,221	77.0%	1,181	57.9%
Carpooled	477	14.9%	423	10.1%	-54	-11.3%
Public Transportation	6	0.2%	8	0.2%	2	33.3%
Walked	501	15.6%	276	6.6%	-225	-44.9%
Other Means	29	0.9%	40	1.0%	11	37.9%
Worked at Home	149	4.7%	215	5.1%	66	44.3%
Mean Time to Work	17.3 min	-	24.7 min	-	7.4 min	42.8%

Source: US Census Bureau, 1990-2000

PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

An analysis of the population, housing, and economic data and information indicates the following planning implications for New Garden:

- **Growth Pressure -** Growth pressure from Delaware is likely to continue and further increase the demand for residential and non-residential development. The Township needs to ensure that future populations can be accommodated in terms of land area, infrastructure, and community facilities and services with development occurring in an appropriate manner that also protects the remaining open space, natural, historic features.

- **Population Projections -** Population and housing projections indicate approximately 4,600 additional residents and 1,400 new homes could be located/needed in New Garden by 2020. Reducing scattered development and focusing it in and around the rural centers of the community are sound land use policies for the Township. The Township needs to address directing projected future growth into the most appropriate areas. Site design that complements the character of the Township should be encouraged among the development community.

- **Key Demographic Cohorts -** Increases in the number of both school age children and older age groups need to be considered in terms of their impact on schools, new housing developments, types of housing, services, and facilities.

- **Agriculture Industry -** The presence of the mushroom industry and the rural nature of portions of the Township creates a higher percentage of persons in agriculture and farming than is typical of the County. The encouragement and implementation of programs and land use regulations that support farmland protection are both objectives of this Plan.

- **Commuting Patterns -** A majority of Township residents work in Pennsylvania, however the number residents working outside of Pennsylvania, predominately to the Wilmington area has grown significantly. There is a need to identify these commuter patterns and the Township should work at the regional level on transportation improvements and coordinate with the State of Delaware.