

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This analysis is concerned with the quality of the human community's facilities. Its principal emphasis is on residential facilities in the various hamlets and planning areas. However, it also examines nonresidential facilities and the environmental problems that are already associated with the quality of the human community.

The title, Neighborhood Analysis, is somewhat misleading. Its purpose is not so much to analyze as it is to propose the means of implementing the Planning Objectives related to housing the community's residents. These Planning Objectives recognize the need for a healthy environment in terms of adequate water supply and the elimination of pollution, both now and in the future, as well as a concern for adequate community facilities and the natural environmental resources necessary to maintain a quality of life that would assure the Southampton Community of being an attractive place to live in in all senses of the word. More specifically, in terms of housing, a basic need for the human community, the Planning Objectives state that:

"1. The Master Plan and the related regulations and ordinances should encourage a wide variety of housing types and purchase or rental costs appropriate for the anticipated population's needs. They should also encourage flexibility and innovation in the planning of housing groups or developments.

"2. Existing substandard housing shall be eliminated gradually through housing code enforcement."

It is in the spirit of these Planning Objectives that this Neighborhood Analysis is projected as an implementation program.

Delineation of Planning Areas

Since the Southampton Community is composed of settled hamlets, farms, and relatively undeveloped lands, the term planning areas has been adopted to describe the components of the total community. The eight such areas shown on Map 10, are related to the settled hamlets as follows:

<u>Planning Area No.</u>	<u>Hamlets and Developed Areas Included</u>
1	Riverside-Flanders
2	Eastport-Remsenburg-Speonk-Westhampton
3	East Quogue-West Tiana-Pine Neck
4	Hampton Bays-Canoe Place-Ponquogue-Springville
5	Shinnecock Hills Area
6	North Sea Area
7	Noyack Area
8	Bridgehampton-Sagaponack-Hayground-Mecox

In general, the hamlet development centers are located on the south shore of the mainland along Montauk Highway. Riverside-Flanders is the only exception, being a southerly outreach from the Riverhead Hamlet across the Peconic River in the Town of Riverhead. The Shinnecock Hills, North Sea and Noyack areas do not have the complete physical character of hamlets despite their recognizable social structure and significance in the community.

The Neighborhood Analysis summarizes the conditions and problems found by Planning Area with appropriate reference to the hamlets and the named areas of the community.

Resource Data

Information regarding existing conditions is drawn from many sources. Some have been already noted in the Building and Environmental Conditions Section of the Survey and Analyses Report. Among others, they include the 1960 Census of Housing and Population, the Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board, the Suffolk County Departments of Health and Social Services, various town and village officials and field surveys.

HOUSING CONDITIONS AND FAMILIES AFFECTED BY POOR HOUSING

General Factors to be Considered

With seasonal housing accounting for 47 percent of all housing units, the question of housing conditions and the families

affected by poor housing is more difficult to assess than it would be in a more conventional year around community. Likewise, the fact that there is a substantial number of retired persons whose income in terms of wages or salaries may be inconsequential but, nevertheless, in terms of total from all sources is proportionately high, also confuses the picture. The very fact that the case load of the Suffolk County Department of Social Services in the town is in the order of four percent of the year around resident households, while the resident families with incomes of less than \$3,000 in 1959 was in the order of 18 percent suggests that unreported income is a factor in the results reported by the Census. Further, with reference to overcrowding of housing units, the Census of Housing reports the normal occupancy of a housing unit but it is well established that, in the summer, household guests are a factor and, more particularly, that certain households are rented out for the summer on a "group" occupancy basis.

With these preliminary precautions in mind, this analysis, presented by Planning Areas, describes the existing concentrations of residential blight shown on Map 10.

Planning Area 1

This Planning Area has only one concentration of deficient buildings, located south and east of the Riverside traffic circle. However, it is the most intensive concentration in the town. As Map 10 indicates the Riverside-Flanders location will require a major rehabilitation program in its central portions and code enforcement and spot demolition of buildings in the surrounding area.

West of N.Y.S. Route 113, the Quogue-Riverhead Road, and just south of Howard Johnson's, Maynard Street shows some signs of potential deterioration. The street itself is unimproved. Further south, on an unimproved private road, there are several cabin-type homes and mobile homes which are also subject to potential deterioration. At the end of this local area is the Stark Mobile Homes, Inc., mobile home park. It is well laid out and shows no apparent signs of potential blight.

To the east, between N.Y.S. Route 113, and Cook Boulevard, the entire development layout is substandard. The uses include a mixture of such things as junk yards, wrecking yards, spot commercial uses and residences. The interior streets and alleys are unpaved. Many housing units within this area are either deteriorating or dilapidated. Frequently, they are of inadequate original construction or design. These same characteristics

generally occur along N.Y.S. Route 24, the Riverhead-Hampton Bays Road, easterly to Ludlam Avenue and, to a lesser extent between N.Y.S. Route 24 and the Peconic River.

Finally, the newer development areas along Ludlam Avenue and Phillips Avenue have modest housing units with the Phillips Avenue Elementary School as a central focus. However, it is apparent that, even with relatively modern construction, this residential area is feeling the blighting influence of the nearby intermixed nonresidential uses and deterioration. The drive-in theater exit driveway on a minor residential street is a further blighting factor.

Most families in the total described area are non-white. Many are renters and it is anticipated that further investigation would reveal a substantial number of single person households, or roomers. Low incomes are indicated for many families with others ranging up to middle income levels. The high percentage of overcrowded housing units recorded in the 1960 Census of Housing also suggests low incomes.

One other residential location that shows some signs of blight, although not a serious problem at this time, is the former summer cottage area on both sides of N.Y.S. Route 24 in the vicinity of Evergreen and Wood Roads on the north and Bell and Maple Avenues on the south. Conversion of a few structures to two or more family use and inadequate original construction as summer cottages, aggravated by year around use, are characteristic of the occasional problems. The residents of this area are generally middle income white families.

Planning Area 2

The Hamlets of Eastport, Remsenburg, Speonk and Westhampton along with the Quogue area are the only significant developed sections of this Planning Area. The Village of Westhampton Beach is not included. One moderate concentration of deficient buildings is identified on Map 10 at John Street and Peters Lane in Quogue. The housing units involved are older summer cottages or cabins converted to year around use with much inadequate construction of additions. Conversions to two or more family use is also apparent. This area is primarily occupied by non-white families.

In the Hamlet of Speonk a relatively minor problem exists along Phillips Avenue from the railroad north to Old Country Road. Housing units in this area are deteriorating in many instances and one or two are dilapidated. Characteristically mixed land

uses are found here. Nonresidential uses include such things as automobile body repairs, steel fabrication and feather storage. The families affected are presumed to be low and middle income white families who are generally living in single family housing.

Planning Area 3

The Village of Quogue is not included in this analysis. The Planning Area does not have any concentration of deficient buildings, although there is a minor grouping of deteriorating residential structures strung out along Old County Road in East Quogue. These structures are inhabited by white families.

Planning Area 4

Stretching from Tiana Bay easterly to the Shinnecock Canal, Planning Area 4 was not found to have any concentrations of residential building deficiencies. A minor collection of deteriorating and dilapidated housing units is found at Canoe Place immediately south of Montauk Highway on the shore of Shinnecock Bay. These housing units are occupied by white families.

Planning Area 4 has been one of the focal points of the "group rental" activity. This is a case where a group of people rent a house for their joint use throughout the summer season. According to some reports it would seem that the actual numbers of persons living in such a house over a weekend is almost unlimited. It is not unusual for the bedrooms in such a house to be furnished with bunk beds so that a substantial number can be accommodated. The objection to "group rentals" arise both out of the number of persons living on the premises and also the impact of intensive party activity and similar things on neighboring residential land uses.

Planning Area 5

The Shinnecock Hills section of the community has two areas of concern. One is the Barrier Beach at Cold Spring Pond. This sand bar and fill area is noted primarily for its inadequacy of sanitary waste disposal facilities and its potential for flooding. In addition, there are several deteriorating housing units. These are seasonal units in most instances owned by white families.

The second area of concern is a unique one, the Shinnecock Indian Reservation. Although it is a very low density area,

it is reported as a special problem because the Indians are unable to get financing for home improvements or new houses apparently due to various legal limitations.

A general concern in Planning Area 5 is the fact that the seasonal cottages in many cases are very small, compactly grouped units which represent potential inadequate conversions to winter-time use for housing Southampton College students.

Planning Area 6

This Planning Area centers roughly on the developed portion of North Sea. Two types of deficient residential buildings were noted earlier. One was simply inadequate year around structures while the other was conversion of intensively developed summer colonies located at or near water level.

Since the 1960 Census of Housing and the "windshield" survey the first condition has improved to a point where it is no longer significant, demonstrating the possibility for improvement.

The second case is represented by two moderate concentrations of deficient buildings. One is the Old North Sea Summer Colony and the other is the Towd Point Summer Colony. Both have very intensive small lot development almost at water level, poor street improvements and considerable deterioration of housing units. At Towd Point the major problem is the generally substantial character of the development.

The Village of Southampton is not included in this analysis.

Planning Area 7

The Noyack Planning Area has some minor concentration of residential building deficiencies, particularly in the Pine Neck development.

Planning Area 8

Planning Area 8 includes almost all of the most productive farming lands and the Hamlets of Bridghampton, Sargentwood, Hayground, Moxox and Water Mill.

Bridghampton, as a center of farming activity, has three concentrations of residential building deficiencies. The larger is located along the Sag Harbor Turnpike from the railroad area

north to Scuttle Hole Road. It includes a small area requiring major rehabilitation as well as other areas requiring code enforcement and spot demolition. The area along the road is characterized by well kept dwellings intermixed with a substantial number of deteriorating and dilapidated dwellings. Nonresidential uses such as bars and commercial garages, are also present. A considerable effort has already been expended by the residents of this area in creating a new subdivision which has developed with attractive housing.

As already indicated, a major rehabilitation program will be needed at the railroad tracks. This is a particularly intensive group of deficient structures.

Narrow Lane, just to the south, has problems of scattered deterioration and deferred maintenance.

Snake Hollow Road has a smaller group of housing that is in very poor condition. The people living in these areas of Bridgehampton are non-white. They range from low to middle income and in many instances live in overcrowded dwellings. There is also an indication that the proportion of rental units is high in this concentration.

NONRESIDENTIAL AREAS

At this time the nonresidential business areas over the entire Southampton Community are serving a population of approximately 38,000 year around residents and an additional 66,000 residents on peak weekends during the summer. Beyond this there are an estimated 25,000 transient day-trippers in the community during a summer weekend day. As a result of this fluctuation in population to be served, certain businesses are strictly seasonal while those oriented to convenience shopping and personal services customarily associated with a year around community remain open throughout the year.

Generally the seasonal businesses are located outside the hamlet business centers with the exception of those in the Village of Southampton and Westhampton Beach. From season to season these business facilities are subject to change of occupancy as well as to change of ownership of a particular business. The year around businesses tend to concentrate in the hamlet and village business centers with the exception of occasional convenience shopping facilities and such highway oriented businesses as gasoline service stations, automobile agencies, diners and similar uses. The principal business centers serving the Southampton Community are in the Villages of Southampton and Westhampton Beach and in the Hamlets of Hampton Bays and Riverhead.

This pattern and most of the structures have developed over the course of many years. As a result, a substantial number of the structures are of advanced age and in some cases of an obsolete design. The final stage of obsolescence may be noted in the eventual abandonment of a roadside stand or store structure.

The Nassau-Suffolk County Regional Planning Board reported that there were 1,150 acres of land devoted to business (commercial) uses in 1966. This represented an ample 12 acres per 1,000 persons of summer resident population and nearly 10 acres per 1,000 persons when the day-trippers were added into the total. The Existing Land Use Map, Map 5, in the Surveys and Analyses Report 1, demonstrates that these uses were, in general, conveniently distributed throughout the community.

Business structures in the community are generally sound and fulfilling their appropriate functions at this time. There are scattered exceptions, including those that have been abandoned, and more specifically the older business structures in Planning Area 1's Riverside-Flanders concentrations of deficient buildings. These business structures should be incorporated in the major rehabilitation program. Special notice should be taken of the poorly designed strip commercial development along the highways in some parts of the community. Although the structures are sound much could be done to improve the community appearance and general highway safety in these areas. Finally, the impact of the soon to be constructed Sunrise Highway Extension from Eastport to Hampton Bays on the more marginal business uses along the Montauk Highway in the by-passed area should be carefully watched for future deterioration and possibly abandonment.

Turning to commercial housing in the form of motels and hotels, it is readily apparent that these facilities have also developed over many years. The earlier form of tourist court with its tiny cabins is still in evidence. All such housing has generally been among seasonal uses. There is a trend, however, towards renting out motel rooms as efficiency apartments over the off-season months to Southampton College students and similar off-season residents. Since these structures have not been designed for year around apartment use in many instances and are not located in appropriate areas for residential use, they represent a serious question as to their adequacy and compatibility with surrounding land uses. Tourist courts and motels have also raised questions with reference to the adequacy of their sanitary waste disposal systems, particularly in the case of those at or near the water's edge.

Finally, there are a few industrial uses in the Southampton Community. Several observations are pertinent to their condition as it might affect the future land uses of the community.

Many of these uses fall into the category of sand and gravel mining. Some of these sites are active while others, generally minor borrow pits, are inactive. The manner in which these sites have been worked indicates that the existing sand and gravel extraction regulations are not functioning effectively in terms of site rehabilitation. In a somewhat similar manner, the various solid waste disposal sites operated by the town and villages over past years and the private dumps and automobile graveyards, all will require rehabilitation if their sites are not to have a blighting influence on future land uses.

A second kind of situation is the outdoor storage of equipment and materials which has been practiced in some instances without concern for neighboring properties. Some of these uses, which are now nonconforming uses, have been extended in contradiction to the provisions of the Building Zone Ordinance. These sites will also have a blighting influence on future land uses.

Aside from these more customary situations, the Bridgeton Racetrack is a special concern. Located in an undeveloped residential area on the very attractive moraine topography well off the main highway system, this use presents a serious blighting influence for the future development of this otherwise desirable area. It should be relocated, if possible, in an area where it would be a compatible use and where direct express highway access would be available.

ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

The Surveys and Analyses Report provides detailed studies of community facilities and utilities. It noted that in 1968, the public school playgrounds met the standard requirements set forth for neighborhood parks and playgrounds for year around residents. Adding the undeveloped upland park areas of the town the standard would be exceeded. However, the total was not enough to meet the needs of the summer resident population on the basis of the same standard. Further, it was noted that some areas were not conveniently served. A similar shortage of area occurs in the case of community-wide parks and beaches, although the beach component of this category was apparently adequate even for the summer weekend population in 1968. In conclusion it was noted that, in a resort community such as

Southampton, the private and semi-public recreational facilities are important assets that should be encouraged.

With reference to the public school facilities and the 15 school districts that serve the community, it was determined that pupil populations were beginning to exceed plant capacity in all districts. This is expected to be particularly evident west of the Shinnecock Canal as the Sunrise Highway construction is completed and further year around conversion of summer dwellings takes place.

Among the other public facilities considered, it was established that public libraries are conveniently located through the community although the funding limits their development, and that the 11 fire departments generally provide an adequate level of fire protection.

Houses of worship are located in every hamlet area while other semi-public organizations tend to be situated in the principal business centers, such as the Village of Southampton. These locations are considered to be generally convenient for the resident population.

CAUSES OF BLIGHT

Although there is a very limited amount of blight in the Town of Southampton today, the future potential may be far more serious since its causitive seeds are already in place. They are the extensive number of older seasonal cottages. These may all be subject to inadequate conversion in the future as commuting by highway to jobs in western Suffolk County becomes easier. Experience indicates that even despite their inadequate original construction and obsolete design in many cases, few of these structures are abandoned. In the concentrated areas designated for corrective action on Map 10, these blighting factors are aggravated by private land development patterns with inadequate public improvements such as streets and drainage and are frequently served by inadequate sanitary waste disposal and water supply systems. Unfortunately, many of these cottage colonies are also located on very low ground at the water's edge making them subject to flooding on occasion.

In the concentrated area of Riverside-Flanders, there is the more specific blighting factor of an incompatible mixture of deteriorating and dilapidated nonresidential structures. These are associated with poor soil and ground water conditions and traffic congestion at both the traffic circle and, on occasion, at the drive-in theater.

Another important general cause of blight in some residential areas is the relatively low income of families seeking housing accommodations as compared with housing costs which are very high. This tends to perpetuate even the poorest residential structures and encourages overcrowding.

In nonresidential areas, three factors are involved in causing blight. One is the inadequate rehabilitation and interim screening of the extractive industries, outdoor storage and solid waste disposal areas. A second is the lack of adequate control over access to the highways and the failure to use contemporary site design standards in commercial areas along the highways, allowing some areas to develop chaotically. And third is the impact of the scattered abandoned structures.

Finally, the destruction of the natural environment through indiscriminate dredging and filling of both public and private lands in a resort and fishing community such as Southampton is a general cause of blight not customarily associated with an urban neighborhood analysis. However, it can have a substantial influence on the future of the Southampton Community.

IDENTIFICATION OF STEPS NEEDED TO ELIMINATE PRESENT BLIGHT AND TO PREVENT FUTURE BLIGHT

General Scope of Recommendations

Fortunately, as this Neighborhood Analysis indicates, the Town of Southampton is not now substantially effected by blight. However, the seeds of future blight have already been planted. The steps recommended are intended to eliminate existing blight and to prevent those seeds of future blight from germinating. They recognize the Community Master Plan's expressed need for limiting resident population to protect the natural environment and to maintain an adequate domestic water supply.

The broad objectives on which these steps are based are:

1. To provide adequate housing accommodations for community residents within their economic means and allowing for some choice in housing types.
2. To assist both low and lower middle income residents in achieving an ownership interest in the housing that they occupy.
3. To improve, where necessary, and maintain a high quality physical environment in both residential and nonresidential areas.

In general, the steps recommended may be identified in four categories by their general priorities:

1. The establishment of appropriate regulations and codes, including their enforcement, as an ongoing program to assure that the housing supply does not deteriorate below a standard condition as well as to permit the construction of adequate increases to that supply in both numbers and types.
2. The creation of a Town Housing Committee for the purpose of developing access to the available housing programs and appropriate procedures for their utilization by low and lower middle income residents.
3. The construction of necessary public improvements to upgrade community facilities in deteriorating or inadequately served areas.
4. The activation of major rehabilitation programs for the Riverside-Flanders and Sag Harbor Turnpike concentrations of blight.

Obviously, the four categories above are interrelated in their component parts. As a result, the general priorities are just that. The various sub-elements must be related in timing to their prerequisite steps. These sub-elements are described briefly in the following section.

Recommended Specific Regulatory Steps

Zoning Ordinance: Since the proposed Zoning Ordinance has a broad application over the entire unincorporated area, it has top priority among all the plan's proposals. It includes five provisions that relate specifically to housing and other causes of blight described in this analysis. Further, they are compatible with the Master Plan in the context of the Community Planning Objectives.

First, there is a provision for planned residential development. It provides for flexibility of housing types within the established capacity of a given site area. This will not only permit a choice of housing type, it will also provide much of the open space and greenbelt parks that are required to implement the Master Plan.

Second, there is a provision for the transfer of residential development rights. This would make it possible to provide

an appropriate number of garden apartments and town houses in hamlet centers for middle income families, young couples and the elderly. The transfer procedure would not increase the community's overall residential capacity established through the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map. It is also proposed that this same technique be used to preserve the best farm lands for agricultural activities and the best water catchment areas for ground water reservoir recharge.

Third, it is proposed that special increments in residential density be permitted on a limited number of small sites distributed through the community that would permit a non-profit corporation to construct housing for low income families. Using state and federal programs, these non-profit corporations would be required to assure both future availability of such low income housing and also provide for the development of owner equity. It is proposed that this low income housing inventory be set at five percent of the number of year around resident families, or about the current level of families receiving assistance of one kind or another from the Suffolk County Department of Social Services. The detailed development and application of this provision, should be assigned to the proposed Town Housing Committee.

Fourth, the Zoning Ordinance proposes that site plan review procedures be used to establish contemporary standards of site development. It would also improve the quality of development on highway frontages and achieve adequate screening to assure compatibility of neighboring uses, particularly along residential-nonresidential district boundaries.

And fifth, through the establishment of overlay district regulations, safe development practices and environmental protections of the flood plains, tidal marshes and wetlands, and the ocean and ocean beach are required.

The above five specific references by no means summarize the Zoning Ordinance proposals which are further described in Section X of this report.

Subdivision Regulations: The Town Subdivision Regulations are already of a high caliber. Suggested amendments emphasize the need for greater consideration of the natural environment in subdivision design and ground water reservoir recharge. As in the case of the Zoning Ordinance these regulations should have a high priority since they have a general application.

Regulating and Controlling, Mining and Regrading of Land, Excavation and Removal of Sand, Gravel and Topsoil, and Other Excavations, Ordinance No. 42: During the course of the Urban

Planning Assistance Program, a detailed examination of the existing condition of sand and gravel mining sites, the character of the regulations and their administration was undertaken. It was found that the policies relating to such areas were not clear and that the regulations themselves should be amended to strengthen the controls. In this process future concern should be expressed for dredging, bulkheading and filling of private water's edge and tidal lands.

Housing Code: Any serious effort to improve the quality of residential properties in the community calls for the adoption of a housing code. Unlike the Building Code, which controls all new construction, a housing code is designed to establish minimum standards for the condition, maintenance and level of occupancy of already existing residential properties. The housing code would apply to all types of housing, including mobile home courts. In this way it is intended to prevent future deterioration and dilapidation as well as exploitation of properties in a manner deleterious to the surrounding properties and unhealthy for the occupants.

It is recommended that the Town Housing Committee study the available model housing codes and their related administrative needs. Further, that the committee establish areas of potential overlaps with existing ordinance and regulations, if any. An application might prove appropriate for assistance programs such as the federal Code Enforcement Program administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Grants could be as much as three-quarters of the project cost including planning, administration and such necessary public improvements as the environment may require. Approval of such a project also makes financial assistance available for relocation, mortgage insurance for rehabilitation work and direct low-interest rate loans and grants for rehabilitation in selected situations.

In terms of priorities, it should be noted that in this program the town should first create the Town Housing Committee, then adopt a housing code after study, and finally apply the housing code, possibly with the assistance of a Code Enforcement Program. The latter could also provide assistance in financing the necessary public improvements noted as having a third basic priority in the listing.

Licensing of Rental Housing Facilities: In an effort to provide for a regular review of rental housing compliance with the housing code and other applicable regulations or codes, it is recommended that all rental housing facilities be required to have an annual license. Such a license would spe-

cify the occupancy permitted based on a certificate of occupancy issued by the Building Inspector establishing the facility's capacity. The determination of capacity would be based on the appropriate provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and housing code as well as any other applicable regulations or codes.

Such rental housing licenses would be required for facilities used for "group" occupancies, for mobile home courts and for commercial housing facilities such as motels and cabin colonies.

Enforcement: Since the enactment of ordinances and adoption of codes has little meaning without enforcement, it is recommended that a staff position be created with the assignment of *coordinating and enforcing all such regulations and codes* related to the development and continued physical well-being of the community. The title might well be Development and Environmental Program Coordinator. The person filling this position might be responsible for coordinating the efforts of the various officials and staff members involved with such ordinances and codes and public improvements, including the mining and regrading ordinance, and the housing codes and rental housing licensing, the subdivision regulations, the highway superintendent, and the various special districts and agencies providing public improvements in the community.

The Town Housing Committee

As stated, it is proposed that the Town Board create a Town Housing Committee. Its responsibility is to develop access to available housing programs and to establish procedures for *their utilization by low and lower middle income residents*. This responsibility includes a concern for the condition of the existing housing and a monitoring of the need for housing at these income levels.

The appointment of the Town Housing Committee should be a high priority action, since it will take some time for the members to become familiar with their responsibilities and their potential resources for carrying out those responsibilities. It is recommended that the manner in which the committee functions should remain relatively flexible and that in some part its membership should also be variable. However, the core committee members should be assigned the role of resource members to evaluate the available housing programs, how they might be applied, where appropriate, establish procedures for applying them. This would enable individuals or groups for whom these programs would provide assistance to use organized

information and approved procedural mechanics. These core committee members should be chosen for their established expertise in the specialized fields that housing involves, such as architecture, banking, construction, engineering, government and social services. They should be people whose opinion is respected and who are concerned about helping residents to achieve standard quality housing and eliminating substandard housing.

A second membership group in the Town Housing Committee should involve a representative from each hamlet area. They would be assigned the role of relating the established resources to questions in their hamlets and, in the process, for developing a beneficial relationship between the Town Housing Committee and hamlet residents. Villages might also participate in this.

The third membership group would be representative of an area in which housing assistance is needed. These local membership groups would remain in existence as long as such assistance programs were operating.

The manner in which these committee members approach their responsibilities should be left in their hands. However, it is suggested that early discussion be undertaken with the following groups as a starting point:

1. The existing group or groups working under the Farmers Home Administration Program.
2. Various groups that have an interest in the Suffolk County Air Force Base housing and its beneficial use. It has been suggested that this housing might be moved to replace substandard dwellings in other areas.
3. The Suffolk County Department of Social Services.
4. Established non-profit corporations or other groups prepared to manage housing units or act as guides in the low and lower middle income housing field.
5. The Town Planning Board with reference to its Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance proposals.

Among the assistance programs that the Town Housing Committee might find helpful are the following list:

Under the Department of Housing and Urban Development (the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969):

1. Purchase of individual home ownership under Sections 235 (mortgage interest payment), or rehabilitation of existing homes under Section 203k and 220h.
2. Rental and cooperative housing accommodations under Sections 213, 221(d) (3) or 236, possibly combined with Section 235.
3. Condominium housing accommodations under Section 234, possibly combined with Section 236.
4. Senior citizens housing and housing for the handicapped of all ages under Sections 202, possibly combined with Section 236 and Section 231.

Under the Farmers Home Administration: Low mortgage rates.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 also provided seed money by way of 80-percent interest free loans to non-profit sponsors of housing for low and lower middle income families. These loans are available for such costs as organizational expenses, legal fees, architects fees, preliminary site engineering fees, and land options.

Public Improvements

The nature of the public improvements needed in the various groups of hamlets have already been described. It has also been noted that federal assistance may be available in meeting part of the cost of such improvements found necessary in a federal Code Enforcement Program project area. A similar possibility would exist in a federally assisted Urban Renewal project area. Aside from these more intensive programs the following assistance programs should be noted, although their usefulness will depend on the availability of funds:

1. Public Works Planning Program (DHUD) provides interest-free advances for planning essential public works and community facilities, intended for construction within a reasonable period of time. Advances are repaid on start of construction.
2. Open Space Land Program (DHUD) grants 50 percent of land acquisition and improvements costs for park, recreation, conservation, scenic and historic projects. This program can also be supplemented by the following program.

3. Park and Recreation Land Acquisition Act and Next Step Programs (N.Y.S.) provide up to 75 percent of land acquisition costs and 75 percent of improvement costs.
4. Urban Beautification and Improvement Program (DHUD) for the beautification and improvement of publicly owned and controlled land provides grants for 50 percent of the increase above average beautification expenditures for the preceding two years. Work may include park development, upgrading malls or similar public areas, street improvements and beautification of public places.

Major Rehabilitation

In those areas where concentrations of deficient buildings have led to a designation "Intensive-Requiring Major Rehabilitation" it is anticipated that a more fundamental approach to area improvement will be necessary. The objective should be to plan such activity to accomplish the proposed objectives with the least general disruption of its inhabitants. Therefore, careful consideration should be given to the extent of a project area and to the kind of action to be taken.

The Code Enforcement Program (DHUD) provides 75 percent of the cost for a concentrated three-year housing code enforcement project in areas where 20 percent of the buildings have code violations. Significantly, these programs may include the cost of necessary public improvements and they also qualify eligible owners and tenants for three percent rehabilitation loans and rehabilitation grants. Where certain few structures in such an area must be demolished the Demolition Grant Program provides two-thirds of the cost.

The Urban Renewal Program (DHUD) makes it possible to overcome completely obsolete blighted areas. Although it may combine rehabilitation with areas of demolition, replanning and rebuilding, it generally should be reserved for the most serious conditions. To complete the entire program, theoretically could take upwards of three to five years depending on its complexity. In practice, however, these projects have taken up to ten years. One alternate to this entire area procedure is called the Neighborhood Development Program (DHUD) in which the project is carried out in annual steps of renewal activities leading to eventual completion.

As in the case of code enforcement the Federal Urban Renewal Program Assistance would be 75 percent of the project cost.

New York State would provide an additional 12.5 percent. Thus, the town's share would be 12.5 percent of the cost.

Conclusion

The objectives expressed in the Neighborhood Analysis are very similar to those expressed in the Master Plan. As a result, the steps needed to eliminate blight also find their counterparts in the implementation elements of the Master Plan. However, it emphasizes implementation measures as they relate to residential qualities of the local areas of the community. In doing so, it indicates the coordination needed to meet their problems.