

NOV 1972

R E P O R T

prepared by the

Ad Hoc Committee

To Study

Housing Needs in the Village of Alfred

Mr. Alex Spyralatos,

Village of Alfred

Mr. Robert C. Kelley,

Alfred University

Dean Milo Van Hall,

SUNY Agricultural and Technical College

Dr. Gary Horowitz,

Planning Board, Village of Alfred

Dr. Warren L. Bouck,

Board of Trustees, Village of Alfred

Mr. Robert E. Rich and Mr. Robert A. McNary, Assistant Planners,
Allegany County Department of Planning

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Introduction

The Housing Survey

Methodology

Analysis of Data

Trends and Recommendations

Projection of Village Housing Needs to 1985

Recommendations of Suitable Land Use for Village Housing

Data from Housing Survey

INTRODUCTION

The Ad Hoc Committee on Housing Needs within the village of Alfred gratefully acknowledges its appreciation to the Allegany County Department of Planning for assistance in making this study and especially to Robert E. Rich and Robert A. McNary, Assistant County Planners, who advised the committee, making available the benefits of their expertise and experience. A special note of appreciation is paid to Mr. McNary, who collated the data and summarized the findings from the questionnaire used to survey the status of housing in the village.

The Ad Hoc Committee was supplied by Mr. Rich with a copy of the report of a study of housing in Allegany County, prepared in June, 1971 by the Department of Planning of that county. This report was helpful to the committee in terms of methodology of such a survey and of general background information on the status of county-wide housing.

The Ad Hoc Committee, representing the constituencies of Alfred University, the SUNY Agricultural and Technical College, and the private citizens, together with representatives from the Village Planning Board, the Village Board of Trustees, and the Allegany County Department of Planning, met during the latter part of April and throughout May and June of 1972 to define the problems it was to resolve, to outline the study, to select a questionnaire, to organize a survey of housing, and to implement this survey.

The committee also met at intervals during the summer months and resumed a more regular schedule of meetings in September and October to analyze and to interpret the data from the survey and to perform its other charges from the Board of Trustees of the village.

The Ad Hoc Committee was directed by that board to carry out the following responsibilities and duties:

1. To collect and analyze all available data (i.e., from the Allegany County Department of Planning) on the status of single-family residence housing, multiple-residence housing, and student housing (off-campus) within the village of Alfred.

2. To project and to define the housing needs in the above noted areas to the year, 1985.

3. To identify suitable land areas within the village boundaries (no matter who the present owner is) for the location of each of the above noted types of housing.

4. To make all those recommendations it deems necessary to solve the housing needs of the village, and to include these recommendations, plus all data collected, all projections of needs, and all identifiable suitable land for housing, in a report to be presented to the Village Planning Board.

METHODOLOGY OF HOUSING SURVEY

As noted in the scope of responsibilities, the first task of the Ad Hoc Committee was to conduct a survey of the present status of housing in the village. Some brief comments in regard to methodology and personnel are appropriate to an understanding and appreciation of the survey.

The instrument used in the survey was one patterned on a questionnaire, suggested by Mr. Rich, that was used for a similar purpose in Erie County. This questionnaire was adapted to meet the local situation and needs in the village.

After the questionnaire had been redesigned, the committee decided to divide the village into ten neighborhoods as follows:

1. Hill Street, High Street, Randolph Road, and South Main Street from Randolph Road to Hill Street
2. Pine Hill Drive and Sayles Street Extension
3. Terrace Street, Park Street, Ford Street, and Sayles Street
4. South Main Street from Hill Street to West University Street
5. West University Street from Main Street and the Reynolds Street "Loop"
6. Church Street, Mill Street, and North Main Street from West University to West Pine Street, plus Main Street business block
7. West University Street from Reynolds Street to Moland Road
8. North Main Street to its intersection with Route 244
9. Hillcrest Drive, Glen Street, and Greene Street
10. Hillcrest Court.

The personnel who did the survey were selected by the committee from among faculty wives (the one exception being Maria Rodriguez Boucher) of both educational institutions in the village.

Prior to making the survey, a training session was conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee for those participating. The questionnaire, the methodology of the survey, and their involvement were explained. They also received guidance from the members of the committee during the period of the survey when such advice was

requested.

The survey consisted of an oral administration of the questionnaire to each resident of a dwelling unit approached. In a single-family residence, only one adult member was interviewed. In a multiple-dwelling unit, an attempt was made to interview at least one resident of each apartment or one resident of a single room. In those single-family residences that housed roomers, an attempt was made to interview at least one occupant of each room. The responses were recorded on separate forms provided by the committee. A deliberate attempt was thus made to insure the greatest degree of uniformity and objectivity.

It is noted, however, that this method presents some problems of internal validity. Interviewing is always apt to be prejudiced by a bias of interpretation and by a standard error percentage involved in the compilation from initial steps to final analysis. Another variable that existed at the time the survey was conducted (early June, 1972), was that some persons, both permanent residents and students were not available.

On the other hand, when one considers that the sampling was a fairly accurate representation (320 out of 441 units or 73 per cent), as well as the cooperative response to the questionnaire from village residents, a reliable degree of validity does exist.

ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM THE HOUSING SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Residents of the village who were surveyed were divided into three groups: (1) student, retired, and other. The latter category makes up the majority of resident types with "student" and "retired" comprising near equal minority types. In keeping with this pattern, it is noted that over 50 per cent of all village housing units are single-family dwellings and nearly 50 per cent are multiple-dwelling structures.

A slight majority of the persons interviewed rent their housing (51 per cent). This finding cannot be attributed entirely to the students who reside in the village since they total only 21 per cent of those interviewed. Of this slight majority who do rent, approximately 66 per cent state that they are presently paying from \$100.00 up in rent per month.

If we take into account the preference of whether one would like to own or to rent, we find that 48 per cent of those interviewed elected ownership. One might assume this finding to be an indicator; however, we must keep in mind that the terminology of the question stipulated "prefer." We cannot, therefore, make a realistic appraisal of market availability from this data.

To determine "moving trends," an index or definition of housing stability was arbitrarily selected as: anyone who has lived in the same dwelling unit for three years or more has attained a degree of permanence. Anyone under this three-year limit was regarded to be in a status of temporarity. Alfred has a majority, (56 per cent) of its population that was surveyed, which is regarded as permanent since they have lived in the same dwelling unit for three years or longer. Moreover, a sizeable number of total respondents (75 per cent) have been living in the village for three years or more. These findings would seem to indicate a rather stable body of residents under the index that was utilized. A word of caution is noted in regard to this particular analysis, for the data includes students, some of them connected with Alfred University, who are in both under-

graduate and graduate programs. This group might be expected, therefore, to remain in off-campus housing for a period of three or more years. On the other hand, we are reminded that all students surveyed comprise only 22 per cent of those interviewed. A sizeable percentage, then, of those interviewed who meet the criterion of housing stability are those other than students.

Relative to analyzing the nature of the residents in regard to rentals, we find that 76 per cent of the total respondents rent their last dwellings. There is, thus, a distinct overlap; and we realize that an important percentage of those "permanent" residents do, in fact, rent.

In the self-analysis portion of the questionnaire, we find that a majority of the respondents (67 per cent) see themselves as long-term residents. Likewise, a majority of those interviewed (56 per cent) regard their present housing as a permanent dwelling unit (at least for the next three years), and 82 per cent of the total respondents find their present housing to be adequate. These responses and others (49 per cent would advise a friend to move into the village and 74 per cent were not actively looking for new housing at the time of the survey) lead one to assume that there is an availability of satisfactory housing.

There are some distinct and important findings that are unique to each of the three groups of residents who were interviewed.

Of the "other" group, 63 per cent own their own dwelling units, and most of them consider themselves to be long-term residents of the village. A revealing 41 per cent of this group, however, are seriously considering moving out of the village.

In the "retired" group, 76 per cent own their own dwelling units. A majority of the respondents in this group have lived in the village and in the same dwelling unit for at least fifteen years. Generally they consider themselves as long-term residents who are satisfied with their present housing situation. It is understood, also, that they would prefer not to rent.

The "student" group presents a different type of housing relationship because some of their dwelling units are divided up into apartments for their use,

while others may be boarders or tenants in a part of the housing structure. Regardless of the type of dwelling unit, students do play an instrumental role as a determinant of village housing. As noted in the Introduction to this report, the survey, since it was taken after some students had already left the village for the summer, may lack a degree of validity of student housing. However, one might surmise that the responses of students who were interviewed would be representative of the expressions of the larger student population who reside in off-campus housing within the village.

Of those in the "student" group who were interviewed, a majority reported that they pay \$60.00 or more rent per month, and a reasonable percentage (41 per cent) have utility costs included in the rental payment. Approximately 60 per cent of student residents interviewed were satisfied with their accommodations. However, a sizeable percentage of student respondents (36 per cent) reported their housing to be inadequate. Of the students interviewed, 63 per cent stated that they were seriously considering moving from the village; however, few indicated they were actively looking for housing outside of the village. As an indication of how much the students interviewed will pay for rental housing, the findings show that 63 per cent would rent an apartment, if they had the opportunity, with payments averaging between \$80 and \$120 per month.

Keeping in mind that the village was divided into ten neighborhoods for this survey, the responses to a series of questions are revealing in regard to the degree of satisfaction with various conditions in one's neighborhood. Generally, a majority of the residents interviewed are "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" with most of the items to which they were requested to respond. Of interest are the following responses by percentages:

<u>Condition</u>	<u>Very Satisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>
Street lighting	18	76
Cleanliness	12	61
Quietness	11	64
Trees	13	69
Lawns	15	67
General condition of neighborhood	18	64
Type of persons living in area	28	61

A surprising revelation is that 54 per cent of the respondents are "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" with the recreational facilities in their neighborhoods.

On the other hand, there were some conditions of their neighborhoods about which those who were interviewed expressed degrees of dissatisfaction as follows by percentages:

<u>Condition</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Very Dissatisfied</u>
Vehicular traffic	25	14
Shopping facilities	28	16
Available parking space	21	15
Adequacy of bus service	16	49

From these findings, one might assume that village residents are generally satisfied with many of the conditions in their neighborhoods. One might be tempted to generalize from these results that village residents are, for the most part, satisfied with conditions in the village which the questionnaire sampled. However, one must use caution in these interpretations for the following reasons:

1. The data from those interviewed in the ten neighborhoods was collated in reporting these findings.
2. The questionnaire did not seek responses from those surveyed on the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with similar conditions in the village as a whole. This lack was an inherent weakness of the questionnaire.

That 41 per cent of the "other" group are seriously considering moving from the village does give one pause for reflection on their reasons. The findings from the survey yield no valid or significant data to account for their reasons.

3. One does find expressions of degrees of dissatisfaction with some conditions from the residents of certain neighborhoods when the raw data is examined. For example, in neighborhoods 5, 6, and 7 (that area commonly identified as the downtown business-commercial "triangle"), the residents who were interviewed were generally dissatisfied with the availability of parking space. A significant number of respondents from this area also expressed dissatisfaction with traffic

conditions. A milder degree of dissatisfaction was expressed with the cleanliness, the lawns, and the general conditions of this area. On the other hand, a significant number of respondents expressed satisfaction with the area's street lighting.

TRENDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A market for rental housing is most apparent in the student sector with the "other" and retired groups favoring dwelling ownership. Of those interviewed from these two latter groups, 48 per cent responded they would prefer to own if they were to move to another dwelling unit as contrasted with 33 per cent from these groups who said they would prefer to rent if they were to move. Of the respondents from these groups, 59 per cent indicated they would prefer to own a one-story dwelling, 44 per cent a two-story dwelling, and 14 per cent a split-level dwelling.

Of those interviewed from these groups who indicated they would prefer to own their dwellings if they were to move, 16 per cent stated they would choose to own rather than to rent because ownership gave them a sense of security, 29 per cent for equity, 25 per cent for privacy, and 30 per cent to use the property as they liked.

Of those surveyed from the "other" and retired groups who would prefer to rent, 30 per cent indicated they wanted to be able to move about freely, 15 per cent noted a lack of funds for a down payment, 14 per cent stated they didn't want the obligation of a mortgage, and 18 per cent commented they would not have to make repairs if they rented.

As an index of range of the purchase price of single-family dwelling units, 34 per cent of the respondents replied the maximum amount they could pay was \$25,000 to less than \$35,000, and 25 per cent stated they could pay \$15,000 to less than \$25,000. It is noted that a little over one-third of the respondents from these groups (34 per cent) indicated they did not know in answer to this question.

The responses to the question of the maximum monthly payments (including principle, interest, and taxes) is another indication of the range of purchase price. Of those interviewed from these two groups who indicated they would prefer to buy, 20 per cent responded they feel they could make a maximum monthly payment

of \$250 or more, 18 per cent \$200 to less than \$250, 20 per cent \$150 to less than \$200, and 8 per cent \$120 to less than \$150. Again, about one-third indicated they did not know.

Most of the "other" and retired residents comprise a stable majority of the "permanent residents" of the village. Among these two groups, the pattern of housing mobility does not appear to be one of great change. Although 41 per cent of the respondents from the "permanent residents" indicated they were seriously considering moving from the village at the time of the survey, 74 per cent of this group replied they were not actively looking for new quarters at this time. There would appear to be, therefore, some feelings among these respondents of dissatisfaction with present conditions within the village. The reasons are assumed to be other than those associated with their standards of housing. However, in regard to "permanent residents," a review of zoning applications shows minimal construction of one-family dwelling units within the village during the past two years.

In the student group, there appears to be a preference for apartment-type multiple-dwellings. Over 50 per cent of the respondents from this group indicated they would rent an apartment, if given the opportunity to do so, with a rental range averaging between \$80 and \$120 per month.

Off-campus student housing should be more comprehensively studied by the two collegiate-level institutions within the village since they have more access to the needs for such housing than does the Ad Hoc Committee. Much in this area will depend, of course, on the response of the State University of New York to a declining utilization of dormitory beds at the SUNY Agricultural and Technical College. Whether this present decline is only a temporary phenomenon or the beginning of a continuing pattern remains to be seen. Whichever the case, caution would seem to be called for in projecting off-campus student housing needs within the village.

The Ad Hoc Committee has concerned itself with the housing needs within the village of Alfred. The committee notes, however, that planning would necessarily have to include consideration of the availability of housing in the township of Alfred, as well as in the surrounding communities. It is to be anticipated, therefore, that the Planning Boards of both the village and the township will be involved in all future planning in regard to housing of the single-family residence type and the multiple-dwelling type.

Projection of Village Housing Needs to 1985

In formulating any projection of village housing needs, one must take into consideration the impact of the two collegiate institutions on such needs since they constitute the most viable economic base of the Alfred community. A principal factor that influences local housing needs is the projected enrollment growths of these two institutions. These projections have a bearing on the housing needs for some particular groups in the community: on-campus student housing, off-campus student housing, both for single and married students, faculty and administration housing, and support staff housing.

One would like to be able to project housing needs on an annual basis to 1985 for each of these groups; however, the information from the two institutions does not lend itself to such a neat and discrete tabulation. The projection, therefore, is in narrative form.

Alfred University:

The University currently is housing 1,335 students on campus. The undergraduate off-campus housing accommodates 484 students, and the graduate off-campus housing provides for 237 students. About 725 University students, therefore, are housed presently off-campus, some in the village, and some in the adjacent township. These figures do not include commuters, who are residing at home.

The following new or additional on-campus housing requirements for full-time undergraduate students are projected by the University:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Beds</u>
1973-74	180
1977-78	120
1981-82	<u>60</u>
360 Total Beds	

The total of 360 additional beds projected for 1981-82 assumes that total full-time undergraduate enrollment will not exceed 2,540 students. However, if the upper enrollment projection of 2,750 students is reached, a total of approxi-

mately 140 beds in addition to the 360 beds will be required for 1981-82, making a total of 500 beds to be added.

Looked at in another way, the enrollment projection of 2,540 full-time undergraduate students calls for about 1700 of these to be housed on-campus with the rest (about 850) off-campus. The higher projected limit of 2,750 students would mean that slightly over 900 of this total would be housed off-campus. Neither one of these off-campus student housing figures include graduate student off-campus housing estimates. If we include this factor, conceivably the total number of University students living off-campus by 1982 could amount to about 1200.

It would seem that these patterns have significant implications for both the village and the town planning boards.

According to the Master Plan, Alfred University, including the College of Ceramics, will be adding a total of 97 new people to its staff in the next 10 years. This figure includes faculty, administration, office personnel, technical assistants and Physical Plant employees. About half of this number will be supportive staff. It is assumed that many of these people will already have homes in the area, and they would not have, therefore, much of an influence on the housing market within the Village.

For one reason or another, many of these new people will find housing outside the Village. In addition, within the next 3 years, the effects of the University's housing policy will be felt, under which faculty families must vacate University-owned housing after a residency of three years. Because of that, approximately 11 families will need to find housing elsewhere in the Village or surrounding areas. Also, the University will be removing some of its houses which now sit on the perimeter of the campus in order to use the land for other purposes.

Taking the above into consideration, the University will need a minimum of 35 new housing units in the next 10 years. The majority of this number should be

available within the next 3-5 years.

At the present time, Alfred University has no married student housing. The University anticipates that it will need a minimum of 100 of these units by 1988. Most of these should be erected within the next ten years.

SUNY Agricultural and Technical College:

There are indications that enrollment growth at this institution is beginning to level off. The most recent projections from SUNY Central Office in Albany have not been received as of the time of this report.

This college provides dormitory housing of 2,533 beds, of which 235 were vacant in September when the college opened. As it has been noted earlier in this report, it is too soon to know if this decline is temporary or is the beginning of a continuing pattern. Neither can one at this time, as it has been noted also, predict the response of SUNY to this decline in dormitory utilization.

Not including commuters, there are about 550 students enrolled at this college presently living off-campus. Most of these reside in the village or the township. Assuming a leveling off of enrollment at this institution, it seems doubtful if there will be a significant increase in the number of its students housed off-campus. The principal need, therefore, for off-campus housing is for University students. However, if we add the number of off-campus students of the Agricultural and Technical College to the projected number of off-campus University students, we see that by 1982 the total number to be provided for is approximately 1,800 students.

Of all of the projected needs uncovered by this study, that of providing off-campus student housing is the greatest and the most pressing. This problem calls for immediate, coordinated planning at both the village and the township levels. The alternatives to such planning are all too clear.

Faculty and support staff growth at the Agricultural and Technical College also appears to be leveling off as a result of the student enrollment pattern.

For example, the additional faculty projections for 1977 is only 13 more than the total for 1972. The increase in number of support staff positions is expected to be about the same number.

Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Housing Committee in regard to suitable land areas within the village limits for single-family residences, multiple-dwelling housing, and student housing. The land areas are arranged by order of priority within each group.

1. Single-family residences

a. Ellis property on Randolph Road, owned by Alfred University. (see also Item No. 2 a. below.)

b. Tullar, Embser, and Cummings property, presently undeveloped, in the Pine Hill area.

c. Mrs. L. S. Greene property on Hillcrest Drive. This should be the last area in the village to be developed, and its development depends on the location of the entrance highway into the village from Route 244 (the Belmont Road).

2. Multiple-dwelling housing

a. Ellis property along Randolph Road, low-density multiple-dwelling or a combination of this type and single-family residences.

b. Stanley Butts and Mrs. Hubert Watkins properties on South Main Street with entrance from High Street.

c. William McMahon property, off Sayles Street Extension. To be incorporated with vacant property, owned by Winfield Randolph.

d. Lester Shershoff property opposite Saxon Heights.

e. Hillcrest Drive between the creek, bordering the property of the Church of the Nazarene, and the property of Mrs. C. R. Myers.

3. Student housing

a. Property owned by Alfred University, extending at the rear of Theta Theta Chi Sorority and John McMahon properties to the road up and around what is termed locally as "fraternity row."

b. Saxon Heights

(This area may be used also for multiple-dwelling.)

The committee further recommends that no housing be planned in the triangle formed by Main Street, West University Street, and Church Street. This area should be reserved for business-commercial development. Recognizing that federal funding for urban development may depend on the provision of multiple-dwelling housing, such as garden-type apartments, the committee recommends that such housing units be planned for other areas in the business-commercial zone.

REPORT OF DATA FROM THE HOUSING SURVEY

A total of 320 dwelling units were surveyed, and oral responses to the questionnaire were obtained from 356 residents.

In the data reported, the term, "No.," refers to the number of residents responding, and the term, "%," refers to the percentage of the total number for each item reported.

<u>Type of resident</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Student	75	21
Retired	66	18
Other	216	61

*Dwelling units or apartments in structure (S-R-0)

One	183	57
Two	77	24
Three	28	9
Four	20	6
Five	6	2
Six	6	2

*Neighborhood #6 was eliminated because of incompatible responses

Age of head of household (S-R-0)

Less than 18 years	16	5
19-29 years	65	22
30-44 years	70	23
45-64 years	96	32
65 years and over	55	18

Number of rooms in dwelling unit, excluding bathrooms, closets, etc. (S-R-0)

1	6	2
2	20	6
3	26	8
4	36	11
5	65	19
6	46	14
7	45	13
8	39	12
More than 8	52	16

Number of bathrooms in dwelling unit (S-R-0)

One	183	55
One and one-half	64	19
Two	55	17
Two and one-half	12	4
Three	15	5
More than three	4	1

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Ownership or rental of dwelling unit (R-0)</u>		
Own	165	49
Rent	172	51
<u>Approximate amount of rent per month (S-R-0)</u>		
Less than \$40	1	1
\$40 to less than \$60	8	5
\$60 to less than \$80	23	13
\$80 to less than \$100	25	14
\$100 to less than \$120	30	17
\$120 to less than \$150	45	25
\$150 to less than \$200	133	19
\$200 to less than \$250	4	2
\$250. or more	5	3
Don't know	3	2
<u>Items included within rent (S-R-0)</u>		
Heat, hot water	17	8
Electricity (Light)	10	5
Gas	14	7
Kitchen appliances	47	22
Furniture	16	8
None of above	59	28
All of above	46	22
<u>Estimate of market value of house (R-0)</u>		
Less than \$5,000	3	2
\$5,000 to less than \$10,000	5	3
\$10,000 to less than \$15,000	8	5
\$15,000 to less than \$20,000	10	6
\$20,000 to less than \$25,000	18	11
\$25,000 to less than \$35,000	51	32
\$35,000 or more	32	20
Don't know	33	21
<u>If residents were to move to another dwelling unit, they would prefer to (R-0)</u>		
Own	139	48
Rent	96	33
Don't know	55	19
<u>Reasons for preferring to own (R-0)</u>		
Gives me security	28	16
Equity	49	29
Privacy	42	25
Use property as wished	51	30
Don't know	1	1

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Type of house preferred (R-0)</u>		
1-story house	59	40
2-story house	44	30
Split level house	14	10
Don't know	31	21

<u>Reasons for preferring to rent (R-0)</u>		
Freedom of movement	25	30
Lack of down payment	13	15
Difficulty of marketing house if moving	1	1
Do not wish obligation of a mortgage	12	14
Do not wish to make own repairs to dwelling	15	18
Do not need larger quarters	3	4
Don't know	2	2
Other	13	15

<u>Years family or individual has lived in the dwelling unit (R-0)</u>		
Less than 1 year	67	21
1 to less than 3 years	72	22
3 to less than 5 years	32	10
5 to less than 10 years	41	13
10 to less than 15 years	24	7
15 years or more	85	26
Don't know	2	1

<u>Years family or individual has lived in the Village of Alfred (R-0)</u>		
Less than 1 year	21	7
1 to less than 3 years	59	18
3 to less than 5 years	54	17
5 to less than 10 years	45	14
10 to less than 15 years	23	7
15 years or more	120	37
Don't know	1	.03

<u>Is this the only dwelling unit this family has ever lived in? (R-0)</u>		
Yes	66	25
No	196	75

<u>Ownership or rental of last residence (R-0)</u>		
Ownership	56	24
Rental	180	76

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Rooms in last residence (excluding bathrooms, closets, etc.) (R-O)</u>		
One	3	1
Two	7	3
Three	13	5
Four	43	18
Five	52	22
Six	29	12
Seven	34	14
Eight	33	14
Nine	26	11
<u>Bathrooms in last residence (R-O)</u>		
One	175	67
One and one-half	43	17
Two	27	10
Two and one-half	9	3
Three	2	1
More than three	4	2
<u>Reasons for locating in neighborhood (R-O)</u>		
Wanted to be near downtown	6	2
Wanted to be in the village	1	.03
Wanted to live in rural area	4	1
Only house we preferred	13	5
House reasonably priced	8	3
Quite neighborhood	7	3
Shopping facilities nearby	1	.03
Close to place of work	40	15
Friends and relatives nearby	3	1
No choice	24	9
Other	164	60
<u>Temporary or long term resident of the village (S-R-O)</u>		
Temporary	77	27
Long term	192	67
Don't know	19	7
<u>Do you feel that your present quarters are temporary or do you feel that you are going to remain in your present quarters for at least the next 3 years? (S-R-O)</u>		
Temporary	99	35
Long term	159	56
Don't know	28	10
<u>Adequacy of present quarters (S-R-O)</u>		
Adequate	271	82
Inadequate	52	16
Don't know	9	3

DEGREES OF SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH
CONDITIONS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD

	<u>Very Satisfied</u>		<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Don't know or No opinion</u>		<u>Dis-Satisfied</u>		<u>Very Dis-Satisfied</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Location of schools (S-R-O)	42	13	167	53	86	27	17	5	2	.06
Quality of schools (S-R-O)	28	9	138	44	107	34	35	11	3	1
Traffic conditions (S-R-O)	17	5	166	52	10	3	80	25	44	14
Street lighting (S-R-O)	51	18	220	76	6	2	12	4	2	1
Shopping facilities (S-R-O)	12	4	159	50	9	3	88	28	52	16
Cleanliness (S-R-O)	38	12	192	61	5	2	56	18	22	7
Quietness (S-R-O)	36	11	202	64	7	2	47	15	26	8
Availability of Parking Space (S-R-O)	27	8	167	51	16	5	70	21	49	15
Trees (S-R-O)	41	13	220	69	5	2	41	13	10	3
Lawns (S-R-O)	47	15	211	67	10	3	30	10	17	5
General condition of Neighborhood (S-R-O)	57	18	201	64	5	2	38	12	12	4
Type of persons living In area (S-R-O)	88	28	189	61	16	5	15	5	4	1
Recreational facilities (S-R-O)	22	7	142	47	51	17	56	18	32	11
Distance from work (S-R-O)	118	42	111	39	48	17	3	1	3	1
Location of church (S-R-O)	63	20	154	50	75	24	13	4	5	2
Adequacy of bus Service (S-R-O)	9	3	34	12	62	21	46	16	144	49

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Would you advise a close friend to move into this village? (S-R-O)</u>		
Yes	173	49
No	112	31
Don't know	71	20
<u>Are you seriously considering moving from this village? (R-O)</u>		
Yes	95	28
<u>Are you actively looking for new quarters at this time? (R-O)</u>		
Yes	68	26
No	195	74
<u>Preference in regard to new quarters (R-O)</u>		
Rent a single-family house	16	16
Rent a section of a two-or-more family house	7	7
Rent an apartment	15	15
Buy a section of a two-or-more family house	1	1
Buy a single family house	27	28
Buy an apartment in common ownership plus others	31	32
<u>Maximum rent willing to pay per month (S-R-O)</u>		
Less than \$40	1	2
\$40 to less than \$60	3	7
\$60 to less than \$80	6	14
\$80 to less than \$100	4	9
\$100 to less than \$120	8	19
\$120 to less than \$150	7	16
\$150 to less than \$200	8	19
\$200 to less than \$250	2	5
Don't know	4	9
<u>Maximum amount to pay if purchasing a house (R-O)</u>		
\$5,000 to less than \$10,000	1	2
\$10,000 to less than \$15,000	1	2
\$15,000 to less than \$20,000	6	14
\$20,000 to less than \$25,000	5	11
\$25,000 to less than \$35,000	15	34
\$35,000 or more	1	2
Don't know	15	34

Maximum monthly payment including principal,
interest, and taxes, if purchasing (R-0)

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Less than \$60	1	2
\$100 to less than \$120	1	2
\$120 to less than \$150	3	8
\$150 to less than \$200	8	20
\$200 to less than \$250	7	18
\$250 or more	8	20
Don't know	12	30

Sources of family income and other receipts
in 1971. (S-R-0)

Wages and salaries	219	46
Interest and dividends	96	20
Rents and royalties	40	8
Pensions and Social Security	75	16
Unemployment Compensation	1	.02
Gifts	2	.04
Public assistance	5	1
Parents	18	4
Loans and Other	18	4

Approximate total gross income and other
receipts for all persons living in household
in 1971. (S-R-0)

Less than \$3,000	28	13
\$3,000 to less than \$5,000	18	8
\$5,000 to less than \$8,000	22	10
\$8,000 to less than \$10,000	27	12
\$10,000 to less than \$15,000	60	27
\$15,000 to less than \$20,000	25	11
\$20,000 to less than \$25,000	8	4
\$25,000 or more	7	3
Don't know	24	11