

# IMPACTED COMMUNITIES STUDY

Sussex County Delaware

Community Development & Housing Department

September 2016



Prepared by GCR, Inc.





BRAD D. WHALEY  
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT & HOUSING  
(302) 855-7777 T  
(302) 854-5397 F  
bwhaley@sussexcountycle.gov



**Sussex County**  
DELAWARE  
sussexcountycle.gov

September 30, 2016

The Sussex County Community Development and Housing Department would like to acknowledge the following people and organizations for their assistance with the completion of this Impacted Community Study.

### **Sussex County Council, Administration, and Staff**

Michael H. Vincent, Council President  
Samuel R. Wilson, Council Vice President  
Joan R. Deaver, Council Member  
George B. Cole, Council Member  
Robert B. Arlett, Council Member  
Todd F. Lawson, Sussex County Administrator  
Gina Jennings, Finance Director/COO  
Brandy Nauman, Housing Coordinator & Fair Housing Compliance Officer  
Dale McDowell, Rehabilitation Specialist II  
Mike Jones, Rehabilitation Specialist II  
Guillermo Montalvo, Rehabilitation Specialist I  
Nicole Riddick, Secretary II  
Hans Medlarz, County Engineer  
Joe Wright, Assistant County Engineer  
John Ashman, Utility Planning Director  
Patti Deptula, Special Projects Director  
Andrea Wall, Accounting Manager (Study RFP Committee Member)  
Megan Nehrbas, GIS Manager (Study RFP Committee Member)  
Joel Marshall, GIS Specialist  
Mark Deao, GIS Specialist  
Nicholas Tucker, GIS Technician  
Buddy Lynch, GIS Asset Specialist  
John Norris, Senior Systems Analyst  
Debbie Morris, Database Administrator  
Henson Destine, Intern  
Alysha Hall, Intern

### **Legal Counsel**

Stephanie Hansen, Young, Conaway, Stargatt & Taylor

J. Everett Moore, Moore & Rutt

Vince Robertson, Griffin & Robertson

### **U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development**

Jane C. W. Vincent, Mid-Atlantic Regional Administrator

Nadab Bynum, Community Planning & Development Director, Region 3

### **Delaware State Housing Authority**

Anas Ben Addi, Director

Marlena Gibson, Director of Policy & Planning (Study RFP Committee Member)

Karen Horton, Principal Planner (Study RFP Committee Member)

Cindy Deakyne, Housing Development Administrator

Andy Lorenz, Management Analyst III

### **First State Community Action Agency**

Bernice Edwards, Executive Director

Bruce Wright, Program Manager

Michelle Johnson, Community Development Specialist

### **Diamond State Community Land Trust**

Ken Smith, Executive Director (Study RFP Committee Member)

### **GCR, Inc.**

Nathan Cataline, Senior Planner

Thomas Haysley, Senior Planner

Jeffrey Goodman, Designer

The County could not have completed this process without the dedicated assistance of the many caring and concerned leaders from the fourteen communities served by this Study. Their help was invaluable to the completion of this report.



COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES WEST COMPLEX  
22215 DUPONT BOULEVARD | PO BOX 589  
GEORGETOWN, DELAWARE 19947

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	3
II. Sussex County Demographic Profile	5
III. Sussex County Community Development & Housing Department Investment	8
IV. Community Infrastructure	15
V. Impacted Communities Summary	22
VI. Survey Response	24
VII. Conclusion	39
VIII. Impacted Community Reports	41
i. Cedar Creek	42
ii. Concord	48
iii. Cool Spring	54
iv. Coverdale	60
v. Diamond Acres	66
vi. Dog Patch	72
vii. Greentop	78
viii. Lucas Development	84
ix. Mount Joy	90
x. New Hope / S. Old State Rd.	96
xi. Pinetown	102
xii. Polly Branch	108
xiii. Possum Point	114
xiv. West Rehoboth	120



# INTRODUCTION

Sussex County is Delaware's largest county by land area, and features diversity of land use from deep agricultural roots, to beach communities and historic small towns. The Sussex County Community Development and Housing Department commissioned this study to understand the geographic, ethnic, and racial differences in Impacted Communities within the County and examine the social, infrastructure and housing needs for those Sussex County residents. While the study focuses on key communities throughout the County, low income communities across Sussex County face similar challenges in terms of access to services, quality housing and infrastructure. The Sussex County Impacted Communities Study creates a baseline of data to better understand the needs of low income communities in Sussex County.

## What Are Impacted Communities?

The Impacted Communities were identified within the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Voluntary Compliance Agreement with Sussex County in 2012. This settlement emerged from a lawsuit regarding the development of an affordable housing project ("New Horizons") within Sussex County in 2008. As a recipient of Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership funds through the Delaware State Housing Authority, Sussex County must ensure compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits discrimination based on race, color or national origin for programs receiving Federal funding, the Fair Housing Act and must demonstrate efforts to identify and address impediments to fair housing choice. This settlement identified ten (10) communities within Sussex County - termed Impacted Communities - where further analysis on housing and infrastructure needs is needed. The County voluntarily included four (4) additional communities as part of this Study to better represent low-income communities across the County. Several of the original communities listed have changed considerably since first identified over 30 years ago.

Evaluation of the Impacted Communities includes an analysis of residents' responses to questions about the prioritization of their individual and community needs, a geographic assessment of each Impacted Community, and an evaluation of the County's past participation of providing funding for owner-occupied housing rehabilitation, trash disposal, roadway crusher run installation, well and septic installation and repair, public water and sewer system hookup, afterschool and community programs, street lighting and construction for accessibility within the Impacted Communities. The Impacted Communities that comprise this Study are:

- Lucas Development
- Pine Town
- New Hope
- West Rehoboth
- Polly Branch
- Dog Patch
- Mount Joy
- Concord
- Possum Point
- Coverdale Crossroads
- Cedar Creek
- Cool Spring
- Diamond Acres
- Green Top

The Impacted Communities Study ("the Study"), will assist the County in its planning activities, including the development of its Comprehensive Plan and in formally approving a process to fund projects geared towards meeting the identified needs of the Impacted Communities as outlined in this Study. However, it was not economically or practically feasible to include all low-income households existing in Sussex County as part of this Study and it should be understood that the County is committed to serving the needs of all of the residents of Sussex County.

## Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

Sussex County is committed to affirmatively furthering fair housing through housing and community development investments throughout the County. Adopted in July 2015, the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Final Rule assists communities with data and tools needed to assess their state of fair housing. The Impacted Communities Study furthers fair housing by providing data about housing conditions in the Impacted Communities. Sussex County conducted community meetings in each Impacted Community, and conducted a first of its kind household survey within Impacted Communities. While Sussex County is not a direct grantee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, it embraces the goal and spirit of the AFFH Final Rule throughout this Study to overcome historic patterns of segregation, promote fair housing choice, and foster inclusive communities.<sup>1</sup>

## Study Objectives

With its roots in the Voluntary Compliance Agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Sussex County Impacted Communities Study is an opportunity to understand the diversity of Sussex County residents, previous County investments in housing and infrastructure, and create a baseline of the needs for households within the 14 Impacted Communities. The Impacted Communities Study provides a geographic assessment of each Impacted Community including household demographics; housing, infrastructure and community needs; and a low and moderate income (LMI) determination for each Impacted Community based upon HUD methodology.

## Methodology and Data Sources

The Sussex County Impacted Communities Study uses a mix of national data sets along with extensive primary data collection from Sussex County, including a review of previous Housing and Community Development investments and survey data collected using HUD approved survey methodology. Quantitative data relies on the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) Five Year Estimates 2010-2014, and U.S. Census Bureau's Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) 2008-2012 5-Year Average Data.

Unless otherwise noted, the data in this section uses the 2000 and 2010 Census, and the 2010-2014 ACS 5-Year Estimates. The ACS 5-Year Estimates are the most reliable and draw from the largest sample size. The purpose of the ACS is to describe social and economic characteristics. For rural Counties like Sussex County, the ACS provides a statistically significant survey of demographics for a changing county.

Sussex County Community Development staff knocked on the doors of 916 households making contact with 679 households and completed 579 surveys within the Sussex County Impacted Communities during 2015 and 2016. This unprecedented data collection effort provides a snapshot of community needs at the household level and can be used as a bench mark for policy decisions at the County and the local level. Data from this survey is aggregated to preserve the privacy of survey participants.

## Survey Methodology


Sussex County utilized the HUD Suggested Survey Methodology to Determine the Percentage of Low and Moderate Income (LMI) Persons in the Service Area of a Community Development Block Grant-Funded Activity. This methodology is encouraged by HUD to determine that at least 51% of residents in a service area of a CDBG funded activity are low or moderate income persons. A copy of the survey and the overall methodology is available on the Sussex County Community Development website.<sup>2</sup>

# SUSSEX COUNTY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Sussex County features a mix of land uses, from historic towns, agricultural communities and coastal communities. Over the past 10 years, the coastal communities have seen some of the fastest growth rates in the State near the Bethany and Rehoboth areas. The western portion of the County features agricultural and rural communities along with historic towns.

Sussex County experienced a building boom during the 2000s, with 43% of the State's building permits issued in Sussex County during this period. The County's proximity to major metropolitan areas such as Baltimore, Philadelphia and Washington D.C., as well as its notable coastal features make Sussex County a regional destination for tourism and vacation homes for all income levels. The area is also a destination for aging baby-boomers, and its economy relies heavily on tourism and supporting industry. Building permits have increased 55% from 2011 to 2015 showing that there is renewed market demand for residential home construction in the County. The graphic below shows the type of housing construction permits issued in Sussex County:

Figure 1: Building Permits in Sussex County by Year



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Building Permit Estimates

The following sections outline key trends for Sussex County's Demographics, Economy, and Housing Market.



## Population<sup>3</sup>

- **Population Growth Slowing** - Sussex County's population grew by 26% percent between 2000 and 2010. Between 2010 and 2014, the County has grown 3%.
- 48% of residents moved into their homes between 2000 and 2009.
- Sussex County has a higher percentage of households over 65 compared to the State of Delaware overall. 23% of people within Sussex County are Over 65 (45,854) compared to 15% statewide (141,082)
- **Language Access** - Sussex County mirrors state trends, with 13% of Delaware residents speaking another language, and 10% of Sussex County speaking another language. Both Delaware and Sussex are estimated to have 7% of their populations who speak Spanish. However, within Sussex County, 53% of those that speak Spanish are estimated to "Speak English less than very well" compared to 31% Statewide.
- **Racial Diversity** - Statewide, 30% of Delaware's residents (277,706) are estimated to be non-white minorities compared to 19% in Sussex County (38,210) in 2014.
- **Ethnic Diversity** - 9% of both Delaware (78,598) and Sussex County (18,385) residents are estimated to be Hispanic or Latino in 2014.
- **Residents with a Disability** - In 2014, 14% of Sussex County (28,974) residents were estimated to have a disability, compared to 12% statewide (109,238).
- **Education** - 15% of Sussex residents over the age of 18 (24,878) have less than a high school diploma, compared to 12% (712,544) of residents statewide in 2014.

## Economy<sup>4</sup>

- **Household Income** - In 2014, Sussex County's median household income was \$53,505, slightly lower than the statewide median of \$60,231. In 2016, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Median Family Income is \$61,800.<sup>5</sup>
- **Unemployment** - Sussex County has 5.1% unemployment, and 42.3% (70,821) of people not in the labor force, compared to statewide unemployment of 5.4% and 36.2% not in the labor force.
- **Low and Moderate Income Households** - Sussex County has more low and moderate income households compared to Delaware overall. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's 2015 Estimates of Low and Moderate Income Individuals, Delaware overall has 28% Low and Moderate Income (LMI) individuals (323,729), while Sussex has 36% (67,759).
- **Poverty in Sussex County** - Poverty levels in Sussex County are slightly higher than the State of Delaware overall. 13% of Sussex County residents (26,583) were estimated to be living in poverty over the past 12 months in 2014, compared to 12% of the state overall (107,101).<sup>6</sup>
- **Living and Working in Sussex County** - 62,325 people are employed in Sussex County, and 75,672 live in Sussex County. 58.5% of residents live and work within Sussex County, and 41.5% live in the county but work outside of the county.<sup>7</sup>

Sussex County's residents are primarily employed in educational services, health care and social assistance; retail trade; manufacturing and entertainment, recreation and accommodation food services. The chart below shows the diversity of employment for Sussex County residents over 16 years old.

Figure 2: Sussex County Employment by Industry

Civilian employed population 16 years and over	Number	Percentage
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	1,848	2%
Construction	7,376	8%
Manufacturing	8,636	10%
Wholesale trade	1,825	2%
Retail trade	12,961	15%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	3,942	5%
Information	1,072	1%
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	4,734	5%
Professional, scientific, management, and administrative and waste management services	7,164	8%
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	19,517	22%
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	8,852	10%
Other services, except public administration	4,874	6%
Public administration	4,980	6%

Source: U.S. Census, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, 2014

## Housing Market<sup>8</sup>

- **Vacant Homes** - Sussex County's estimated vacancy rate is 37% compared to 17% statewide. However, a majority of reported vacancies are vacant for seasonal, recreational or occasional use (80% of total vacant units in the County). Only 9% (4,282 units) of vacant households in Sussex County are estimated as long-term vacant, compared to 16% statewide.
- **Average Home Prices** - The median Home Value for Sussex County is \$231,400 and the median Rent is \$965 per month. Sussex County has 78,361 occupied housing units, 78% are owner-occupied and 22% are renter-occupied.
- **Housing Type** - Sixty-two percent (62%) of homes in Sussex County are single family homes (77,849 units) and 18.5% are mobile homes (23,349 units). Eighty percent (80%) of homes were built between 1970 and 2009.
- **Aging Housing Stock** - Eighteen percent (18%) of homes in Sussex County (22,412) were built before 1970.
- **Housing Problems** - Defined by HUD as having one or more of the following: "incomplete kitchen facilities; incomplete plumbing facilities, more than 1 person per room; and cost burden greater than 30%" In 2012, 34% of households in Sussex County identified having 1 of 4 HUD identified Housing Problems.<sup>9</sup>
- **Severe Housing Problems** - Defined as: "incomplete kitchen facilities; incomplete plumbing facilities; more than 1 person per room; and cost burden greater than 50%." Only 16% of households in Sussex County met the Severe Housing Problem definition.<sup>10</sup>
- **Cost Burden** - In 2012, 32% of Sussex County renters and homeowners paid over 30% of their household income towards housing costs.<sup>11</sup>
- In 2016, the average renter wage for Sussex County was \$10.92 per hour, significantly lower than the housing wage needed to afford a 2-bedroom apartment, \$19.46 per hour. A worker would need to work 94 hours a week to afford a 2-bedroom apartment at fair market rent.<sup>12</sup>

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & HOUSING DEPARTMENT INVESTMENT

Sussex County Community Development & Housing Department's mission is to provide decent, safe, and affordable housing opportunities to people of low and moderate incomes in Sussex County. Since 1990 the Community Development & Housing Department has assisted over 3,450 families with housing needs.

Sussex County is a subgrantee of the Delaware State Housing Authority (DSHA), and must match their administrative allocations with local funds. As a subgrantee, the amount of funds that the Delaware State Housing Authority receives impacts the amount of Sussex County residents that are served. Of all the HUD funding received by DSHA, only Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds are made available to Sussex and Kent Counties. Such funding is made available to Sussex and Kent Counties through a competitive grant process whereby DSHA makes the final award determination. DSHA manages the Emergency Solutions Grant, and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Program, and any public housing or Housing Choice Voucher units within Sussex County.

Figure 3: Delaware State Housing Authority Funding 2012-2016

DSHA HUD Funding	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% Change
Community Development Block Grant	\$1,796,093	\$ 2,005,029	\$ 1,931,385	\$ 1,923,531	\$ 2,063,710	+15%
HOME Investment Partnership	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,017,887	\$ 3,002,167	\$ 3,023,400	+1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,796,093</b>	<b>\$ 5,005,029</b>	<b>\$ 4,949,272</b>	<b>\$ 4,925,698</b>	<b>\$ 5,087,110</b>	<b>6%</b>

Source: Department of Housing and Urban Development

As a subgrantee of DSHA, Sussex County administers federal funds from HUD. The Department also administers U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development (USDA), and local funds from the Sussex County Council. Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership funds are annual allocations that Sussex County must apply for annually from DSHA, and other programs, including a one-time allocation of Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Funds (2009), Neighborhood Stabilization Program I funds (2008), and Neighborhood Stabilization Program II funds (2009) were the result of recovery and stimulus funding made available at the federal level.

- **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG):** A broad, longstanding program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In Sussex County, CDBG investment location data was available between FY 2010 and FY 2015.
- **Community Development Block Grant – Recovery (CDBG-R):** The CDBG-R program provides additional CDBG funding to areas that have been subject to a Presidentially Declared Disaster. CDBG-R funds were administered in Sussex County in FY 2009.
- **County Council Emergency Repair Program:** The Sussex County Council utilizes its own funds to provide emergency housing rehabilitation assistance, particularly to individuals who may not be eligible for other programs. Location data for County Council investments is available from FY 2010 through FY 2015.
- **Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME):** The HOME program provides financial assistance to government agencies to create affordable housing for low-income households. Program activities are wide-ranging, but Sussex County has only utilized HOME funding for housing rehabilitation. HOME investment locations in Sussex County are available for FY 2010 to FY 2015.
- **Housing Preservation Grant (HPG):** Administered by the US Department of Agriculture Rural Development (USDA), the HPG program provides funding to rehabilitate housing for low-income (<50% AMI) households in rural areas. Locations data for HPG investments in Sussex County is available for FY 2010 to FY 2015.
- **Neighborhood Stabilization Program I (NSPI):** Funded by the Housing and Economic Recovery Act (HERA) of 2008, this program provided funding for the redevelopment of abandoned and foreclosed homes. Location data for NSPI is available for FY2009 to FY2015.

- **Neighborhood Stabilization Program 2 (NSP2):** NSP 2 was a second round of the NSP 1 program, funded by the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) of 2009. Location data for NSP2 is available for FY2012 to FY2015.

The following chart shows the total amount of funding by source and by year provided by Sussex County's Community Development & Housing Department. The chart only includes data provided by the County at the time of this analysis and some funding sources, such as Neighborhood Stabilization Program and Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery were only one-time awards.

Figure 4: Sussex County Community Development & Housing Department Funding 2009-2015<sup>13</sup>

Year	CDBG	CDBG-R	County Council	HOME	HPG	NSP 1	NSP 2	Year Total
2009	\$ 900,000	\$ 289,264	\$30,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 1,900,000	\$ -	\$ 3,239,264
2010	\$ 984,000	\$ -	\$30,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 894,480	\$ 2,028,480
2011	\$ 833,000	\$ -	\$60,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,113,000
2012	\$ 797,790	\$ -	\$220,005	\$ 200,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,237,795
2013	\$ 869,460	\$ -	\$250,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,639,460
2014	\$ 904,010	\$ -	\$300,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,724,010
2015	\$ 765,626	\$ -	\$100,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,385,626
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,053,886</b>	<b>\$ 289,264</b>	<b>\$990,005</b>	<b>\$ 2,100,000</b>	<b>\$ 140,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,900,000</b>	<b>\$ 894,480</b>	<b>\$ 12,367,635</b>

Source: Sussex County


Figure 5: Sussex County Demographics by Program

Program	CDBG	HOME	HPG	NSP 1	NSP 2
Date Range - Fiscal Year	2011 - 2015	2011 - 2015	2011 - 2015	2009 - 2015	2012 - 2015
Total Households Assisted	765	142	30	32	11
Total Individuals Assisted	1417	330	60	89	34
% Minority (Including Hispanic)	66%	56%	63%	42%	35%
% Households with a Disability	41%	56%	73%	3%	0%

Source: Sussex County

The following map shows the location of investments made by the Sussex County Department of Community Development and Housing, time ranges depend on the timeframe for each program, but the overall timeframe displayed below is FY2009 to FY2015.

Figure 6: Location of Sussex County Community Development & Housing Investments, 2009-2015



Source: Sussex County




## Department of Housing and Urban Development Low and Moderate Income Methodology

HUD uses Low and Moderate Income Block Groups to determine eligibility and set aside requirements for federal grant programs including Community Development Block Grants. For the CDBG Program, a household is considered low income if their family income is under 80% Area Median Income. HUD publishes Low and Moderate Income Individuals by block group annually to estimate areas with concentrations of LMI individuals. The map below shows the LMI block groups (highlighted in green).

However, the HUD block groups do not fully reflect low and moderate income areas across Sussex County. One of the goals of the Impacted Communities Study is to understand which Impacted Communities qualify as LMI. In order to determine the percentage of LMI residents within each Impacted Area, Sussex County utilized the HUD Suggested Survey Methodology to Determine the Percentage of Low and Moderate Income (LMI) Persons in the Service Area of a Community Development Block Grant-Funded Activity. The Impacted Communities Summary section provides the results of this survey and the LMI percentage of each Impacted Community.

Figure 7: Low and Moderate Income Geography, 2016



Source: Department of Housing and Urban Development, Sussex County


The following chart provides an overview of the number of investments by geography from the map above. There is overlap between the different geographies, for example an Impacted Community like Diamond Acres also falls within an LMI area, so the chart demonstrates the total number of investments found within the community boundary, so duplicates do occur. Impacted Communities have received significant investments.

Figure 8: Amount Invested by Area, 2009-2015<sup>14</sup>

Area	Investments	Amount Invested
Impacted Communities <sup>15</sup>	207	\$ 1,548,534
LMI Areas	180	\$ 1,599,160
Census Designated Places	275	\$ 2,865,911

The following map provides additional insight into the number of awards made in each Impacted Community received between 2009 and 2015.<sup>16</sup>

Figure 9: Number of Investments by Impacted Community



Source: Sussex County (note: does not include Constable Office Investments)

Figure 10: Investments in Impacted Communities 2009-2016<sup>17</sup>

Program	Total Investments	Total Invested	Years	Type of Investments
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	158	\$ 1,260,032	2010 - 2015	Home Repair, Heating Systems, Wells, Accessibility, Demolition, Plumbing Repair
Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery (CDBG-R)	4	\$ 50,872	2009	Home Rehabilitation
Constable Office Investments	8	\$ 22,471	2009 - 2016	Clean-Ups, Trash Collection & Disposal, Demolition
County Council Emergency Repair Funds	26	\$ 50,650	2014 - 2015	Home Repair, Wells, Heating Systems
HOME Investment Partnership	14	\$ 175,927	2010 - 2015	Home Rehabilitation
Housing Preservation Grant (HPG)	4	\$ 11,053	2012 - 2015	Home Rehabilitation, Accessibility
Human Service Grants	37	\$ 27,800	2010 - 2016	After School Programs, Tutoring, Community Services
Non-Profit Grant Program	57	\$ 72,463	2010 - 2016	After School Programs, Trash Collection, Street Lights, Community Programs
<b>Total Invested in Impacted Communities</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>\$1,671,268</b>		

Source: Sussex County

## Program Spotlight: County Grants

### Non-Profit Grant Program

Sussex County Council provides grants to non-profit agencies. These funds assist organizations with resources in support of programs, or capital purchases that benefit Sussex County residents. Each fiscal year, \$175,000 is made available for distribution. Grants are considered throughout the year during County Council meetings.

### Human Service Grant Program

The Human Service Grant program provides grants to county-wide non-profit agencies for the purpose of enhancing health and human services which contribute to a safe, healthy and self-sufficient community. Funds provide grants that assist organizations with resources in support of programs or capital purchases.

Human Service Grants are made available once per year. The Sussex County Council has made \$200,000 available for the Fiscal Year 2017 grant cycle.



## Program Spotlight: County Constable Investment

Each year the Sussex County Constable's Office receives \$10,000 from the Delaware Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Public Health to carry out the Rodent Control Program. The Program is implemented by the Constable's Office by receipt of a complaint or by requests for assistance by community leaders, property owners, and advocacy groups on a first-come, first-served basis. There is no formal application process if the request is for assistance. Rodent control activities are generally supported by neighborhood clean-ups (dumpster rentals, tools/safety equipment, work/release prison labor), pest control services, rodent harborage clean-up/eradication, and the purchase of neighborhood rodent proof trash containers.

The chart below shows the number of investments made by Sussex County Constable from 1998 to 2016 in Impacted Communities. In total, 44 projects were funded for a total of \$76,260. The majority of the funds were used for trash collection, dumpster rentals, waste disposal and demolition.

Figure 11: County Constable Investment, 1998-2016 in Impacted Communities<sup>18</sup>

Impacted Community	Total Amount (1998-2016)	Total Number of Investments
Cool Spring	\$ 4,196	5
Coverdale Crossroads	\$ 22,401	16
Lucas Development	\$ 10,524	3
Mt. Joy	\$ 2,000	1
New Hope/S. Old State Rd.	\$ 15,117	8
Pinetown	\$ 2,837	3
Polly Branch	\$ 1,500	1
West Rehoboth	\$ 17,685	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 76,260</b>	<b>44</b>

Source: Sussex County Community Development and Housing Department

## Program Spotlight: Community Development Block Grants

Community Development Block Grant funds make up the majority of funds received by Sussex County and this section examines how funds have been utilized throughout Sussex County. The following graph shows the difference in the amount requested and received by Sussex County. From 2009 to 2016, Sussex County requested \$19,082,755 and received \$9,514,685. Approximately \$9 million of unfunded requests were on behalf of the municipalities. Federal funding is limited and DSHA provides CDBG and HOME funds to Kent and Sussex County, but with \$12,168,070 requested and not awarded to Sussex County, there are significant unfunded needs across Sussex County.

Together, CDBG and Home funding peaked in 2014, with Sussex County receiving \$ 1,404,010 for demolition, emergency rehabilitation, sewer and water connection hook-ups, infrastructure, marketing and outreach, and home rehabilitation.

Sussex County requests CDBG funding for municipalities within the county, rural communities and scattered-site activities. County funds include scattered site rehabilitation, sewer and water hook-ups, demolition, and outreach and marketing for fair housing activities. The current Delaware CDBG Program Guidelines restrict each application submitted, including the County application, to no more than \$1.1 million. Municipalities are incorporated areas within Sussex County. Rural Communities funds are targeted for unincorporated areas throughout the County including many of the identified Impacted Communities.

Figure 12: Sussex County Funding Requests to DSHA for CDBG Programs<sup>19</sup>

Total Requested	Amount Requested	Amount Funded	Percent Funded
Scattered-Site	\$ 4,110,000	\$ 2,354,425	57%
Municipality	\$ 11,467,755	\$ 2,668,260	23%
Rural Communities	\$ 3,505,000	\$ 1,892,000	54%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 19,082,755</b>	<b>\$ 6,914,685</b>	<b>36%</b>

Source: Sussex County

# COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

Community Infrastructure including water, sewer and community services are critical for creating complete communities. This section provides an overview of existing and planned infrastructure in relation to Sussex County's Impacted Communities. Based on data provided by Sussex County, and primary data collection from the Delaware Department of Transportation, and the Sussex County Comprehensive Plan, this section outlines community infrastructure for Sussex County's Impacted Communities.


## Sewer and Water Service Districts

Within Sussex County, there are several operators of water and sewer services including cities and towns, County-operated districts and private water and sewer districts. For private operators, the State of Delaware regulates non-governmental water and wastewater utilities that have fifty or more customers, issuing Wastewater and Water Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity.

According to the County's 2008 Comprehensive Plan, private companies provide almost all of the water to those parts of Sussex County served by central water systems. The largest of the service areas belongs to Tidewater Utilities. It includes areas west of Rehoboth and along the Route 1 commercial corridor, adjacent areas along Route 24 and Camp Arrowhead Road, areas west of Delmar, the Angola area, and areas along Orchard Road/Route 5. Tidewater Utilities also serve numerous scattered developments.

Figure 13: TUI & TESI Water and Wastewater Service Areas

Source: Tidewater Utilities, Inc.



The second largest private water provider in Sussex County is Artesian Water Company. Their largest service areas are the Route 9 corridor east of Georgetown, South Bethany, the Route 5 corridor south of Route 9, and the Roxana Area east of Selbyville. Other large private water companies include the Broadkill Beach Water Co. (which serves Broadkill Beach and Primehook), Long Neck Water (which serves almost all of Long Neck), Sussex Shores Water (which serves areas north of Bethany Beach), and Slaughter Beach Water Co. (which serves the town of Slaughter Beach). Dewey Beach is the only area in the County served by a water system that is owned and operated by Sussex County.

Private central sewer or water systems provided by Artesian and Tidewater (or any other sewer or water provider) are governed by the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity process (CPCN Process) set forth in Title 26 of the Delaware Code. Private operators cannot unilaterally create a private sewer or water system without a CPCN issued by the Delaware Public Service Commission.

Municipal water systems are provided by Bethany Beach, Blades, Bridgeville, Dagsboro, Delmar, Frankford, Georgetown, Greenwood, Laurel, Lewes, Milford, Millsboro, Milton, Rehoboth, Seaford, and Selbyville. In many cases, these water systems extend outside of the municipality's borders. There are also many scattered private water systems, such as systems serving scattered mobile home parks, campgrounds and industries.

As with many rural areas, many of the Impacted Communities have private septic systems and wells. Other Impacted Communities are within Annexation or Expansion Areas, but have not been connected to the public or private system.

## Sanitary Sewer Districts

Sanitary Sewer Districts provide sewer service for County residents. Access to sewer is a primary concern for Sussex County and Impacted Community residents. According to the County's 2008 Comprehensive Plan, Title 9, Chapters 65 and 67 of the Delaware Code addresses public sewer and water services in Sussex County. Those regulations provide Sussex County with the authority to establish sanitary sewer districts. In many cases, under those provisions, a referendum is held to ask affected property owners whether they wish to be served by County sewage service. Public wastewater planning in Sussex County is overseen by the Sussex County Engineering Department.


Most of Sussex County's cities and towns operate their own sewer systems, including Seaford, Georgetown, Rehoboth, Laurel, Lewes, Millsboro, Bridgeville, Delmar, Greenwood, Milton, and Selbyville. Milford is connected to a system owned by Kent County that has its treatment plant a few miles north of Milford, east of Route 113/1. Private sewer providers are considered a viable option for wastewater treatment in areas where County or municipal services are non-existent or not planned. Artesian Wastewater Management and Tidewater Environmental Services currently mainly provide sewer services for individual developments that are along Route 9 east of Georgetown or along the Routes 5, 24, and 26 corridors in the eastern part of the County. In addition to Artesian and Tidewater, there are other small, private providers of sewer service.

Figure 14: Proximity of Impacted Communities to Sanitary Sewer Districts

Source: Sussex County

Impacted Community	District	Closest Sewer	Water System <sup>21</sup>
Cedar Creek	City of Milford Central Sewer System	1.9 Miles	Private
Concord	Sussex County Unified Sewer District	1.3 Miles	N/A
Cool Spring	Sussex County Unified Sewer District	1.8 Miles	N/A
Coverdale	City of Seaford Sewer System	1.8 Miles	N/A
Diamond Acres	Sussex County Unified Sewer District	.3 Miles	N/A
Dog Patch	Sussex County Unified Sewer District	Adjacent	Adjacent
Green Top	City of Milford Central Sewer System	1.3 Miles	N/A
Mt. Joy	Sussex County Unified Sewer District	2.1 Miles	N/A
Pinetown	Sussex County Unified Sewer District	Within District (Publicly Served)	N/A
Polly Branch	Town of Selbyville Municipal Sewer	Within District (Publicly Served)	Within Town District (Publicly Served)
Possum Point	Town of Millsboro Sewer System	Directly Adjacent	N/A
New Hope / S. Old State Rd.	Sussex County Unified Sewer District	Within District (Publicly Served)	N/A
Lucas Development	Town of Milton Central Sewer System	.2 Miles	N/A
West Rehoboth	Sussex County Unified Sewer District	Within District (Publicly Served)	City of Rehoboth (Publicly Served)

Figure 15: County Wastewater Service Territory



Source: Sussex County

## Planning Areas

Planning Areas were established through Sussex County's 2008 Comprehensive Plan to provide logic and rationale for the County's zoning and future land use plan.<sup>22</sup> The Areas were intended to coordinate with the County's 18 sewer planning areas, but are not considered zoning districts. Planning Areas are divided between Growth Areas and Rural Areas. The distinction between the two areas tries to strike a balance between preserving farmland and the rural landscape and encouraging growth near areas with public sewer and water or near existing municipal boundaries or annexation areas. Also, as of the date of this publication, Sussex County has begun to update its Comprehensive Plan that will likely provide an update on Planning Areas including Growth and Annexation Areas. For more information on the current Comprehensive Plan update, visit <http://sussexplan.com/>.

**Growth Areas:** Municipalities, Town Centers, Developing Areas, Environmentally Sensitive Developing Areas, Mixed Residential Areas, Highway Commercial Areas and Planned Industrial Areas.

**Rural Areas:** Low Density Areas, State Agricultural Preservation Districts, and Protected Lands.

## Growth and Annexation Areas

Growth Areas and Annexation Areas were identified in the Sussex County Comprehensive Plan in 2008, and they indicate expected growth areas around each of the County's 25 municipalities. These expansion areas indicate areas that municipalities intend to annex over time. In some cases Growth and Annexation Areas mean that municipalities will extend their public water and sewage systems, but this is not uniform for all communities.




## Lighting Districts

Chapter 95 of the Sussex County Code provides the legal authority to establish a street lighting district and levy taxes. It also provides the guidelines for the establishment, maintenance and modification of the street lighting district. Communities are eligible to apply if there are at least ten (10) or more dwellings, there is a minimum length of 500 linear feet of roadway, and it is situated in such a way that it is reasonably and economically capable of being improved by the installation, maintenance and operation of streetlights. The community must present an initial request to the Sussex County Engineering Department indicating their desire to form a district. If more than 50% of residents submit petitions in support, the County will move forward with creating a lighting district. Ultimately, votes are cast by the residents, and the determination is made by the simple majority of votes cast. If passed, each property owner is charged an annual fee.

Only two Impacted Communities, Cedar Creek and Pinetown, are located within Lighting Districts. Most recently, in April 2016, Pinetown residents approved the establishment of their lighting district, and the annual fee for property owners is \$66.<sup>23</sup>

The following map shows lighting districts across Sussex County.

Figure 16: Lighting Districts in Sussex County



Source: Sussex County, ESRI


# Road Projects

The Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT) owns and maintains all public roads in Sussex County, but many private roads are owned and maintained by the individual homeowner associations for each community. The following chart identifies the nearest DelDOT project to each Impacted Community, and the following map shows additional details on each project. Impacted Communities are shown in red on the map.

Figure 17: Proximity of DelDOT Projects to Impacted Communities

Impacted Community	Nearest Road Projects	Impacted Community	Nearest Road Projects
Cedar Creek	.5 mile	Mount Joy	1.5 Miles
Concord	Within Community	Pinetown	.5 Miles
Cool Spring	.25 mile	Polly Branch	4.3 Miles
Coverdale Crossroads	1.75 miles	Possum Point	1 Mile
Diamond Acres	.9 miles	New Hope /S. Old State Rd	.6 Miles
Dog Patch	.4 miles	Lucas Development	1.5 Miles
Greentop	Adjacent to Community	West Rehoboth	2 Miles

Figure 18: DelDOT Projects and Impacted Communities



Source: Delaware Department of Transportation

## Sussex Community Improvement Program

The Sussex Community Improvement Program (SCI) was adopted by the Sussex County Council and established as Chapter 96 of the Sussex County Code in 2009. The SCI program provides an opportunity for a residential subdivision with private roads and an established homeowner's association (HOA) to request technical and financial assistance for the construction of new pavement and related improvements.

The SCI Program requires that the HOA present an initial request to the Sussex County Engineering Department indicating their desire to receive assistance. If more than 50% of residents submit petitions in support, the County will move forward with the project improvements and financing. Ultimately, votes are cast by the residents, and the determination is made by the simple majority of votes cast. If passed, each property owner is charged an annual fee based on a 15-year repayment period.

## Community Services and After School Programs

Sussex County is served by an array of nonprofit and government community service and after school programs. From Head Start facilities to community supported activities, numerous Impacted Communities have community services nearby or within the community boundaries.<sup>24</sup> However, as predominantly rural communities, access to services remains a challenge for many Impacted Communities.

Head Start promotes school readiness of children up to age 5 for low income families. Services include early learning, health and family well-being. In Sussex County, there are eight Head Start Facilities. Services includes Early Childhood Education (ECAP), free meals, transportation, education, health and mental health services and disability services.

The following areas are served by additional community service groups:


- Coverdale Crossroads – Served by Coverdale Crossroads Community Council.
- West Rehoboth – Served by West Side New Beginnings.
- Greentop – Served by Family Outreach Multipurpose Community Center.
- Pinetown – Pinetown Community Center previously operated after-school programs, but programming is currently on hold.
- Cool Spring – Served by Telamon Corporation.<sup>25</sup>
- New Hope/S. Old State Road – Served by New Hope Recreation & Development Center.



# IMPACTED COMMUNITIES SUMMARY

This section provides a summary of the survey data for all of Sussex County’s Impacted Communities. The map below shows the location of Impacted Communities across the County.

Figure 19 Location of Impacted Communities in Sussex County



Source: Sussex County, ESRI

## Community Engagement in Impacted Communities

The Sussex County Department of Community Development & Housing hosted public meetings in each of the Impacted Communities. County staff provided an overview of Sussex County’s Community Development & Housing Department, the total amount invested within each community over the past five years, and an overview of the New Horizons lawsuit including an overview of the Voluntary Compliance Agreement between HUD and Sussex County. Staff also distributed copies of the County’s Fair Housing Policy, Impacted Communities Study Explanation, a copy of the Survey Document at each meeting, and advised stakeholders and residents that their concerns would be included in this Study. Meetings were scheduled concurrently with existing community meetings whenever possible to increase resident participation, such as civic association meetings held within or nearby the community, or at local community centers. The following Table summarizes community concerns presented during these meetings.

Figure 20: Summary of Public Meeting Feedback by Impacted Community

Impacted Community	Meeting Date	Community Feedback
Cedar Creek	10/1/2015	Received help in early 90's from State Representative in creating a street lighting district, having issues during snowstorms getting roads plowed, animal control issues, septic systems over capacity due to overcrowding, vacant homes, desire for open space in the community, homes are aging, need home repair funds.
Concord	9/17/2015	Vacant and abandoned houses, animal control, water in area reported to have high iron level - need for public water system, truck traffic is a concern, illegal dumping, and road repair.
Cool Spring	8/4/2014	Animal control issues, requested training on Delaware Landlord Tenant Codes (workshop took place on 9/8/14).
Coverdale	8/31/2015	Trash issues in the community, concerns about area roads and safety, need for affordable housing and home repair funding. Expressed a need to have a stoplight on the intersection of Coverdale Road and Route 404.
Diamond Acres	4/16/2015	Trash issues in the community, drug activity, illegal dumping, landlords not maintaining their properties, rodents and animal control issues, drainage and flooding, dangerous properties, needed demolitions, and speeding issues.
Dog Patch	11/5/2015	Dangerous and abandoned structures, animal control, drug activity, drainage issues, speeding cars and traffic control, need for public water and sewer.
Green Top	5/14/2015	Concern about road conditions including need for paved roads, speeding cars, drainage concerns, and additional funding needed for housing rehabilitation.
Lucas Development	12/17/2014	Traffic concerns and speeding issues, illegal dumping, vacant homes and needed demolitions, squatters in vacant properties, desire to have street lights.
Mt. Joy	7/28/2014	Concerns about traffic and speeding, home repairs, property maintenance, and code enforcement.
Pinetown	7/14/2014	Would like additional investment in Pinetown Community Center for after-school programs and summer camp, GED classes; increase internet access for students; code enforcement and demolition of vacant properties; road improvements needed; additional funds for housing rehabilitation needed.
Polly Branch	8/19/2014	Concerns about trash and illegal dumping, additional home repair funds, drainage issues, and interest in streetlights, sidewalks and speed bumps in the community.
Possum Point	4/23/2015	Concern about Chicken processing plant and potential impacts on wastewater and sewage systems; desire for a public sewer system; concern over water quality and air pollution; vacant and abandoned properties in the area; drainage issues in the area. Since the time of the meeting, County Staff assisted the community to resolve the drainage issues in the area. (Completed 7/14/15)
New Hope / S. Old State Road	6/25/2015	Traffic concerns and need for sidewalks, streetlights and bus stops; need for a community space for children; concern about drug dealing in the area; concern about water quality, living conditions and high rents; trash and illegal dumping is a major concern.
West Rehoboth	7/22/2014	Concern about trash and illegal dumping, funds needed for home demolitions, crime, and desire for subsidized sewer bills.

# SURVEY RESPONSE

Sussex County staff knocked on the doors of 916 households making contact with 679 households in 2015-2016. For each of the Impacted Communities, the County set an internal goal to obtain a response rate of 80%. However, despite extensive outreach efforts which encompassed hosting public meetings in each community, telephone surveying, and door-to-door surveying over the course of nearly two years, a more realistic goal of reaching 70% of the residents was realized in all communities except Concord and Coverdale Crossroads. Staff visited each community a minimum of three times to conduct door-to-door surveying, leaving information and following up by telephone as needed.

The responses gathered present a credible picture of the needs of the residents in the Impacted Communities. Moving forward, Sussex County is committed to understanding the needs of its residents, and will work to build relationships with resident groups, nonprofit organizations and other community institutions to ensure continued engagement within each of the Impacted Communities.

In Figure 21 below, Total Households include all residential structures in Impacted Communities, and this number includes both active responses where the resident agreed to be surveyed or refused to be surveyed, as well as households where no one was home when visited by County staff. It does not include vacant lots. Total Households Contacted represent only the number of households in which there was an active response (agreed to be surveyed or refused).

Figure 21: Households Contacted by Impacted Community

Impacted Community	Total Households	Total Households Contacted	Percent of Households Contacted
Cedar Creek	93	75	81%
Concord	57	28	49%
Cool Spring	100	79	79%
Coverdale Crossroads	172	107	62%
Diamond Acres	59	51	86%
Dog Patch	18	14	78%
Greentop	56	45	80%
Mount Joy	56	43	77%
Pinetown	21	21	100%
Polly Branch	55	43	78%
Possum Point	98	73	74%
New Hope /S. Old State Rd	78	59	76%
Lucas Development	7	5	71%
West Rehoboth	46	36	78%
All Communities	916	679	74%

## Completed Surveys

Of the Total Households Contacted (679), 578 completed (63%) the Impacted Communities household surveys. The table below outlines the number and percentage completed by Impacted Community, response rates ranged from 39% (Concord) to 90% (Pinetown). There are a total of 1,714 Total Residents within the 578 surveyed households.

Figure 22: Completed Surveys by Impacted Community

Impacted Community	Total Households	Completed Surveys	Total Residents in Surveyed Households	Percent of Households Who Completed Surveys
Cedar Creek	93	62	245	67%
Concord	57	22	53	39%
Cool Spring	100	65	168	65%
Coverdale Crossroads	172	98	278	57%
Diamond Acres	59	48	155	81%
Dog Patch	18	11	34	61%
Greentop	56	33	93	59%
Mount Joy	56	36	86	64%
Pinetown	21	19	41	90%
Polly Branch	55	37	115	67%
Possum Point	98	66	182	67%
New Hope /S. Old State Rd	78	50	181	64%
Lucas Development	7	5	19	71%
West Rehoboth	46	26	64	57%
All Communities	916	578	1,714	63%

## Low and Moderate Income (LMI) Population

A primary goal of the Impacted Communities Study was to document the number and percentage of LMI persons in each Impacted Community. Figure 23 outlines HUD's 2016 Income Limits for Households Under 80% Area Median Income (AMI) for Sussex County, Delaware by the number of people in each family. Using data collected through the CDBG Methodology Survey, determined that 86% of households who reported their household income and number of people in their family in Impacted Communities meet HUD's LMI definition.

Figure 23: Area Median Income Limits for Sussex County, DE in 2016

People in Family	AMI Limits 2016
1	\$ 34,650.00
2	\$ 39,600.00
3	\$ 44,550.00
4	\$ 49,450.00
5	\$ 53,450.00
6	\$ 57,400.00
7	\$ 61,350.00
8	\$ 65,300.00
9	\$ 69,230.00
10	\$ 73,186.00

Source: Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2016

The following chart shows the total number of properties surveyed, households who reported their household income, a summary calculation of households that met the LMI threshold (household income and number of people in the family), and finally an LMI percentage by Impacted Community. The Impacted Communities range from 74% to 100% LMI. For any future infrastructure projects funded by HUD, Sussex County staff would re-survey the community to update and verify LMI data.

Figure 24 Low and Moderate Income Households by Impacted Community


Impacted Community	Total Households	Total Number of Families Who Provided Household Income	Total Number of People in Households Who Reported Income	Number of LMI Residents	Percent LMI
Cedar Creek	93	43	171	133	78%
Concord	57	20	50	43	86%
Cool Spring	100	60	155	115	74%
Coverdale Crossroads	172	87	244	211	86%
Diamond Acres	59	37	130	120	92%
Dog Patch	18	11	34	32	94%
Greentop	56	31	91	72	79%
Lucas Development	7	3	11	11	100%
Mount Joy	56	29	70	59	84%
New Hope / S. Old State Rd	78	38	129	128	99%
Pinetown	21	16	32	26	81%
Polly Branch	55	35	104	89	86%
Possum Point	98	53	155	133	86%
West Rehoboth	46	20	48	46	96%
All Communities	916	483	1424	1218	86%



## Current Land Use

Forty-seven percent (47%) of surveyed properties (574) in Impacted Communities are Inhabited Structures, 33% (406) are Lot Only. Vacancy is an issue in Impacted Communities, with 10.5% (128) Vacant Homes, 3.3% (40) Abandoned Structures, and 1.6% (19) Seasonal Vacancy. Seasonal vacancy is substantially lower in Impacted Communities compared to Sussex County overall.

Figure 25: Current Land Use by Impacted Community



## Tenure

Seventy-three percent (73%) of responding Impacted Communities households (423) are owner occupied, and 23% (135) are renter occupied. New Hope / S. Old State Road has the highest percentage of rental households, while all of Lucas Development's responding households are property owners.

Figure 26: Tenure for Impacted Communities





Figure 27: Percent Tenure by Impacted Community



## Multiple Owners

A majority (87%) of the 578 households who responded to the Impacted Communities survey reported that their property is owned by a single owner, and 13% of the households have multiple owners. Cedar Creek, Diamond Acres and Lucas Development did not report any properties with multiple owners. Many of these properties with multiple owners are inherited family properties with family owners, presenting challenges for clear property title.




Figure 28: Number of Properties with Multiple Owners by Impacted Community

## Type of Home

Single Family homes are common in Impacted Communities, including a high percentage of single-wide and double-wide mobile homes. 55% (316) of surveyed households in Impacted Communities households are 1 story, 5% (28) are 2 story homes. 12% (71) of the homes are double-wide homes, and 28% (163) are single-wide homes.

Figure 29: Type of Home for All Impacted Communities





Figure 30: Number of Mobile Homes by Impacted Community






# Age of Home

Seventy-six percent (76%) of the households within the Impacted Communities are between 10 and 50 years old. The largest categories are between 21 and 30 years and 41 to 50 years old.

Figure 31: Age of Homes within Impacted Communities



## Land Ownership

Seventy-three percent (73%) of respondents own their home and the land. Twenty-one percent (21%) rent their home and land, Four percent (4%) rent the land and own their home. Dog Patch, Mount Joy, Possum Point and New Hope / S. Old State Rd. have the highest rate of homeowners that rent the land and own the home.

Figure 32: Land Ownership for All Impacted Communities





Figure 33: Percent Land Ownership by Impacted Community



# Property Condition

County staff conducted windshield surveys for each surveyed property, assessing the exterior of the structure.<sup>26</sup> Properties were assessed by County staff using “windshield surveys”. County staff assessed each structure using a very cursory and exterior-only assessment, with minimal input from residents. Staff classified properties into four categories: good condition, needs minor repairs, needs major repairs, and uninhabitable. Minor repairs imply that the home needs only general maintenance, with nothing of significant concern. Major repairs indicate that the home may be in need of a new roof, new siding, new windows, and perhaps has structural damage. A home was deemed uninhabitable if the structure sustained significant structural damage, severe roof issues, and appeared to be unsafe. Thirty-one percent (31%) of structures are in good condition, thirty-two percent (32%) are in need of minor repairs, thirty-seven percent (37%) need major repairs, and only one respondent reported that their home is uninhabitable. With 68% of homes in the Impacted Communities built over 20 years ago and such a temperate climate, home repair needs will continue to grow.

Figure 34: Condition of Homes in All Impacted Communities (Percentage)





Figure 35: Property Condition by Impacted Community (Percentage)



## Resident Needs

Responding residents reported that Home Repair is their top priority, followed by Water Quality Testing and Well/Septic Installation or Repair. Residents ranked their needs on a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating the highest priority and 10 meaning the least important priority. Darker blue indicates a higher priority.

Figure 36: Average Resident Need Score for All Impacted Communities

Resident Need	Priority
<b>Home Repair</b>	1.5
Water Quality Testing	2.5
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.7
Home Accessibility	3.5
Trash Collection/Disposal	3.5

## Community Service Needs

Impacted Community residents identified After-School Programming as their top priority, followed by Animal Control Services. Financial Literacy and Code Enforcement ranked slightly below, but remain an overall priority.

Figure 37: Average Community Services Score for All Impacted Communities

Community Services	Priority
<b>After-School Programs</b>	1.6
Animal Control Services	2.2
Financial Literacy Education	2.5
Light Code Enforcement	2.7

## Community Infrastructure Needs

Responding residents identified Street Lights as the most pressing issue across Impacted Communities. Street/Road Improvements, Sidewalks, Public Water Systems, Demolition, and Drainage Improvements follow as other high priorities. Community Center Repairs, Community Center Accessibility and Public Transportation are the lowest priorities across the Impacted Communities. Darker blue indicates a higher community priority.


Figure 38: Average Community Infrastructure Score for All Impacted Communities

Community Infrastructure Needs	Priority
<b>Street Lights</b>	2.2
Street/Road Improvement	3.4
Sidewalks	3.5
Public Water/Sewer System	3.7
Demolition of Structures	3.8
Drainage Improvements	3.9
Public Transportation	4.9
Community Center Repairs	5.6
Community Center Accessibility	6.5

# Number of People in Household

The average household size for Impacted Communities is 2.96. Nine (9) of the communities were under the average and 5 are over the average. Cedar Creek has the highest average household size (3.98) and Lucas Development has the lowest average household size (1.75). The average household size in Sussex County is 2.56, and statewide is 2.63.

Figure 39: Average Number of Household Residents by Impacted Community






## Average Gross Annual Income

The average gross income for the Impacted Communities is \$25,582 per household. The lowest average income is Lucas Development (\$9,843) and the highest is Cedar Creek (\$36,154). Six communities are above the average and eight are below. By comparison Sussex County's median household income was \$53,505, and statewide is \$60,231.


Figure 40: Average Gross Annual Income by Impacted Community



## Count of People Under 18

Of the 481 residents under 18, Cedar Creek has the highest percentage of youth with 18% (85), and Lucas Development has the fewest (5) young residents.


Figure 41: Percent of Residents Under 18 by Impacted Community



## Count of Disabled Persons

There are 239 people who self-identified as living with a disability within the Impacted Community areas. Coverdale Crossroads has the highest concentration with 21% (51) of the total disabled population. Dog Patch has the lowest concentration at 0.4% (1).


Figure 42: Number of Residents with a Disability by Impacted Community



## Female Headed Households

A majority (53%) of Impacted Community respondents are from female-headed households. West Rehoboth has the highest number of female headed households (73% of households), while Dog Patch and Concord have the lowest percentage of female headed households (36% of households).


Figure 43 Percent of Female Headed Households by Impacted Community



## Gender

Overall, the Impacted Communities have more male (56%) than female (42%) residents.

Figure 44: Gender of Residents in All Impacted Communities



## Race

Sixty-five (65%) of Impacted Community Residents identified as Black or African American, with twenty-three (23%) identifying as White and five percent (5%) as Multi-Racial or Other. This calculation is derived from the Impacted Community Survey that asked respondents to identify the race of each person in the household.

Figure 45: Racial Composition for All Impacted Communities





Figure 46: Percentage of African American Residents by Impacted Community






# Ethnicity

Nine percent (9%) of Impacted Community residents identify as Hispanic. Of the 1,714 residents in Impacted Communities, 157 identified as Hispanic. Forty-seven (47%) of Dog Patch residents identified as Hispanic, the highest concentration of all of the Impacted Communities.

Figure 47: Percent Hispanic Residents by Impacted Community



# CONCLUSION

Sussex County's Community Development & Housing Department initiated the Impacted Communities Study in late 2014 with public meetings and completed the survey portion of the Impacted Communities Study in the spring of 2016. While the Voluntary Compliance Agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development initiated the Impacted Communities Study, the Survey and Study will provide the County with a wealth of data to inform the creation of a fair and reasonable investment strategy across Sussex County, including the 14 Impacted Communities.

Sussex County staff knocked on the doors of 916 households making contact with 679 households in Sussex County's 14 Impacted Communities through door-to-door surveys, telephone surveys, and holding public meetings in each Impacted Community. This intimate knowledge of Impacted Communities and expansive community engagement will enable the County to create a data-driven strategy to meet Impacted Community resident needs.

The Study provides an extensive review of previous investments made in Impacted Communities using Federal, State and Local funding, showing the importance of Department of Housing and Urban Development funds in the Impacted Communities. In addition, with 578 completed surveys, using the Department of Housing and Urban Development's *Suggested Survey Methodology to Determine the Percentage of Low and Moderate Income Persons in the Service Area of Community Development Block grant Funded Activities*, Sussex County can verify that 86% of survey respondents within the Impacted Communities are considered Low and Moderate Income households.

The survey provides unprecedented data and insight into the demographics, land use, and housing stock, of the Impacted Communities. Despite significant investment within the Impacted Communities, real challenges remain. Many Impacted Communities express the need for additional Community Services (After-School Programs and Animal Control Services), Community Infrastructure (Street Lights, Street and Road Improvements, and Sidewalks), and Resident Needs (Home Repair, Water Quality Testing and Well/Septic Installation and repair).

As a recipient of federal funds, Sussex County is committed to complying with the law and spirit of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Choice and the Impacted Communities Study is a step towards creating a more responsive and comprehensive investment strategy for Sussex County. The following section provides additional detail on the demographics, needs and previous investments for each individual Impacted Community.

# NOTES

1. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Final Rule, [https://www.huduser.gov/portal/affht\\_pt.html#final-rule](https://www.huduser.gov/portal/affht_pt.html#final-rule), Accessed August 2016.
2. Sussex County Community Development & Housing Website: <https://www.sussexcountyde.gov/community-development-housing>.
3. U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates.
4. U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates.
5. Section 8 Income Limits, Department of Housing and Urban Development <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/il/il16/FY16-IL-de.pdf>.
6. Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months, 2010-2014 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates.
7. U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, 2014.
8. U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates.
9. Department of Housing and Urban Development Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) 2008-2012 estimates.
10. Department of Housing and Urban Development Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) 2008-2012 estimates.
11. Department of Housing and Urban Development Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) 2008-2012 estimates. "Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters, housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners, housing cost is "select monthly owner costs", which includes mortgage payment, utilities, association fees, insurance, and real estate taxes."
12. Delaware Housing Coalition, "Who Can Afford to Live in Delaware?" <http://housingforall.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/WhoCanAfford2016.pdf>, Accessed August 2016.
13. Initial award allocations, based on the Federal Fiscal Year.
14. This only includes properties provided at the address level, so the number differs slightly from Figure 4.
15. Includes CDBG, CDBG, County Council Emergency Repair Funds, HOME, and HPG address level data provided by Sussex County, not all program investments were able to be geo-coded.
16. Methodology: Geocoded using ArcGIS all address level data provided by Sussex County for CDBG, CDBG-R, County Council, HOME, HPG, NSP 1 and 2 and conducted a spatial analysis of which properties were located within Impacted Community boundaries.
17. Numbers include funds spent within the boundaries of the Impacted Communities between FY2009-FY2015.
18. Based on information available at the time of this report.
19. Does not include HOME funds, which totaled \$2,600,000 from FY 2009 – FY 2016.
20. Only Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) areas for TESI and TUI were available for inclusion into this Study.
21. If a community is not directly connected to a water system it is indicated by "N/A," and is likely to have well/septic connections on the property, but not confirmed.
22. Sussex County 2008 Comprehensive Plan [http://www.sussexcountyde.gov/sites/default/files/PDFs/CompPlan\\_FullDocument.pdf](http://www.sussexcountyde.gov/sites/default/files/PDFs/CompPlan_FullDocument.pdf), Accessed August 2016.
23. Cape Gazette, Pinetown residents to vote on street-lighting district, April 20, 2016. <http://www.capegazette.com/node/102104>, Accessed August 2016.
24. Delaware Health and Social Services Division of State Service Centers, Directory of Human Services for Delaware 2015, [http://dhss.delaware.gov/dhss/dssc/files/2015\\_hsdirectory.pdf](http://dhss.delaware.gov/dhss/dssc/files/2015_hsdirectory.pdf), Accessed August 2016.
25. Telamon Corporation, <http://www.telamon.org/delaware-head-start.aspx>, Accessed August 2016.
26. Delaware State Housing Authority Delaware Community Development Block Grant Program Guidelines for FY2016, [http://destatehousing.com/Landlords/landlordmedia/cdbg\\_fy2016\\_proguide.pdf](http://destatehousing.com/Landlords/landlordmedia/cdbg_fy2016_proguide.pdf), Accessed September 2016 (Section 2. (c)- page 4.)

# IMPACTED COMMUNITY REPORTS

# Cedar Creek

Located in the rural northeast section of Sussex County, Cedar Creek is a fairly large development of 92% one story single family homes. The community was developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to provide affordable housing in the early 1980's. Cedar Creek features 93 households, 62 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and these households have 245 residents. The area falls into County Council District 3, and is within Census Tract 501.05.


Sussex County held a public meeting in Cedar Creek on November 1, 2015 at Slaughter Neck Community Action Center where residents identified the following community needs and concerns:

- Expressed concern about clearing roads during and after snowstorms.
- Concern about animal control issues.
- Need to address over capacity septic systems due to overcrowding.
- Concern about the number of vacant homes.
- Interested in seeing additional open space in the community.
- Need for additional home repair funds because homes are aging.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of Cedar Creek's 93 households, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 75 households, and completed 62 surveys. Despite the direct mailing invite to the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in Cedar Creek was 67%.

Figure 1: Vicinity Map




Sussex County Impacted Communities - Cedar Creek

## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

The rate of vacant houses in Cedar Creek is similar to that of the other Impacted Communities; however, there are substantially fewer vacant lots. Ten percent of houses in Cedar Creek are vacant, while only one percent of lots have not been developed.


Figure 2: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Cedar Creek has relatively high homeownership rates, and all properties are fee-simple ownership. Eighty percent (80%) of residents are homeowners.

Figure 3: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






CONDITION

Three quarters of the homes in Cedar Creek are in good condition, or require minor repairs. This indicates a higher overall condition of homes than in the Impacted Communities as a whole, in which 63 percent of houses are in good condition or require minor repairs.

Figure 4: Property Condition



HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>27</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>28</sup> Cedar Creek households received 4 investments of housing assistance for a total of \$48,863. These include:

Figure 5: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
Cedar Creek	\$48,863	4
CDBG-R	\$13,266	1
Housing Rehabilitation	\$13,266	1
County Council Emergency Repair	\$4,650	1
New Heating System	\$4,650	1
HOME	\$30,947	2
Housing Rehabilitation	\$16,660	1
Roof Repair	\$14,287	1

FOOTNOTES

27. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

28. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS


### HOUSEHOLDS

Households in Cedar Creek tend to be larger than in the other Impacted Communities. The average household size is 3.98 people, compared to 2.96 overall. Of the area's residents, 18 percent are children under the age of 18 and 10 percent have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average gross annual income in Cedar Creek is \$36,154, higher than the Impacted Community average of \$25,582 but significantly below the Sussex County median income of \$53,505. Of the 62 survey responses, 69% provided their household income.

Of the households that provided income information, 78 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.



## Demographics

### GENDER

Cedar Creek's residents are 63% male and 36% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Cedar Creek has a lower percentage of female headed households at 45%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Cedar Creek is one of two Impacted Communities in which the majority of residents are white. In Cedar Creek, 57 percent of residents are white, 28 percent are African American, and 16 percent are another race or did not disclose their race. On average, Impacted Community residents are 23 percent white, 65 percent African American, and 11 percent another race or did not disclose their race. There are also fewer Hispanic residents in Cedar Creek, where 74 percent of residents are non-Hispanic as compared to 59 percent overall.

Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Cedar Creek
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	1%
Black or African American	65.40%	28%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	8%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	7%
White	23.10%	57%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	13%
Non-Hispanic	59%	74%
Not Disclosed	32%	13%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Survey respondents identified after school programs and animal control services as their top community service priorities.

Figure 8: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	<b>1.8</b>
<b>Animal Control Services</b>	<b>2.0</b>
<b>Financial Literacy Education</b>	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Light Code Enforcement</b>	<b>3.2</b>

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Survey respondents identified Home Repair as the highest priority for needed services, followed by Water Quality Testing and Well/Septic Installation or Repair.

Figure 9: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	<b>1.9</b>
<b>Water Quality Testing</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<b>Well/Septic Installation or Repair</b>	<b>2.6</b>
<b>Home Accessibility</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Trash Collection/Disposal</b>	<b>4.3</b>

## Infrastructure

Cedar Creek lies within a Secondary County Service Area, previously known as the North Coastal Planning Area. The Secondary Service Area represents an area of the County where growth is expected and special environmental needs may exist, but service is not expected within the next 5 years.

Currently, a private water system services the entire community and each property has an onsite septic system. The Cedar Creek community is 1.9 miles from the nearest available central sewer system, which is provided by the City of Milford.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Cedar Creek:

- Pine Haven Road Pavement Rehabilitation
- Scheduled Construction: 2016
- Distance: Approximately 0.5 Mile
- Cost: Not reported

## STREET LIGHTING

Cedar Creek is located within a County Street Lighting District. The District was formed in 1994 and has 20 street lights. Residents pay an annual assessment on their property tax bill.

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Among survey respondents, the Street Lights were noted as the most important infrastructure need, followed by Public Water/Sewer System and Sidewalks.

Figure 10: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Street Lights</b>	2.5
Public Water/Sewer System	3.5
Sidewalks	3.7
Demolition of Structures	4.0
Public Transportation	4.2
Street/Road Improvement	4.2
Drainage Improvements	4.3
Community Center Accessibility	5.5
Community Center Repairs	6.7

# Concord

The community of Concord is located just east of Seaford. This is a very old community, with a rich history tied to the Nanticoke River. The housing in this area is a mixture of older homes and newer in-fill houses, with 68% one story homes and 23% two story single family homes. Concord features 57 households, 22 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 53 residents. Concord is within County Council District I, and Census Tracts 504.08 and 504.07.


Sussex County held a public meeting in Concord on September 17, 2015 at Concord United Methodist Church where residents identified the following issues:

- Community members expressed concern about the number and condition of vacant and abandoned houses, and illegal dumping occurring in the area.
- There is a need for additional animal control services.
- Residents noted that water in the area is reported to have high iron levels and that there is a need for access to a public water system for the area.
- Traffic in the area is a major concern due to the number of trucks in the area and overall road conditions.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of Concord's 57 households, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 28 households, and completed 22 surveys. Despite the direct mailing invite to the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in Concord was only 39%.

Figure 11: Vicinity Map




Sussex County Impacted Communities - Concord

## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

The majority of parcels in Concord are used for residential purposes or are vacant lots.


Figure 12: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Homeownership rates in Concord are similar to other Impacted Communities, with 73 percent of homes owned by the residents and 23 percent rented.

Figure 13: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






CONDITION

Structural condition of homes in Concord tends to be polarized. While 41 percent of homes are in good condition, 45 percent are in need of major repairs.

Figure 14: Property Condition



HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>29</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>30</sup> two households in Concord received housing assistance for a total of \$3,744 for repair and replacement of plumbing.

Figure 15: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
Concord	\$3,744	2
County Council Emergency Repair	\$3,744	2
Repair/Replace Pipes	\$3,744	2

FOOTNOTES

29. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

30. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS


### HOUSEHOLDS

Of the 22 households surveyed in Concord, the average household size was 2.41 people. Just 1 percent of Concord residents are under the age of 18. Similarly, 2 percent of residents have a disability, compared to 14 percent of Impacted Community residents overall.

### INCOME

Average annual income in Concord is \$27,195, slightly above the Impacted Community average of \$25,582 but significantly lower than the Sussex County median annual income of \$53,505. Of the 22 survey responses 91% provided their household income.

Of the households that provided income information, 86 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.



## Demographics

### GENDER

Concord's residents are 66% male and 32% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Concord has a lower percentage of female headed households, 36%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

The racial makeup of Concord is very similar to that of other Impacted Communities, with African-Americans comprising two-thirds of the population. The proportion of Hispanic residents is slightly lower, at four percent compared to nine percent in the Impacted Communities overall.

Figure 17: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Concord
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	4%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	66%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	6%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	2%
White	23.10%	23%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	4%
Non-Hispanic	59%	60%
Not Disclosed	32%	36%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Concord residents identified after school programs as their top community service need.

Figure 18: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	1.0
Financial Literacy Education	1.5
Light Code Enforcement	1.7
Animal Control Services	2.0

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Residents of Concord rank Home Repair and Water Quality testing as their highest priority needs.

Figure 19: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	1.1
Water Quality Testing	1.7
Home Accessibility	2.0
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.3
Trash Collection/Disposal	2.3

## Infrastructure

Concord lies within a Secondary County Service Area, an area previously known as the Blades Project Area. The Secondary Service Area represents an area of the County where growth is expected and special environmental needs may exist, but service is not expected within the next 5 years.

Currently, properties in Concord have individual wells and onsite septic systems. The Concord community is 1.3 miles from the nearest available central sewer system, which is provided by Sussex County. Concord is not currently within a water system boundary or served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Concord:

- Nearest Road Project: Church Road Pavement Rehabilitation
- Scheduled Construction: 2016
- Distance: Within Community
- Cost: Not reported

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Concord residents rank a Public Water/Sewer System as their highest priority infrastructure need. This is followed closely by Sidewalks and Street Lights.

Figure 20: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Public Water/Sewer System</b>	1.0
Sidewalks	1.3
Street Lights	1.5
Street/Road Improvement	1.8
Public Transportation	2.3
Demolition of Structures	2.3
Drainage Improvements	3.0
Community Center Accessibility	N/A
Community Center Repairs	N/A

# Cool Spring


The Cool Spring community is located just off Route 9 between Georgetown and Lewes. The area originated as a small rural housing community and later, as an affordable area for working families. Most homes in Cool Spring are mobile homes, with 63% single wide and 22% double wide trailers. Cool Spring features 100 households, 65 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 168 residents. Cool Spring is within County Council District 3, Census Tract 508.02.

Sussex County held a public meeting in Cool Spring on August 4, 2014 at the Cool Spring Telamon/Head Start Center where residents expressed the following about community needs:

- Expressed concerns about the need for additional animal control due to the large number of dogs in the community that are not properly contained or leashed.
- Requested training on the Delaware Landlord Tenant Code because of the high rate of rental properties in the community. The training on the Code was subsequently held on September 8, 2014.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of Cool Spring's 100 households, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 79 households, and completed 65 surveys. Despite the strong turnout to the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in Cool Spring was 65%.




## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

Compared to the Impacted Communities overall, there are relatively more inhabited structures and fewer vacant lots in Cool Spring. However, there are also a higher number of vacant houses.


Figure 22: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Homeownership rates in Cool Spring are slightly lower than in other Impacted Communities, and there are more people who own a mobile home but rent the land on which they reside.

Figure 23: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






## CONDITION

Homes in Cool Spring are in somewhat poorer condition than in other Impacted Communities. Just 26 percent are in good condition, while 41 percent are in need of major repairs.

Figure 24: Property Condition



## HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>31</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>32</sup> Cool Spring households received 32 investments of housing assistance and 7 community investments for a total of \$297,047. These include:

Figure 25: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
Cool Spring	\$297,047	39
CDBG	\$262,212	26
Plumbing Repair	\$4,400	3
New Water Pump	\$1,812	1
Housing Rehabilitation	\$256,000	22
CDBG-R	\$17,530	1
Housing Rehabilitation	\$17,530	1
County Council Emergency Repair	\$3,429	4
Heater Repair/Replacement	\$479	2
Housing Rehabilitation	\$2,150	1
Plumbing Repair	\$800	1
HOME	\$8,480	1
Housing Rehabilitation	\$8,480	1
County Constable	\$4,196	5
Non-Profit Grant Program	\$1,200	2
Community Outreach/Event	\$1,200	2

## FOOTNOTES

31 Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

32. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS


### HOUSEHOLDS

Of the 100 households in Cool Spring, the average household size is 2.58 people. There are fewer children and disabled persons in Cool Spring than in the Impacted Communities as a whole, with 9 percent of the population under the age of 18 and 9 percent of the population having some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average household income of respondents answering questions about income was just \$24,956. This is two percent lower than the Impacted Community average of \$25,582 and 53 percent lower than the Sussex County median of \$53,505. Of the 65 survey respondents, 92% responded to questions about income.

Despite lower average household incomes there are fewer low and moderate income households in Cool Spring than the Impacted Communities as a whole. In Cool Spring 74 percent of households earn under 80 percent of the Area Median Income, as compared to 86 percent of all Impacted Community households.



## Demographics

### GENDER

Cool Spring residents are 43% male and 56% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Cool Spring has a higher percentage of female headed households at 65%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

The racial composition of Cool Spring is very similar to that of other Impacted Communities. Two-thirds of the population is African-American while 21 percent is white.

Figure 27: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Cool Spring
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	1%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	66%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	1%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	4%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	7%
White	23.10%	21%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	7%
Non-Hispanic	59%	45%
Not Disclosed	32%	48%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Cool Spring residents identified after school programs as their top community service priority, followed by the desire for additional financial literacy opportunities.

Figure 28: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	<b>1.4</b>
Financial Literacy Education	1.9
Light Code Enforcement	2.6
Animal Control Services	2.6

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Home repair ranked as the most significant need among surveyed households, followed by well/septic installation or repair.

Figure 29: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.3
Water Quality Testing	2.9
Trash Collection/Disposal	3.2
Home Accessibility	3.5

## Infrastructure

Cool Spring lies within a Secondary County Service Area, an area previously known as the North Coastal Planning Area. The Secondary Service Area represents an area of the County where growth is expected and special environmental needs may exist, but service is not expected within the next 5 years.

Currently, properties in Cool Spring have individual wells and onsite septic systems. The Cool Spring community is 1.8 miles from the nearest available central sewer system, which is provided by Sussex County. Cool Spring is not currently within a water system boundary or served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Cool Spring:

- Nearest Road Project: State Route 9 and Hudson Road Intersection Improvement
- Scheduled Construction: Complete, 2015
- Distance: 0.25 Mile
- Cost: Approximately \$1.3 Million

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Cool Spring respondents identified Street Lighting as their first priority for infrastructure improvements, followed in priority by Street/Road, Sidewalk and Drainage Improvements.

Figure 30: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Street Lights</b>	2.1
<b>Street/Road Improvement</b>	2.8
<b>Sidewalks</b>	3.1
<b>Drainage Improvements</b>	3.1
Demolition of Structures	3.9
Public Water/Sewer System	4.9
Public Transportation	5.4
Community Center Accessibility	5.7
Community Center Repairs	6.3

# Coverdale

The Coverdale Community located just east of Bridgeville, was developed and expanded in the late 1950's into the 60's. A local house mover, John Evans purchased and sub-divided several areas within the community boundaries of Coverdale. Coverdale features 53% single family, one story homes and 32% single wide mobile homes. Coverdale Crossroads has 172 households, 98 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 278 residents. Coverdale is within County Council District 2, and Census Tract 504.07.

Sussex County held a public meeting in Coverdale on August 31, 2015 at the Coverdale Community Center where residents expressed the following community needs:

- Need to address trash and illegal dumping in the community.
- Concern about road quality and traffic safety, specifically a need for a traffic light at the intersection of Rt. 404 and Coverdale Road.
- Need for more affordable housing.
- Desire for home repair for existing residents.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of Coverdale's 172 households, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 107 households, and completed 98 surveys. Despite the strong turnout to the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in Coverdale was only 57%.

Figure 31: Vicinity Map




## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

Coverdale has a higher rate of vacant lots and lower rate of inhabited structures than other Impacted Communities. Of the properties surveyed, 41 percent were vacant lots and 42 percent were inhabited homes.


Figure 32: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Ownership rates in Coverdale are similar to other Impacted Communities. While 74 percent of households own both their land and home, 21 percent rent the land and home, and four percent rent the land but own the home.

Figure 33: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






## CONDITION

Structures in Coverdale are in generally poorer condition than those in other Impacted Communities. Just 15 percent are in good condition, as compared to 31 percent of the Impacted Communities as a whole. Similarly, 54 percent of structures in Coverdale are in need of major repairs while just 37 percent of all Impacted Community structures are in the same condition.

Figure 34: Property Condition



## HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>33</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>34</sup> Coverdale households received 57 investments of housing assistance and 35 community investments for a total of \$393,475. These include:

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
<b>Coverdale</b>	<b>\$393,475</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>CDBG</b>	<b>\$300,720</b>	<b>43</b>
Accessible Tub/Shower	\$3,100	1
Demolition	\$26,470	4
Electrical Repair	\$1,646	1
Extermination	\$3,000	1
Handicap Ramp Installation	\$4,400	1
New Well Installation	\$4,704	2
New Heating System	\$19,105	5
New Water Pump	\$2,300	1
Install New Well	\$23,400	7
Plumbing Repair	\$5,595	3
Housing Rehabilitation	\$202,000	16
Roof Repair	\$5,000	1
<b>CDBG-R</b>	<b>\$7,713</b>	<b>1</b>
Housing Rehabilitation	\$7,713	1
<b>County Council Emergency Repair</b>	<b>\$19,681</b>	<b>11</b>
Mobile Home Hookups/ Connections	\$7,150	1
New Heating System	\$3,000	1

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
New Roof/Roof Repair	\$3,100	1
Other/Multiple Repairs	\$1,500	1
Plumbing Repair	\$695	1
Housing Rehabilitation	\$95	1
Repair/Replace Pipes	\$3,366	4
Water Pump	\$775	1
<b>HOME</b>	<b>\$29,300</b>	<b>2</b>
Housing Rehabilitation	\$29,300	2
<b>County Constable</b>	<b>\$22,401</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Human Service Grants</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>	<b>7</b>
After School Programs	\$1,500	3
Community Programs	\$4,500	3
Community Center Repair	\$500	1
<b>Non-Profit Grant Program</b>	<b>\$7,160</b>	<b>12</b>
Community Programs	\$900	2
Utilities/Operations Expense	\$1,200	2
After School Programs	\$3,260	6
Building Repair	\$500	1
Playground Equipment	\$1,300	1

Figure 35: Housing Assistance. For footnotes 33 & 34, see Page 65

## RESIDENTS

### HOUSEHOLDS


The average household size in Coverdale is 2.85 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 15 percent are children and 21 percent of residents have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$22,257, 58 percent lower than the County median and 13 percent lower than the Impacted Community average. Of the 98 survey respondents, 89 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 86 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.

Figure 36 - Percent Low and Moderate Income Households



## Demographics

### GENDER

Coverdale's residents are 56% male and 44% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Coverdale has a similar percentage of female headed households, 54%, compared to the overall average for Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Coverdale is a majority African American community with 87% of residents identifying as Black or African American, compared to 67% of all respondents. Fourteen percent (14%) of Coverdale residents identified as Hispanic, slightly higher than the overall average.

Figure 37: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Coverdale
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	87%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	9%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	2%
White	23.10%	2%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	14%
Non-Hispanic	59%	47%
Not Disclosed	32%	40%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Coverdale residents identified after school programs as their top community service priority.

Figure 38: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	<b>1.5</b>
Financial Literacy Education	2.0
Animal Control Services	2.5
Light Code Enforcement	2.7

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Coverdale residents overwhelmingly expressed a desire for additional resources for Home Repair funding. Well and Septic Installation or repair followed in order of importance.

Figure 39: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.7
Water Quality Testing	3.0
Home Accessibility	3.4
Trash Collection/Disposal	3.4

## Infrastructure

Coverdale lies within a Secondary County Service Area, an area previously known as the Western Sussex Planning Area. The Secondary Service Area represents an area of the County where growth is expected and special environmental needs may exist, but service is not expected within the next 5 years.

Currently, properties in Coverdale have individual wells and onsite septic systems. The Coverdale community is 1.8 miles from the nearest available central sewer system, which is provided by the City of Seaford. Coverdale is not currently within a water system boundary or served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Coverdale:

- Nearest Road Project: State Route 404 and State Route 18 Intersection Improvements
- Scheduled Construction: FY 17
- Distance: Approximately 1.75 Miles
- Cost: Approximately \$1.2 Million

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Survey responses in Coverdale identified Street Lights as the top priority within their community, followed by Street/Road Improvements and Sidewalk installation.

Figure 40: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Street Lights</b>	<b>1.8</b>
<b>Street/Road Improvement</b>	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Sidewalks</b>	<b>3.1</b>
<b>Demolition of Structures</b>	<b>3.7</b>
Drainage Improvements	4.7
Public Transportation	5.1
Public Water/Sewer System	5.3
Community Center Repairs	5.7
Community Center Accessibility	6.8

## FOOTNOTES

33. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

34. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

# Diamond Acres

Located on Iron Branch Road between Millsboro and Frankford, Diamond Acres was developed as an affordable housing community in the early 1970's. The community is made up of 98% one story, single family homes. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) provided leadership and financing for this project to provide affordable housing for area residents. Diamond Acres features 59 households, 48 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 155 residents. Diamond Acres is located in County Council District 5, Census Tract 515.

Sussex County held a public meeting in Diamond Acres on April 16, 2015 at the Dagsboro Boys & Girls Club where residents expressed the following concerns:

- Concern regarding trash and illegal dumping in the community.
- Need for increased law enforcement presence due to drug activity.
- Need for demolition for dangerous properties, as well as code enforcement for rental properties.
- Increased rodent and animal control.
- Concern regarding flooding and drainage issues.
- Concern about traffic and speeding through the community.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of Diamond Acres 59 households, Sussex County staff made contact with a total of 51 households, and completed 48 surveys. The overall response rate in Diamond Acres was 81%.

Figure 41: Vicinity Map




## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

There are significantly more inhabited structures in Diamond Acres than in other Impacted Communities and no vacant lots. Of the properties surveyed, 84 percent had inhabited structures and only four percent included vacant houses.


Figure 42: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Ownership rates in Diamond Acres are similar to other Impacted Communities, but all properties are fee-simple ownership. There are no households who own their home and rent the land.

Figure 43: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






CONDITION

Structures in Diamond Acres are in generally better condition than those in other Impacted Communities. While 31 percent of all Impacted Community structures are in good condition, the comparable figure in Diamond Acres is 44 percent. However, 31 percent of Diamond Acres structures are in need of major repairs. While this is lower than the 37 percent in Impacted Communities overall, it is still a significant portion of structures in relatively poor condition.

Figure 44: Property Condition



HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>35</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>36</sup> Diamond Acres households received 23 investments of housing assistance for a total of \$188,045. These include:

Figure 45: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
Diamond Acres	\$188,045	23
CDBG	\$166,660	21
Demolition	\$10,705	1
New Well Installation	\$16,230	5
Housing Rehabilitation	\$139,725	15
HOME	\$21,385	2
Housing Rehabilitation	\$21,385	2

FOOTNOTES

35. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

36. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS


### HOUSEHOLDS

The average household size in Diamond Acres is 3.29 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 10 percent are children and 5 percent have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$22,525, 58 percent lower than the County median and 12 percent lower than the Impacted Community average. Of the 48 survey respondents, 77 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 92 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI. Of the 59 households, 37 provided their income.



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

Diamond Acres residents are 50% male and 50% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Diamond Acres has a higher percentage of female headed households, 63%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Diamond Acres has a higher percentage of residents who identify as Black or African American compared to the overall average of Impacted Communities. The area also has a lower percentage (5%) of Hispanic households compared to the overall average.

Figure 47: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Diamond Acres
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	1%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	76%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	6%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	0%
White	23.10%	16%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	5%
Non-Hispanic	59%	81%
Not Disclosed	32%	15%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Diamond Acres residents identified after school programs as their top community service need.

Figure 48: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	<b>1.6</b>
Animal Control Services	2.5
Financial Literacy Education	2.8
Light Code Enforcement	2.8

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Diamond Acres respondents identified Home Repair as their highest priority, followed by Well/Septic Installation or Repair and Water Quality Testing.

Figure 49: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	<b>1.6</b>
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.8
Water Quality Testing	2.9
Home Accessibility	3.6
Trash Collection/Disposal	3.7

## Infrastructure

Diamond Acres lies within a Secondary County Service Area, an area previously known as the Dagsboro Frankford Planning Area. The Secondary Service Area represents an area of the County where growth is expected and special environmental needs may exist, but service is not expected within the next 5 years.

Currently, properties in Diamond Acres have individual wells and onsite septic systems. The Diamond Acres community is .3 miles from the nearest available central sewer system, which is provided by Sussex County. Diamond Acres is not currently within a water system boundary or served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Diamond Acres:

- Nearest Road Project: Dagsboro Road Pavement Rehabilitation
- Scheduled Construction: 2016
- Distance: Approximately 0.9 mile
- Cost: Not reported

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Diamond Acres respondents identified Street Lights as their highest infrastructure need, followed by Drainage Improvements and Sidewalks.

Figure 50: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Street Lights</b>	2.2
<b>Drainage Improvements</b>	3.8
<b>Sidewalks</b>	3.8
<b>Street/Road Improvement</b>	4.0
Public Water/Sewer System	4.3
Public Transportation	4.4
Demolition of Structures	4.5
Community Center Repairs	5.3
Community Center Accessibility	6.5

# Dog Patch

The community of Dog Patch, a colloquial name for the Clarksville community, is located just off of Route 26. It is a relatively small rural community, consisting of 45% double wide and 36% single wide mobile homes. Dog Patch features 18 households, 11 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 34 residents. Dog Patch is located in County Council District 4, Census Tract 513.02.

Sussex County held a public meeting in Dog Patch on November 5, 2015 at Millville Fire Station #2 where residents expressed concern about the following issues:

- Dangerous and abandoned homes and structures.
- Need for increased animal control in the area.
- Concern about drug activity and lack of enforcement.
- Drainage issues for water.
- Desire for connection to public water and sewer.
- Traffic concerns, including the need to control speeding in the area and increase traffic control.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of the 18 households in Dog Patch, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 14 households, and completed 11 surveys. Despite the direct mailing invite to the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in Dog Patch was 61%.




Figure 51: Vicinity Map


Sussex County Impacted Communities - Dog Patch

## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

There are significantly more vacant houses in Dog Patch than other Impacted Communities, but fewer vacant lots. Of the properties surveyed, just 19 percent were vacant lots, but an additional 19 percent included vacant houses.


Figure 52: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Homeownership rates are lower in Dog Patch than in other Impacted Communities. Correspondingly, there are more households that rent the land on which they live or rent the land and the home.

Figure 53: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






CONDITION

Dog Patch has a higher proportion of structures in good condition than the Impacted Communities overall, and a smaller proportion of structures in need of major repair.

Figure 54: Property Condition



HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>37</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>38</sup> 2 households in Dog Patch received housing assistance for a total of \$7,940.

Figure 55: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
Dog Patch	\$7,940	2
CDBG	\$7,940	2
Housing Rehabilitation	\$7,940	2

FOOTNOTES

37.Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

38.CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS


### HOUSEHOLDS

The average household size in Dog Patch is 3.09 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 2 percent are children and none have an identified disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$31,258, 42 percent lower than the County median but 22 percent higher than the Impacted Community average. Of the 11 survey respondents, 100 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 94 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

Dog Patch residents are 71% male and 29% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Dog Patch has a lower percentage of female headed households, 36%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Dog Patch is evenly divided between residents who identify as Black or African American and Hispanic. The area has a higher percentage of Hispanic residents than the Impacted Communities overall.

Figure 57: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Dog Patch
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	53%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	0%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	47%
White	23.10%	0%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	47%
Non-Hispanic	59%	44%
Not Disclosed	32%	9%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Dog Patch residents identified after school programs as their primary community service need.

Figure 58: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	1.2
Financial Literacy Education	2.4
Light Code Enforcement	2.9
Animal Control Services	3.2

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Dog Patch residents identified Home Repair as their top priority, followed by Well/Septic Installation or Repair and Water Quality Testing.

Figure 59: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	1.1
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.0
Water Quality Testing	2.0
Trash Collection/Disposal	3.0
Home Accessibility	3.2

## Infrastructure

Dog Patch lies within a Secondary County Service Area, an area previously known as the Beaver Dam Planning Area. The Secondary Service Area represents an area of the County where growth is expected and special environmental needs may exist, but service is not expected within the next 5 years.

Currently, properties in Dog Patch have individual wells and onsite septic systems. The Dog Patch community is adjacent to an available central sewer system, which is provided by Sussex County. Dog Patch is also adjacent to a central water system provided by the Town of Millville, as well as near private CPCNs. The community is not currently served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Dog Patch:

- Nearest Road Project: State Route 26, Clarksville to Assawoman Canal
- Scheduled Construction: FY 16
- Distance: 0.4 Mile
- Cost: Approximately \$85 Million

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Responding Dog Patch residents identified Demolition as their top infrastructure priority, followed by Drainage Improvements and Street Lights. DELDOT has assisted the community with some drainage improvements since the completion of the survey.

Figure 60: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Demolition of Structures</b>	1.4
Drainage Improvements	2.3
Street Lights	2.6
Street/Road Improvement	4.1
Sidewalks	4.4
Public Transportation	5.9
Public Water/Sewer System	7.0
Community Center Accessibility	N/A
Community Center Repairs	N/A

# Greentop

The Greentop area is located south of Lincoln, off of Fleatown Road. Homes in this community are spread out over a small area, with most bordering the road. There is a mixture of mobile and older stick-built homes (24% double wide and 21% single wide mobile homes) with some newer infill homes. Greentop features 56 households, 33 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 93 residents. Greentop is located in County Council District 2, Census Tract 501.05.


Sussex County held a public meeting in Greentop on May 14, 2015 at the Ashley Christian Center/Duke's Daycare where residents expressed the following concerns:

- Concern regarding road conditions, speeding, and a need for new pavement
- Need assistance with drainage and flooding in the area
- Desire for additional home rehabilitation funding to address housing conditions.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of the 56 households in Greentop, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 45 households, and completed 33 surveys. Despite the direct mailing invite to the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in Greentop was only 59%.

Figure 61: Vicinity Map




Sussex County Impacted Communities - Green Top

## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

Greentop has comparable rates of inhabited structures as to other Impacted Communities, as well as fewer vacant lots and houses. However, it has significantly more abandoned structures. Of properties surveyed, nine percent included abandoned buildings while the rate in the Impacted Communities overall was just three percent.


Figure 62: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Homeownership rates in Greentop are significantly higher than in other Impacted Communities. Just six percent of households rent their home and land.

Figure 63: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






## CONDITION

Greentop has a higher proportion of structures in need of major repairs than other Impacted Communities. Nearly half of all Greentop structures, 48 percent, are in need of major repairs. By comparison 37 percent of all Impacted Community structures are in similar condition.

Figure 64: Property Condition



## HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>39</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>40</sup> Greentop households received 12 investments of housing assistance and 2 community investments for a total of \$122,157. These include: Figure 5

Figure 65: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
<b>Greentop</b>	<b>\$122,157</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>CDBG</b>	<b>\$75,542</b>	<b>9</b>
Install Accessible Tub/Shower	\$1,182	1
New Well Installation	\$3,975	1
Housing Rehabilitation	\$70,385	7
<b>CDBG-R</b>	<b>\$12,363</b>	<b>1</b>
Housing Rehabilitation	\$12,363	1
<b>HOME</b>	<b>\$24,999</b>	<b>1</b>
Housing Rehabilitation	\$24,999	1
<b>HPG</b>	<b>\$8,253</b>	<b>1</b>
Housing Rehabilitation	\$8,253	1
<b>Human Service Grants</b>	<b>\$500</b>	<b>1</b>
After School Programs	\$500	1
<b>Non-Profit Grant Program</b>	<b>\$500</b>	<b>1</b>
Programs & Services	\$500	1

## FOOTNOTES

39. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

40. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS


### HOUSEHOLDS

The average household size in Greentop is 2.88 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 6 percent are children and 7 percent have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$26,241, 51 percent lower than the County median but three percent higher than the Impacted Community average. Of the 33 survey respondents, 94 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 79 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

Greentop residents are 40% male and 52% female - 8% declined to answer - compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Greentop has a higher percentage of female headed households, 64%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Greentop has a higher percentage of Black or African American residents, and slightly fewer Hispanic residents than all Impacted Community respondents.

Figure 67: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Greentop
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	81%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	8%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	4%
White	23.10%	8%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	4%
Non-Hispanic	59%	60%
Not Disclosed	32%	35%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Greentop residents identified after school programs and financial literacy as their top community service needs.

Figure 68: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	<b>1.8</b>
Financial Literacy Education	1.9
Light Code Enforcement	2.6
Animal Control Services	2.6

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Greentop residents overwhelmingly identify Home Repair as their top community need.

Figure 69: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	<b>1.4</b>
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.8
Water Quality Testing	3.1
Trash Collection/Disposal	3.1
Home Accessibility	3.4

## Infrastructure

Greentop lies within a Secondary County Service Area, an area previously known as the North Coastal Planning Area. The Secondary Service Area represents an area of the County where growth is expected and special environmental needs may exist, but service is not expected within the next 5 years.

Currently, properties in Greentop have individual wells and onsite septic systems. The Greentop community is 1.3 miles from the nearest available central sewer system, which is provided by the City of Milford. Greentop is not currently within a water system boundary or served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Greentop:

- Nearest Road Project: Marshall / Third Street Pavement Rehabilitation
- Scheduled Construction: 2016
- Distance: Adjacent to Community
- Cost: Not reported

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Greentop residents overwhelmingly identified Street Lights as the community's top infrastructure need. Street/Road Improvements ranked second in priority.

Figure 70: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Street Lights</b>	1.9
Street/Road Improvement	3.0
Sidewalks	4.2
Public Transportation	4.2
Demolition of Structures	4.4
Drainage Improvements	4.5
Public Water/Sewer System	5.3
Community Center Repairs	6.9
Community Center Accessibility	7.7

# Lucas Development

Located just outside of Milton, Lucas Development is a small community often referred to as “Sam Lucas”. Fifteen years ago when this area was first targeted by Sussex County, there were as many as 20 occupied homes. The community faces significant challenges with vacancy, with few occupied homes left in the area. Lucas Development features 7 households, 5 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 19 residents. Within the Lucas Development, 60% of homes are one story single family homes, and 40% are single wide mobile homes. Lucas Development is located within County Council District 3, Census Tract 508.02.

Sussex County held a public meeting in Lucas Development on December 17, 2014 at the Milton Public Library where residents expressed the following concerns:

- Concern about heavy truck traffic and speeding on Sam Lucas Road.
- Need for street lights.
- Need to address vacant homes including those with squatters and homes in need of demolition.
- Concern with illegal dumping on vacant lots.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of the 7 households in the Lucas Development, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 5 households, and 5 completed surveys, for an overall response rate of 71%.




## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

There are significantly fewer inhabited structures in Lucas Development than other Impacted Communities, as well as more vacant houses, vacant lots, and abandoned structures. Just 15 percent of surveyed properties included inhabited structures, while 45 percent of lots were vacant, 25 percent of properties had a vacant house, and 10 percent contained an abandoned structure.


Figure 72: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Unlike other Impacted Communities, 100 percent of households surveyed in Lucas Development own their own homes.

Figure 73: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






CONDITION

There are few structures in Lucas Development, and all are in relatively poor condition. It is the only Impacted Community without any structures in good condition. Three out of four structures require major repairs, and one has been designated as uninhabitable.<sup>41</sup>

Figure 74: Property Condition



HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>42</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>43</sup> Lucas Development households received three community investments.

Figure 75: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
Lucas Development	\$10,524	3
County Constable	\$10,524	3

FOOTNOTES

41. This home is also vacant.  
42. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.  
43. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS

### HOUSEHOLDS


The average household size in Lucas Development is 1.75 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 1 percent are children and 2 percent have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$9,842, 82 percent lower than the County median and 62 percent lower than the Impacted Community average. Of the 5 survey respondents, 60 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 100 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.

Figure 76: Percent Low and Moderate Income Households



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

Lucas Development residents are 21% male and 74% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Lucas Development has a lower percentage of female headed households, 50%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Eighty-four percent (84%) of Lucas Development respondents identified as African American, compared to 65% within all Impacted Communities.

Figure 77: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Lucas
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	84%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	5%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	0%
White	23.10%	11%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	0%
Non-Hispanic	59%	42%
Not Disclosed	32%	58%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Lucas Development residents identified after school programming as their most pressing community service need.

Figure 78: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Financial Literacy Education	2.0
Light Code Enforcement	3.0
Animal Control Services	3.7

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Lucas Development residents identified Well/Septic Installation or Repair as their top community need, followed by Home Repair.

Figure 79: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Well/Septic Installation or Repair</b>	<b>1.0</b>
Home Repair	2.0
Trash Collection/Disposal	2.8
Water Quality Testing	3.0
Home Accessibility	4.0

## Infrastructure

Lucas Development lies within the City of Milton's Growth and Annexation Area. Currently, properties in Lucas have individual wells and onsite septic systems. The Lucas Development community is .2 miles from the nearest available central sewer system, which is provided by the Town of Milton. Lucas Development is not currently within a water system boundary or served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Lucas Development:

- Nearest Road Project: US 9 and State Route 5 Intersection Improvements
- Scheduled Construction: FY19
- Distance: 1.5 Miles
- Cost: \$13 Million

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Lucas Development residents identified several infrastructure needs as top priorities, including: Demolition of Structures, Public Water/Sewer System improvements and Street Lighting.

Figure 80: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Demolition of Structures</b>	2.0
Public Water/Sewer System	2.3
Street Lights	2.5
Sidewalks	3.0
Street/Road Improvement	3.2
Drainage Improvements	4.5
Public Transportation	7.0
Community Center Repairs	8.0
Community Center Accessibility	9.0

# Mt. Joy

Mount Joy is a rural community located northeast of Millsboro. This is a mid-sized community with homes bordering Mount Joy Road, as well as several side streets. The homes in this area are 56% single wide mobile homes, and 36% one story modular and stick-built homes. Mount Joy features 56 households, 36 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 86 residents. Mount Joy is located within County Council Districts 3 and 5, in Census Tract 507.01.


Sussex County held a public meeting in Mount Joy on July 28, 2014 at St. John 2nd Baptist Church where residents expressed the following concerns:

- Concerns about increased traffic and speeding
- Need for additional funding for home repairs.
- Concerns regarding property maintenance and needing additional code enforcement.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of the 56 households in Mount Joy, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 43 households, and completed 36 surveys. Despite the well-attended community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in Mount Joy was 64%.

Figure 81: Vicinity Map




Sussex County Impacted Communities - Mt. Joy

## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

While there are more inhabited structures and fewer vacant lots in Mount Joy than other communities, there are also more vacant houses. Twenty percent of properties surveyed included a vacant house, as compared to just ten percent in the Impacted Communities overall.


Figure 82: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

There are fewer homeowners and more renters in Mount Joy, as compared to other Impacted Communities.

Figure 83: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






CONDITION

Structures in Mount Joy are in generally better condition than other Impacted Communities. Within the community 26 percent of structures are in need of major repairs, as compared to 37 percent in the Impacted Communities overall.

Figure 84: Property Condition



HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>44</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>45</sup> Mount Joy households received 15 investments of housing assistance and 6 community investments for a total of \$134,576. These include:

Figure 85: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
Mount Joy	\$134,576	21
CDBG	\$125,226	14
Emergency Roof Rehabilitation	\$3,830	1
Handicap Ramp Installation	\$3,000	1
Install New Pressure Tank	\$1,600	1
Housing Rehabilitation	\$116,796	11
County Council Emergency Repair	\$3,900	1
Handicap Ramp Installation	\$3,900	1
County Constable	\$2,000	1
Non-Profit Grant Program	\$3,450	5
After School Program	\$2,950	4
Community Programs	\$500	1

FOOTNOTES

44. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

45. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS

### HOUSEHOLDS


The average household size in Mount Joy is 2.46 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 3 percent are children and 9 percent have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$20,730, 61 percent lower than the County median and 19 percent lower than the Impacted Community average. Of the 36 survey respondents, 81 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 84 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.

Figure 86: Percent Low and Moderate Income Households



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

Mount Joy residents are 57% male and 42% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Mount Joy has a higher percentage of female headed households, 60%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Mount Joy is 95% African American, compared to 65% for all Impacted Community resident respondents.

Figure 87: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Mt. Joy
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	95%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	1%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	0%
White	23.10%	3%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	0%
Non-Hispanic	59%	56%
Not Disclosed	32%	44%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Mount Joy residents identified after school programming and financial literacy as their top community service needs.

Figure 88: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	1.7
Financial Literacy Education	1.7
Light Code Enforcement	2.4
Animal Control Services	2.8

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Mount Joy residents overwhelmingly prioritize Home Repair as a top need in their community. Home Accessibility and Well/Septic Installation or Repair were also identified as high priorities.

Figure 89: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	1.3
Home Accessibility	2.2
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.3
Trash Collection/Disposal	2.5
Water Quality Testing	2.6

## Infrastructure

Mount Joy lies within a Secondary County Service Area, an area previously known as the North Coastal Planning Area. The Secondary Service Area represents an area of the County where growth is expected and special environmental needs may exist, but service is not expected within the next 5 years.

Currently, properties in Mount Joy have individual wells and onsite septic systems. The Mount Joy community is 2.1 miles from the nearest available central sewer system, which is provided by Sussex County. Mount Joy is not currently within a water system boundary or served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Mount Joy:

- Nearest Road Project: North Millsboro Bypass
- Scheduled Construction: FY 23-25
- Distance: Approximately 1.5 Miles
- Cost: \$60 Million

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Mount Joy respondents identified Street Lights as their primary infrastructure need, followed by Public Water/Sewer Systems, Sidewalks and Street Improvements.

Figure 90: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Street Lights</b>	1.5
Public Water/Sewer System	2.6
Sidewalks	2.7
Street/Road Improvement	2.8
Demolition of Structures	3.0
Drainage Improvements	3.0
Community Center Repairs	3.0
Community Center Accessibility	3.7
Public Transportation	5.4

# New Hope / S. Old State Road

The New Hope / S. Old State Road community is located just south of the Town of Ellendale on Old State Road. Homes in this community are spread out over a one mile area with most bordering the road. The New Hope community is a small subdivision of mobile homes located just off of South Old State Road. New Hope / S. Old State Road features 78 households, 50 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 181 residents. New Hope / S. Old State Road is within County Council Districts 2 and 3, and in Census Tract 502.


Sussex County held a public meeting in New Hope / S. Old State Road on June 25, 2015 at the Philadelphia Pentecostal Church where residents expressed the following needs:

- Concern about the water quality and a desire for a public water system in the community.
- Worry about safety for children and pedestrians with increased traffic and speeding.
- Need for sidewalks, streetlights and bus stops.
- Additional community space needed, especially for children.
- Concerns about drug dealing in the area, there is a need for additional enforcement.
- Need for more code enforcement and property maintenance in rental units.
- Trash and illegal dumping is a major issue in the community.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of the 78 households in New Hope / S. Old State Road, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 59 households, and completed 50 surveys. Despite the direct mailing invite to the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in New Hope/S. Old State Road was 64%.

Figure 91: Vicinity Map




Sussex County Impacted Communities - New Hope

## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

There are far more vacant lots and fewer inhabited structures in New Hope / S. Old State Road compared to other Impacted Communities. Just 28 percent of surveyed properties included an inhabited structure, while 54 percent were vacant lots.


Figure 92: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

In New Hope / S. Old State Road homeownership rates are lower than other Impacted Communities, and rental rates are correspondingly higher, with many of the rental properties within the New Hope community.

Figure 93: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






## CONDITION

Structural conditions in New Hope/ South Old State Road are very similar to the Impacted Communities as a whole, with 38 percent of structures in need of major repairs.

Figure 94: Property Condition



## HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>46</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>47</sup> New Hope / S. Old State Road households received 10 investments of housing assistance and 37 community investments for a total of \$137,037.

Figure 95: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
New Hope / S. Old State Rd.	\$137,037	47
CDBG	\$91,990	9
Connect to Central Water System	\$2,400	1
Housing Rehabilitation	\$89,590	8
HOME	\$3,780	1
Handicap Ramp Installation	\$3,780	1
County Constable	\$15,117	8
Human Service Grants	\$11,800	14
After School Programs	\$3,800	7
Community Programs/Services	\$8,000	7
Non-Profit Grant Program	\$14,350	15
Affordable Housing Project	\$1,250	1
After School Programs	\$2,500	4
Community Programs/Outreach	\$7,600	7
Program Expenses	\$2,000	3

## FOOTNOTES

46. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

47. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS

### HOUSEHOLDS


The average household size in New Hope / S. Old State Road is 3.62 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 14 percent are children and 9 percent have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$22,723, 58 percent lower than the County median and 11 percent lower than the Impacted Community average. Of the 50 survey respondents, 76 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 99 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.

Figure 96: Percent Low and Moderate Income Households



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

New Hope / S. Old State Road residents are 81% male and 19% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. New Hope / S. Old State Rd. has a lower percentage of female headed households, 42%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

New Hope/S. Old State Road has a higher percentage of respondents that identify as Other/Multi-Racial compared to all of the Impacted Communities.

Figure 97: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	New Hope / S. Old State Road
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	65%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	6%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	13%
White	23.10%	16%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	7%
Non-Hispanic	59%	60%
Not Disclosed	32%	33%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

New Hope / S. Old State Road residents identified after school programs as their top community service need.

Figure 98: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	1.6
Financial Literacy Education	1.9
Light Code Enforcement	2.1
Animal Control Services	2.6

## RESIDENT NEEDS

New Hope / S. Old State Road residents identified Water Quality Testing as their top priority, followed closely by Home Repair.

Figure 99: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Water Quality Testing</b>	1.3
Home Repair	2.0
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.7
Trash Collection/Disposal	3.2
Home Accessibility	4.3

## Infrastructure

Currently, properties in New Hope/ S. Old State Road are served by a central sewer system, which is provided by Sussex County. New Hope/ S. Old State Road properties have individual wells, and the community is not currently within a water system boundary. The community is not currently served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near New Hope / S. Old State Road:

- Nearest Road Project: US 113 at State Route 16 Grade Separated Intersection
- Scheduled Construction: After FY25
- Distance: Approximately 0.6 Mile
- Cost: Approximately \$42 Million

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

New Hope / S. Old State Road residents identified Public Water/Sewer System improvement as their primary infrastructure need, followed by the need for Street Lighting and Sidewalks.

Figure 100: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Public Water/Sewer System</b>	<b>1.7</b>
Street Lights	2.1
Sidewalks	2.7
Street/Road Improvement	3.6
Drainage Improvements	3.8
Demolition of Structures	4.1
Public Transportation	5.9
Community Center Repairs	7.1
Community Center Accessibility	7.8

# Pinetown

The Pinetown community located just off of Route 9 between Harbeson and Lewes, is a community with deep roots in Sussex County. Pinetown is a small community with just one road and two unpaved side streets. The housing stock in Pinetown includes 37% single story homes and 47% single wide mobile homes. Pinetown features 21 households, 19 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 41 residents. Pinetown is located within County Council District 3, Census Tract 508.03.

Sussex County held a public meeting in Pinetown on July 14, 2014 at the Pinetown Community Center where residents expressed the following community needs:

- Need for additional investment in the Pinetown Community Center for after school programs, summer camps, GED classes and internet access for area children.
- Additional code enforcement and demolition of vacant properties as well as additional funds for housing rehabilitation.
- Road condition is poor, additional road repairs needed.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of the 21 households in Pinetown, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 21 households, and completed 19 surveys. The overall response rate in Pinetown was 90%.

Figure 101: Vicinity Map




Sussex County Impacted Communities - Pinetown

## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

Pinetown has far fewer vacant lots as other Impacted Communities and more inhabited structures; however, it also has more than double the rate of vacant houses.


Figure 102: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Pinetown has the highest rate of households that own their home but rent the land on which it is located. While four percent of households in other Impacted Communities rent land and own a home, the comparable figure in Pinetown is 16 percent. This number is a result of several heir-owned properties that have been passed down through family members for generations, each one with multiple housing units.

Figure 103: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






## CONDITION

Structures in Pinetown are in generally worse condition than other Impacted Communities, with 95 percent in need of major or minor repairs and only one structure in good condition. However, since the survey was conducted, Sussex County has invested \$85,000 in home repairs in the community.

Figure 104: Property Condition



## HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>48</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>49</sup> Pinetown households received 23 investments of housing assistance and 7 community investments for a total of \$151,334. These include:

Figure 105: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
<b>Pinetown</b>	<b>\$151,334</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>CDBG</b>	<b>\$104,797</b>	<b>22</b>
Demolition	\$12,800	2
Disconnect from County Sewer	\$2,000	1
Handicap Ramp Installation	\$5,360	2
Hook to County Sewer	\$3,500	1
Connect Home to County Sewer System	\$2,400	1
New Well Installation	\$12,826	4
Housing Rehabilitation	\$65,911	5
County Council Emergency Repair	\$5,789	3
Install New Well/Replace Water Pump	\$4,015	1
Repair/Replace Pipes	\$750	1
Water Pump	\$1,024	1
<b>HOME</b>	<b>\$38,900</b>	<b>2</b>
Housing Rehabilitation	\$38,900	2
<b>HPG</b>	<b>\$2,800</b>	<b>1</b>
Handicap Ramp Installation	\$2,800	1
<b>County Constable</b>	<b>\$2,837</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Human Service Grants</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>2</b>
Technology	\$500	1
Community Center Repairs	\$500	1
<b>Non-Profit Grant Program</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>2</b>
Community Events/Beautification	\$1,000	2

## FOOTNOTES

48. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

49. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS

### HOUSEHOLDS


The average household size in Pinetown is 2.16 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 1 percent are children and 5 percent have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$20,902, 61 percent lower than the County median and 18 percent lower than the Impacted Community average. Of the 19 survey respondents, 84 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 81 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.

Figure 106: Percent Low and Moderate Income Households



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

Pinetown residents are 27% male and 73% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Pinetown has a lower percentage of female headed households, 63%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

All survey respondents in Pinetown identify as Black or African American, which is higher than the average of all Impacted Communities.

Figure 107: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Pinetown
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	100%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	0%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	0%
White	23.10%	0%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	0%
Non-Hispanic	59%	100%
Not Disclosed	32%	0%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Pinetown residents identified after school programming as their top community service need.

Figure 108: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	<b>1.5</b>
Animal Control Services	2.5
Light Code Enforcement	2.8
Financial Literacy Education	2.9

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Pinetown residents identified Home Repair as their top community need. Water Quality Testing, Well/Septic Installation or Repair and Home Accessibility were also concerns.

Figure 109: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Water Quality Testing	3.0
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	3.1
Home Accessibility	3.1
Trash Collection/Disposal	4.2

## Infrastructure

Currently, properties in Pinetown are served by a central sewer system, which is provided by Sussex County. Pinetown properties have individual wells, and the community is not currently within a water system boundary.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Pinetown:

- Nearest Road Project: State Route 9 and Sweetbriar Road Intersection Improvements
- Scheduled Construction: Complete 2015
- Distance: Approximately 0.5 Mile
- Cost: Approximately \$1.3 Million

## STREET LIGHTING

Pinetown is located within a County Street Lighting District. The District was formed in 2016 and has 8 street lights. Residents pay an annual assessment on their property tax bill.

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Pinetown did not have a clear priority for community infrastructure needs, but Community Center Repairs, Public Water/Sewer System and Street Lighting were ranked highly.

Figure 110: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Community Center Repairs</b>	2.9
Public Water/Sewer System	3.3
Street Lights	3.7
Street/Road Improvement	4.6
Drainage Improvements	4.8
Demolition of Structures	4.9
Sidewalks	5.0
Community Center Accessibility	5.6
Public Transportation	7.3

# Polly Branch

The Polly Branch community is located just outside of the Town of Selbyville. The community spreads from the intersection of Polly Branch Road and Route 54/Lighthouse Road, then crosses Route 17/Roxanna Road, and continues for about 1 mile. The homes are a mixture of mobile, modular, and stick-built bordering the road and in the McCabe and Branch Acres Subdivisions. Fifty-four percent (54%) of homes in Polly Branch are one story homes and a large portion are mobile homes. Polly Branch features 55 households, 37 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 115 residents. Polly Branch is located in County Council District 5, Census Tract 514.


Sussex County held a public meeting in Polly Branch on August 19, 2014 at the Apostolic Church of Christ where residents expressed the following community needs:

- Need to address illegal dumping and trash pickup.
- Desire for traffic calming measures, including speed bumps and streetlights.
- Need to address flooding and drainage in the community.
- Requested additional resources for home repair.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of the 55 households in Polly Branch, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 43 households, and completed 37 surveys. Despite the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in Polly Branch was 67%.

Figure 111: Vicinity Map




## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

There are more inhabited structures in Polly Branch than other Impacted Communities, and slightly fewer vacant lots and houses. There are also fewer abandoned structures.


Figure 112: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Homeownership rates in Polly Branch are relatively high, with 89 percent of households owning their homes.

Figure 113: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






CONDITION

Structural conditions in Polly Branch are similar to those of other Impacted Communities, with 32 percent of structures in need of major repairs.

Figure 114: Property Condition



HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>50</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>51</sup> Polly Branch households received 9 investments of housing assistance and 5 community investments for a total of \$53,845. These include:

Figure 115: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
Polly Branch	\$53,845	14
CDBG	\$48,345	9
Housing Rehabilitation	\$48,345	9
County Constable	\$1,500	1
Human Service Grants	\$4,000	4
After School Programs	\$4,000	4

FOOTNOTES

50. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

51. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS

### HOUSEHOLDS


The average household size in Polly Branch is 3.08 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 7 percent are children and 7 percent have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$30,537, 43 percent lower than the County median but 19 percent higher than the Impacted Community average. Of the 37 survey respondents, 95 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 86 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.

Figure 116: Percent Low and Moderate Income Households



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

Polly Branch residents are 61% male and 19% female - 20% declined to answer - compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Polly Branch has a lower percentage of female headed households, 41%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Polly Branch has a higher percentage of residents who identify their race as Other/Multi-Racial and a higher percentage of Hispanic residents than other Impacted Communities.

Figure 117: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Polly Branch
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	67%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	6%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	10%
White	23.10%	17%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	13%
Non-Hispanic	59%	41%
Not Disclosed	32%	46%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Polly Branch residents identified after school programming and financial literacy programming as their top community service needs.

Figure 118: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	1.4
Financial Literacy Education	1.4
Light Code Enforcement	1.6
Animal Control Services	2.5

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Polly Branch residents identified Home Repair and Trash Collection/Disposal as their top community needs.

Figure 119: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	1.1
Trash Collection/Disposal	1.8
Home Accessibility	2.3
Water Quality Testing	2.7
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	5.0

## Infrastructure

Polly Branch lies within the Town of Selbyville's Growth and Annexation Area. Currently, properties in Polly Branch are served by central water and sewer systems, which are provided by the Town of Selbyville. The community is not currently served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Polly Branch:

- Nearest Road Project: State Route 54 / State Route 20 to Mallard Lakes Development
- Scheduled Construction: Complete
- Distance: 4.3 Miles
- Cost: \$10 Million

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Polly Branch residents overwhelmingly identified Street Lights as their most pressing infrastructure need, with Drainage, Street/Road, and Sidewalk Improvements as other areas of need.

Figure 120: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Street Lights</b>	1.4
Drainage Improvements	2.3
Street/Road Improvement	2.4
Sidewalks	2.4
Demolition of Structures	3.5
Public Transportation	4.4
Community Center Accessibility	4.5
Community Center Repairs	5.5
Public Water/Sewer System	8.5

# Possum Point

The Possum Point area has changed considerably over the years. The end of Possum Point Road borders the bay, and in recent years many Possum Point homes have converted from full-time owner occupancy to summer residences and retirement homes. The area still has a mixture of income levels and variety of housing types, and is comprised of 67% single family one story homes. For the purposes of the Study, Sussex County also included the nearby Riverview Community for this targeted area. Possum Point features 98 households, 66 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 182 residents. Possum Point is within County Council District 5, Census Tract 506.02.


Sussex County held a public meeting in Possum Point on April 23, 2015 at the Dagsboro Boys & Girls Club where residents expressed the following community needs:

- Concern about the chicken processing plant slated to open in the community and the potential impacts of its waste on the community's wells and septic systems.
- Residents expressed interest in a public sewer system, and the need to address drainage issues in the area.
- Concern about the number of vacant and abandoned properties in the area.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of the 98 households in Possum Point, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 73 households, and completed 66 surveys. Despite the direct mailing invite to the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in Possum Point was 67%.

Figure 121: Vicinity Map




Sussex County Impacted Communities - Possum Point

## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

There are more inhabited structures in Possum Point than other Impacted Communities, as well as fewer vacant lots and houses. However, there are slightly more abandoned structures. The community does have a significant amount of seasonal vacancies at 14%.


Figure 122: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Rental rates are relatively high in Possum Point as compared to other Impacted Communities. Of the households surveyed 27 percent rent both their home and the land.

Figure 123: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






CONDITION

Structures in Possum Point are in generally better condition than those in other Impacted Communities. Just 23 percent of Possum Point structures are in need of major repairs, as compared to 37 percent across all Impacted Communities.

Figure 124: Property Condition



HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>52</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>53</sup> Possum Point households received 5 investments of housing assistance for a total of \$18,636. These include:

Figure 125: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
Possum Point	\$18,636	5
CDBG	\$6,600	2
Emergency Housing Rehabilitation - Heating System	\$4,100	1
Install New Well/Replace Water Pump	\$2,500	1
County Council Emergency Repair	\$900	1
Plumbing Repair	\$900	1
HOME	\$11,136	2
Housing Rehabilitation	\$6,500	1
Roof Repair	\$4,636	1

FOOTNOTES

52. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries. Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

53. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15. Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS

### HOUSEHOLDS


The average household size in Possum Point is 2.76 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 10 percent are children and 9 percent have some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$27,510, 49 percent lower than the County median but eight percent higher than the Impacted Community average. Of the 66 survey respondents, 80 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 86 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.

Figure 126: Percent Low and Moderate Income Households



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

Possum Point residents are 59% male and 41% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. Possum Point has a lower percentage of female headed households, 42%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Possum Point has a higher percentage of White residents than other Impacted Communities, and a slightly higher percentage of Hispanic residents.

Figure 127: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	Possum Point
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	33%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	1%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	3%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	0%
White	23.10%	63%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	11%
Non-Hispanic	59%	65%
Not Disclosed	32%	24%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

Possum Point residents identified after school programs as their top community service need.

Figure 128: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	<b>1.9</b>
Financial Literacy Education	2.3
Light Code Enforcement	2.4
Animal Control Services	2.6

## RESIDENT NEEDS

Possum Point residents ranked Water Quality Testing as their primary community need, followed closely by additional funding for Home Repair.

Figure 129: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Water Quality Testing</b>	<b>1.7</b>
Home Repair	2.2
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	2.3
Trash Collection/Disposal	3.8
Home Accessibility	4.4

## Infrastructure

Possum Point lies within the Town of Millsboro's Growth and Annexation Area. Currently, properties in Possum Point have individual wells and onsite septic systems. The Possum Point community is directly adjacent to the nearest available central sewer system, which is provided by the Town of Millsboro. The community is not currently within a water system boundary or served by a Street Lighting District.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near Possum Point:

- Nearest Road Project: Dagsboro Road Pavement Rehabilitation
- Scheduled Construction: 2016
- Distance: Approximately 1 mile
- Cost: Not reported

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Possum Point respondents highlighted Public Water/Sewer System improvements as their primary infrastructure need, followed closely by Street Lighting. After the community meeting, DELDOT remedied the drainage issue at the intersection of Possum Point Road and Iron Branch Road on July 13, 2015.

Figure 130: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Public Water/Sewer System</b>	2.0
Street Lights	2.7
Demolition of Structures	3.5
Drainage Improvements	3.8
Street/Road Improvement	4.0
Sidewalks	4.3
Public Transportation	5.1
Community Center Accessibility	6.7
Community Center Repairs	7.2

# West Rehoboth

Originally founded as an affordable housing community for workers at a local vegetable canning company, West Rehoboth has changed dramatically over the years. At one time it was a very isolated community with only one road in and out. Residents and community groups express concern about the rising cost of housing prices in Rehoboth and the potential of making West Rehoboth unaffordable to existing residents. The current housing stock is 54% single family one story homes, and 31% single wide mobile homes. West Rehoboth features 46 households, 26 households responded to the Impacted Community Survey, and responding households have a total of 64 residents. West Rehoboth is within County Council District 4, and within Census Tract 510.03.

Sussex County held a public meeting in West Rehoboth on July 22, 2014 at Westside New Beginnings where residents expressed the following concerns:

- Concern about trash and illegal dumping.
- Request for funds to demolish blighted properties.
- Need for additional crime prevention mechanisms.
- Help with reduced or subsidized sewer bills.

## SURVEY RESPONSE

Of the 46 households in West Rehoboth, Sussex County staff contacted a total of 36 households, and completed 26 surveys. Despite the community meeting, telephone surveys, and three visits to the community for door-to-door surveying, the overall response rate in West Rehoboth was only 57%.

Figure 131: Vicinity Map




## Properties

### VACANCY & LAND USE

West Rehoboth has significantly fewer inhabited structures than other Impacted Communities, and far more vacant lots.


Figure 132: Land Use (Percentage)



### OWNERSHIP

Homeownership rates in West Rehoboth are similar to that of other Impacted Communities. However, there are significantly more households that own their home but rent the land upon which it is located, and fewer households that rent both their land and their home.

Figure 133: Total Land Ownership (Percentage)






## CONDITION

Compared to other Impacted Communities, housing repair needs in West Rehoboth are minor, with few major repairs identified.

Figure 134: Property Condition



## HOUSING ASSISTANCE<sup>54</sup>

From Fiscal Year 2009 to 2015,<sup>55</sup> West Rehoboth households received 11 investments of housing assistance and 27 community investments for a total of \$149,245. These include:

Figure 135: Housing Assistance

Type of Funding	Sum of Funding	Number of Investments
<b>West Rehoboth</b>	<b>\$149,245</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>CDBG</b>	<b>\$70,000</b>	<b>7</b>
Connect Home to County Sewer System	\$2,000	1
Housing Rehabilitation	\$68,000	6
<b>County Council Emergency Repair</b>	<b>\$8,557</b>	<b>3</b>
Demolition	\$4,000	1
New Heating System	\$3,700	1
Septic Abandonment	\$857	1
<b>HOME</b>	<b>\$7,000</b>	<b>1</b>
Housing Rehabilitation	\$7,000	1
<b>County Constable</b>	<b>\$17,685</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Human Service Grants</b>	<b>\$4,000</b>	<b>4</b>
After School Programs	\$4,000	4
<b>Non-Profit Grant Program</b>	<b>\$42,003</b>	<b>16</b>
Affordable Housing	\$18,000	6
After School Programs	\$6,050	5
Street Lighting, Building Expenses, Clean-Ups	\$17,953	5

## FOOTNOTES

54. Address-level investments were provided by Sussex County. Properties geocoded and analyzed based on location within Impacted Community Boundaries.

Investment amounts may differ due to geocoding constraints at the parcel level.

55. CDBG-R investments are FY09 only. CDBG, HOME, County Council Emergency Repair, and HPG investments are from FY10-FY15.

Constable investments are from records available from FY98-FY16. Human Service Grant and Non-Profit Grant Program investments are from FY10-FY16.

## RESIDENTS

### HOUSEHOLDS


The average household size in West Rehoboth is 2.46 persons per household, compared to 2.96 in the Impacted Communities as a whole. Of the community's population, 2 percent are children and 3 percent have some type of disability. By comparison, 28 percent of all Impacted Community residents are children and 14 percent of the population has some type of disability.

### INCOME

The average income of households responding to the survey was \$23,990, 55 percent lower than the County median and 6 percent lower than the Impacted Community average. Of the 26 survey respondents, 77 percent answered questions about income.

Of the households that provided income information, 96 percent had incomes under 80 percent of Sussex County's area median income and are therefore considered Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households. By comparison, 86 percent of all Impacted Community households are LMI.

Figure 136: Percent Low and Moderate Income Households



## DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

West Rehoboth residents are 36% male and 64% female, compared to 42% female and 56% male for all Impacted Communities. West Rehoboth has a higher percentage of female headed households, 73%, than the overall average for all Impacted Communities (53%).

### RACE & ETHNICITY

Ninety-five percent (95%) of West Rehoboth survey respondents identify as Black or African American, higher than the average of 65% of Black or African American residents across all Impacted Communities.

Figure 137: Race and Ethnicity

Race	All Impacted Communities	West Rehoboth
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.35%	0%
Asian	0.12%	0%
Black or African American	65.40%	95%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.12%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.06%	0%
Not Disclosed	5.66%	0%
Other/Multi-Racial	5.19%	0%
White	23.10%	5%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	9%	0%
Non-Hispanic	59%	70%
Not Disclosed	32%	30%

## COMMUNITY SERVICES

West Rehoboth identified after school programming as their top community service need.

Figure 138: Community Service Ranking

Community Services	Resident Ranking
<b>After School Programs</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Financial Literacy Education	2.2
Light Code Enforcement	2.4
Animal Control Services	3.2

## RESIDENT NEEDS

West Rehoboth residents identified Home Repair as their primary community need.

Figure 139: Resident Need Ranking

Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Home Repair</b>	<b>1.5</b>
Water Quality Testing	2.9
Home Accessibility	2.9
Well/Septic Installation or Repair	3.5
Trash Collection/Disposal	3.5

## Infrastructure

Currently, properties in West Rehoboth are served by a central sewer system, which is provided by Sussex County. The community is also served by a central water system, which is provided by the City of Rehoboth. The community is not currently served by a County Street Lighting District, but does have street lights as a result of a community-sponsored initiative.

## ROADS

The Delaware Department of Transportation has identified the following upcoming or recently completed road project(s) near West Rehoboth:

- Nearest Road Project: State Route 1 and Five Points Improvements
- Scheduled Construction: After FY25
- Distance: Approximately 2 Miles
- Cost: Not reported

In 2016, DelDOT recently completed a large-scale sidewalk project, and lighted cross-walk on Route 1 in the West Rehoboth area.

## INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

West Rehoboth residents identified Sidewalks and Street/Road Improvements as their priority infrastructure need, followed closely by Street Light improvements.

Figure 140: Infrastructure Need Ranking

Infrastructure Need	Resident Ranking
<b>Sidewalks</b>	<b>2.9</b>
<b>Street/Road Improvement</b>	<b>3.1</b>
<b>Street Lights</b>	<b>3.4</b>
<b>Public Water/Sewer System</b>	<b>3.8</b>
Public Transportation	3.9
Demolition of Structures	4.7
Drainage Improvements	4.8
Community Center Repairs	5.6
Community Center Accessibility	6.9