

Observations on North East/Millerton Survey

1. Survey represented both Town and Village residents and a small number of landowners who do not live here. Mostly the landowners who do not live here are business owners. The proportion of Town vs Village respondents (66% Town and 25% Village) is similar to the actual population proportions (68% Town, 32% Village).
2. The vast majority (85%) were homeowners and 9% were renters. The survey underrepresents renters.
3. About 65% of respondents were full time residents and 26% were part time. This is a similar proportion to the population so is representative.
4. Most second homeowners are from the NYC/Boroughs (68%) with a few others indicating they were from New Jersey, Westchester County, Greene County, and Sharon, CT.
5. Most respondents do not have school-aged children living at home. Only 11% did. This survey under-represents school-aged families as per the Census, there are about 26% of households having school-aged children.
6. Most respondents have lived in the area greater than 15 years (62%) but newcomers to the area were represented. About 10% of respondents have lived here less than 3 years.
7. People of all ages participated in the survey, with the majority over age 55. 37% were aged 65 and older. Comparing this to actual census data, young people were under-represented, and older people were over-represented in the survey results.
- 8 and 9. The question explored important issues. This information was also sorted by place of residence and full-time/part-time status. Regardless of residence or residential status, the results were very consistent. All groups listed about the same top 10 issues although different groups prioritized them slightly different. The chart below summarizes the issues indicated to be “Very Important” and are listed in order of the number of responses:

All Respondents	Business Owners Only	Part-Time Residents	Full-Time Residents
Protection of natural resources	Availability to high speed internet, cell	Protection of natural resources	Loss of farmland and open spaces
Loss of farmland and open space	Loss of farmland, open spaces	Loss of farmland and open spaces	Maintain small town character
Maintaining small town character	Protection of natural resources	Maintain small town character	Sufficient businesses catering to everyday needs
Sufficient businesses catering to everyday needs	Preserve historic character	Availability to high speed internet, cell	Protection of natural resources
Preservation of historic structures	Maintain small town character	Sufficient businesses catering to everyday needs	Availability to high speed internet, cell
Availability and	Sufficient	Preserve historic	Preserve Historic

access to high speed internet	businesses catering to everyday needs	structures	Structures
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------	------------

Issues Listed as among the top 3 priority issues were:

- Maintaining small town character
- Lack of protection of farmland and open spaces
- Lack of Sewers (1)
- Lack of protection of natural resources
- Sufficient businesses catering to everyday needs
- Lack of job opportunities (1)

(1) Lack of sewers and lack of job opportunities were identified as two of the top size priority issues in Question 9 but were not in the top issues in Question 8. Lack of sewers was listed as very important by 36.6% of respondents and job opportunities was very important to 40.6%.

10. The top strengths identified for the Town include its beauty, rural nature, farming, open spaces, sense of community, location and access to Town, rail trail, and small town character. The top strengths listed for the Village include local businesses, walkable nature, rail trail, small town character, charm, sense of community, historic character, movie house, rail trail, library, restaurants, and friendly.

11. The top weaknesses identified for the Town include taxes, lack of jobs, grocery store, affordable housing, communication, loss of farms, the school, services, parking, and poor zoning. The top weaknesses for the Village include lack of sewer, loss of businesses and business diversity, parking, traffic, affordable housing, sidewalk maintenance, and need for another grocery store.

12. STILL to do.

13. STILL to do.

14. The top types of businesses desired were another grocery store, specialty food stores, clothing, medical services, restaurants, agricultural and food processing, personal services, and cultural venues.

15. This question explores where businesses should be located. All respondents, as well as the Village-resident only subset answered the same: businesses should be located on Route 44 outside the Village and along Route 22 north of the Village (66%), followed by in the Village (42%).

16. Businesses not desired in Town were chain stores, big box stores, more antique stores, dollar stores, and fast food. There were a variety of other businesses not desired, but these five were the most frequently cited.

17. STILL to do.

18. Regarding whether people agreed with the statement about sewers in the Village, 58% agree or strongly agree (31% strongly agree and 27% agree). About 27% were not sure, 8% disagreed, and 6% strongly disagreed. Overall, about 14% disagreed with the statement. More people agree that sewers limit business development and affordable housing opportunities.

19. For Village residents only, when asked whether they would support provision of sewers and creation of a sewer district, 37% were in support, 22% would not support, 14% were not sure/no opinion, and

28% said it depends. The most common response given to why they feel 'it depends' related to the cost of building a sewer system and its affect on taxes.

20. Outside the Village, the top infrastructure improvements were, in order, expanding availability of broadband/internet services, park and recreation, road improvements and transfer station.

21. In the Village, the top infrastructure improvements were, in order, sidewalk maintenance, parking, broadband/internet, parks and recreation, and roads.

22. Large apartments > 6 units, large subdivisions > 15 units, condominiums and town houses were housing types that were not desired anywhere by the majority of respondents. However, in-law accessory apartments, mixed use buildings, reuse of buildings into apartments, and senior housing (of different types) were housing styles that the majority indicated were desired in both the Town and Village. There were very few people who indicated that a particular housing type was desired only in the Town or Village. This seems to indicate that from a housing perspective, there is little difference based on location.

23. The list of potential actions were all supported by the majority of respondents. None were opposed or strongly opposed by many people (less than 25). Some people (less than 50 in general) were unsure about those actions, but for the most part there was strong feelings that people favor or strongly favor the listed actions. The actions that seemed to have the most support are to share town/village services, use renewable energy to power municipal facilities, update zoning to protect the environment, and pursue more grants. However, there was certainly widespread support for most of the other actions. Electric charging station, a small slaughterhouse, and zoning to encourage affordable housing had the fewest number of people supporting these actions, but there were still more who supported them than not.

24. STILL to do.