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Public housing, in growing urban communities like Daytona Beach, Florida is involved in a perpetual struggle for its continued existence. Public housing programs face serious problems in addition to financial difficulties. Many have acquired the reputation of being worse living environments than the slums they were supposed to replace.

Although public housing originally served the so called "working poor", it has gradually become the "housing of last resort" for America's poorest citizens. Over the years, it has become obvious that public housing has acquired a rather poor image of being a large conglomeration of low income citizens housed in large impersonal concrete structures.

The focus of the study centers on the examination of public housing, its occupants and the negative image that seems to be perpetuated within these lower income areas of cities like Daytona Beach, Florida.
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I. INTRODUCTION

For as long as human beings have existed, shelter has been one of their basic needs. As humans have evolved over the centuries, so have their needs. Presently, in an era when technological breakthroughs are common incidents, the human race is seemingly becoming so concerned with advanced technology that it sometimes tends to veer away from its basic necessities. There exists now a need to maintain a constant effort to provide suitable housing for the lower income citizens of society, especially since complacency and neglect are prevailing attitudes of many important public officials in this country.

Public housing, in growing urban communities like Daytona Beach, Florida is involved in a perpetual struggle for its continued existence. The challenge of supporting it and providing for its future existence in Daytona Beach is a great one. However, the objective of providing suitable housing for lower income citizens of that community can never be abandoned until every American receives adequate, decent housing. But as Sterling Tucker insightfully points out:

"Housing is not just brick and mortar. Housing perhaps more than anything else, helps to shape the nature of one's environment. It is the centerpiece of a neighborhood. It is central to many communities. It is central to the building of a quality life and quality living."
All of us (Americans) know that the neighborhoods out of which we come have something to do with our early motivations, our early expectations, our early perceptions of ourselves. So we know that a neighborhood, a community with environment having the impact that it does in one's life, has a great deal to do with how one meets the challenges of life. For those of us who have to face discrimination and racism in so many areas of life, we know that it is still a fact of life and society in many ways. If we are going to afford young people an opportunity to achieve what Lincoln said so many years ago—that every person, every child should have an opportunity at an unfettered start in the race of life—if that is to take place, we have to create for the children of our Nation, the kinds of livable neighborhoods to make possible a chance to meet the challenges and the opportunities which life offers.1

This paper will focus on public housing and its implication in developing urban areas of our country, specifically Daytona Beach, Florida. We will examine the city's quest for the development of additional housing units for the lower income citizens of Daytona Beach as well as the negative image of public housing that seems to be perpetuated inside these low income areas.

II. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

The Setting

The City of Daytona Beach, Florida, along with many other urban communities nationally, is experiencing increasing amounts of problems related to the concept of public housing. It is extremely difficult to find an immediate workable solution to Daytona Beach's housing problem or that of any other comparable municipality. This difficulty arises primarily because of the fact that since their inception, the housing programs have been dealt with incorrectly.

In spite of numerous attempts by various administrations in Washington to deal with the complex issues regarding public housing, attempts to provide public housing are being frowned upon by influential members of society. In an era when fair housing is of dire necessity, it is being witnessed that increasing numbers of attempts to stifle the development of a fair and suitable housing program in the United States continues.

Numerous municipalities, including Daytona Beach, have formally assumed responsibility for affirmative promotion of fair public housing in connection with their participation in the Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program. Upon applying for the CDBG, the municipal government assures and certifies that it will take action to affirmatively further fair housing in the sale or rental of housing and the provision of brokerage service. This assurance
is the legal cornerstone of a commitment to fair housing by elected officials across the country. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is aware that failure to address fair housing is not necessarily a matter of bad faith. Very often local officials are simply not familiar with techniques by which fair housing can be promoted.

Across the country there are currently more than 3,000 public housing agencies operating about 1.3 million units with a tenant population in excess of 3 million people. About three quarters of the public housing units are in metropolitan areas, and about 80% of those are in central cities. Regardless of the unique characteristics that each community and each local government may possess, each has the common problem of inadequate housing for the poor. Public housing, in the form of any program is being met with increasing amounts of resistance, on the legislative floor, in the courtrooms, and in the neighborhoods.

Internship Experience

As an intern to the city manager of the City of Daytona Beach, it was necessary to become involved in a cross-section of the problems facing the city. Acting as a non-voting participant of the Beach Advisory Board, the intern was able to become involved in many strategy sessions that dealt with various long-range policy implications regarding the maintenance of the beach. (The beach is one of the major sources of revenue for the city.) In addition to these experiences, the writer was

---

also a participant on the Downtown Development Authority which was concerned with the redevelopment of Daytona's vacant downtown areas as well as the Municipal Yacht Basin. Also, working closely with the city's Community Development Agency, the intern along with city staff was responsible for the operation of various workshops designed to aid small businesses. These workshops dealt with the processes of bonding small businesses, competitive bidding, the specifications and plans, and the criteria that city building officials use when construction sites and their site plans are inspected. However, the most enlightening of these internship experiences was the insight gained from being involved with the housing problems that were very critical to the future development of the City of Daytona Beach.

One of the many advantages that city-manager interns have is the privilege of being able to become involved in high-level discussions that deal with very critical policy issues. As a result of these discussions, the writer was able to grasp a firm understanding of many of the realities surrounding the housing issue.

Statement of the Problem

Public housing programs face serious problems in addition to financial difficulties. Many have acquired the reputation of being worse living environments than the slums they were supposed to replace. Daytona Beach, Florida is in the midst of a housing crisis. Although the city has a definite need for additional public housing, its efforts to construct these much needed houses within the city limits have been repeatedly rejected by the citizens of the proposed areas for construc-
tion, the City Planning Board, and subsequently by the City Commission. The basic reason for the rejection of additional public housing in Daytona Beach lies in the negative attitudes that the citizens of this city have of its public housing program. As a result of this negative image, other social problems ranging from inadequate tenant maintenance and vandalism, to high crime rates have developed, thus helping to perpetuate this image. The public housing problem is directly related to the public's perception of the public housing programs and therefore this paper will examine the housing problem in Daytona Beach from this perspective. The intent of the research paper will be threefold:

1. Determine the origin of the negative images that continue to plague public housing in general.
2. Explore the housing problem in Daytona Beach and determine the reasons for the rejection of additional units of public housing in Daytona Beach.
3. Offer recommendations that will be beneficial towards developing a more positive image of the housing program in Daytona Beach and other similar municipalities.

---

III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Issues

The traditional low rent housing program, created by the United States Housing Act of 1937, was the nation's primary low-income housing program until the establishment of the privately-owned, interest-subsidy programs in the late 1960s and the expansion of the leasing programs in the 1970s.4

The purpose of the public housing program is to provide standard, but not elaborate or extravagant, housing for low income persons. Although economy is an important consideration, Congress has recognized that projects must also incorporate good design, amenities needed for a safe and healthy family life and neighborhood environment, energy conservation measures, and the extra-durability required for security and economical maintenance.

Although public housing originally served the so called "working poor", it has gradually become the "housing of last resort," for America's poorest citizens. Along with this gradual change in the function of public housing, comes a growing resentment towards its existence. As a result of these actions, the socio-economic viability of public housing areas has been undermined by this shift, by statutory limits on the rents and charges of public housing units, and by budgetary cuts and/

---

or operating fund impoundments during the Nixon, Ford and Reagan Administrations.

The 1937 law authorized federal financial aid for low income housing built and managed by local housing authorities. These units could be provided through new construction, acquisition of existing housing, or leasing of new housing. Actually, the United States Housing Act of 1937 established public housing as a federally financed, but locally operated program. To participate, states were required to have passed enabling legislation establishing public housing agencies for low income families under the public housing program. Since then, all fifty states have enacted such legislation.

Over the years, there has been increasing debate about the image and perception of public housing among the writers of the field. Many have developed different opinions on the image and problems of the public housing programs of our nation.

In this writer's opinion, the problems of public housing arise from many distinct origins. Initially, the problem comes from within the lower income areas where, in many instances, there are broken homes, single-parent homes and complete households that are subject to the immediate environment in which they exist. Secondly, the areas external to the lower income areas have developed attitudes that respond adversely to those lower income citizens and neighborhoods. Therefore, a case of isolation exists and is perpetuated basically because of the attitudes of both sides, as well as the economic distinctions between them. As a result of these distinctions, a majority of the public housing projects have developed in areas where many low income families reside. These
lower income areas, because of their isolation from the flourishing areas of a city, usually worsen and spread.

In contrast to earlier notions of public housing, writers like Henry J. Aaron of the Brookings Institute, believe that the problem occurs because actual and prospective low income tenants seem to regard public housing as a "better buy" than any other housing available to them on the free market. Most projects have extremely low vacancy rates and long waiting lists for admission. This can be attributed to the fact that most low income residents are usually long-term occupants because they do not in many instances possess the educational and social skills that will permit them to move up to a higher income bracket and job classification level.

The problem in other instances, originates in the local housing authorities. Legislation requires the establishment of public housing agencies. They may vary in form, but they generally operate under a Board of Commissioners, who usually serve without compensation. These boards, which can include "tenant commissioners" are generally appointed by the Mayor or the local governing body. Such is the case with Daytona Beach.

History is showing America that laws alone cannot solve its housing problems. The program of governmental control and involvement in private businesses, and in private lives, is not necessarily a deterrent to the

---

social problem that has roots which have been passed from generation to
generation. Sterling Tucker, Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and
Equal Opportunity (HUD) and many other experts in the field of housing
feel that the way to change these attitudes that continue to retard the
growth of fair open housing is to educate those in the housing profession
and the general public of the ill effects which these very attitudes have
not only on their profession, but the community and wider society as a
whole.6

History also shows that the concentration of low income minority
groups is not a new phenomenon, but it has acquired new significance from
changing social conditions and outlooks. Many immigrant groups in the
past, set apart from the general population by poverty, culture or phys-
ical appearance, have formed compact ethnic communities usually in the
poorest housing areas of American cities. No longer replenished by
large-scale immigration, many of these "ethnic colonies" have gradually
disappeared as their members became assimilated or moved to non-ethnic
neighborhoods. Their residential areas have been taken over and expanded
rapidly by the growing Black and Latin populations.7

Fortunately, the renewed public concern with the whole problem of
racial inequality causes the housing situation and other aspects of
minority status to be viewed in a different perspective today than for-

6Sterling Tucker, The Department of Housing and Urban Development,
A Comprehensive Approach to Open Housing Opportunities, (Washington,

7Report of the Commission on Race and Housing, Where Shall We
Live?, (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968),
pp. 4-7.
merly. According to the Commission on Race and Housing, actual living conditions of Blacks and other minority groups are certainly no worse and probably much better at present than in any earlier period, but conditions which were formerly ignored now attract wide attention. In newspapers, national magazines, motion pictures, and books, the situation of the minority groups and activities seeking to overcome discriminatory barriers are constantly publicized. Even if the American people are not yet ready to grant full equality to minorities, it is obvious that they are constantly being made aware of the facts of the problems of public housing.

Low income neighborhoods for the most part, have been the most deteriorated and dilapidated in our cities. These conditions can be traced to several factors. The simple explanations are discrimination, economic status, and in some instances, the insensitivity of our elected officials. We have come up with some contemporary concepts such as redlining, disinvestment, justification, displacement, and of course, revitalization. These terms relate to changes that are not adequately explained by traditional housing theories, such as filtration where aging housing predictably trickles down to lower income residents. Because these terms do not have rigorous or commonly accepted definitions, they often mean different things to different people. To most residents and others involved in the provision of public housing, it means that they cannot expect to have decent, sanitary and safe housing in neighborhoods that are conducive to good living.

8Ibid.
Approaches

Through the years most federal programs providing housing assistance to lower income renters have been production programs, related to construction or rehabilitation of housing units. For example, the low rent public housing program, initiated in the 1930s, has financed construction and rehabilitation of hundreds of thousands of new units that were constructed or rehabilitated under Sections 235 and 236 and other programs. Federal Housing assistance facilitated the retirement and demolition of substantial numbers of substandard units in central cities. It also contributed to the improvements in overall housing conditions, and expanded the housing choices of many low and moderate income households.

Heavy reliance on housing production programs through the mid 1970s had a number of adverse impacts as well. Communities or housing authorities were sometimes led to produce new or rehabilitated housing for lower income households when existing, vacant housing was available, which, with subsidies, could have met housing needs. In some instances, this meant that housing assistance programs boosted vacancy rates beyond the levels needed to replace these substandard units, thus encouraging abandonment. Perhaps, most importantly, the focus on production of new or rehabilitated housing often limited the locational choices of low income households receiving assistance. Quite often, subsidized housing units were located or developed in lower income neighborhoods of central cities.

Current housing assistance programs and strategies are designed to minimize earlier deficiencies. While the public housing program continues to provide housing assistance to large numbers of lower income
individuals, the scale of new construction is much smaller now than in the past. Section 8 is now the principal subsidy program. It utilizes Federal subsidy commitments to provide direct rental assistance to lower income families in existing housing, as well as to help finance private housing construction and/or rehabilitation by for-profit and not-for-profit sponsors. At present, approximately 50% of Section 8 commitments that enable tenants to live in decent, quality, private housing of their choice have been made. The other 50% are for federally-subsidized housing developments, constructed or rehabilitated under the Section 8 program. Local governments are given major responsibility to determine the allocation of Section 8 assistance among new housing units, rehabilitation, and the existing stock. This now enables the program to reflect local situations more than has been the case under earlier programs.\textsuperscript{9}

The Housing and Development Act of 1974 represents an important milestone in U. S. Housing policy. This act provided the Federal Government and localities flexibility to implement housing assistance strategies responsive to local housing needs and local market conditions. Under Section 8, communities can use federal assistance to make existing housing affordable to lower income renter households. Communities in which new housing construction or rehabilitation is needed to provide decent housing choices or improved neighborhood conditions for lower income renters can use Section 8 to leverage required housing investments. Although the record varies from city to city, local housing strategies

\textsuperscript{9}U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Facts About Section 8, June 1976.
using Section 8 generally appear responsive to local housing needs. Many needy cities experiencing rapid population gains appear to emphasize Section 8 new housing units, thus expanding their stocks of housing for lower income households. By contrast, most needy cities with stable or declining populations seem to focus more on Section 8 substantial rehabilitation or existing housing assistance. This is consistent with the evidence that physical housing conditions remain inadequate for substantial numbers of tenants in such cities and that vacancy rates remain reasonably high in some neighborhoods. Low need cities particularly those with decreasing populations made the most extensive use of Section 8 existing units.10

Some effort was made during most of the history of the public housing program to use housing production to expand housing opportunities for the disadvantaged and minorities. As a result, there was some reduction in racial and economic segregation patterns in urban areas.11 However, many public housing units have been built in lower income, minority neighborhoods in central cities. In Chicago, for example, 95% of all public housing units were located in areas in which 50% or more of the residents were black. While this situation may be extreme, it does reflect a general pattern of public housing enforcing residential segregation patterns through the 1960s and 1970s. Under the Section 8 program, federal laws and regulations which attempted to disperse the bulk of assisted developments and to simultaneously encourage economic

10Ibid.

and racial integration were implemented. The same is true today of the public housing program. Available evidence is incomplete, but some success appears to have been achieved. A recent HUD survey of Section 8 developments in 21 metropolitan areas report that 75% of the units in new and rehabilitated Section 8 developments were located in neighborhoods in which minorities comprise less than 40% of the population.12

IV. METHODOLOGY

Primary Data
During the course of the study of the City of Daytona Beach, the writer chose to use the technique of personal interviews as the primary source of information. The writer focused on the opinions of the Daytona Beach City Commission, the Daytona Beach Housing Authority, concerned citizens as well as experts in the field of housing and officials of city government. Selected individuals from these groups of people were observed and interviewed because of their working knowledge of the housing problems of Daytona Beach as well as the housing issues that are prominent nationally. These interviews were conducted during actual working conditions so as to give the writer a chance to see as well as to hear some of the realities of public housing from various perspectives.

Initially, the research began by interviewing individuals responsible for securing public housing for low income citizens of Daytona Beach. These individuals included the Mayor, City Manager and the Director of Community Development. In this instance, these city employees revealed that a need for additional public housing existed in Daytona Beach.

Because of the fact that the City Commissioners were responsible for rendering the final decisions on any housing issues, it was necessary to interview them about the city's need for public housing.
Although the writer recognized that such an approach had certain disadvantages, in this instance, the approach is effective because those people interviewed were quite simply the most qualified to answer questions related to public housing.

Secondary Data

In order to supplement the primary data that were collected, the researcher selected information from secondary sources. This information is beneficial because it provides a historical and conceptual context for discussion and analysis of the paper's focus. These sources included the minutes from Planning Board hearings, City Commission meetings, Housing Authority conferences, as well as crime statistics from the Daytona Beach Police Department. In addition to these pieces of information, police department reports on criminal activity and national housing statistics were studied. In each case, these sources provided supporting evidence for the analysis and conclusions that were reached by the writer about the housing issues of the City of Daytona Beach, Florida.

Analysis

On any level of politics, (i.e., federal, state, or local), influence is the power that gets things done. And in any issue, critical to the development of a city, the media, through its significant power of influence, will play either a positive or negative role in the outcome of these policy issues. Through newspaper accounts, interviews and observations with Bob Desiderio, the City Hall Reporter for the Daytona Beach

13Earl E. Babbie, The Practice of Social Research, (Belmont, California, 1979), pp. 252-256.
News Journal (the primary source of print media for the Daytona Beach Metropolitan Area) it was revealed that the News Journal was in favor of the construction of additional public housing in Daytona Beach. However, he maintained that this stance might cause adverse citizen reaction from groups who were opposed to their areas being selected as possible sites for construction.

At the request of the city-manager, this writer developed a small survey that would help to determine the position of the City Commission, city staff, as well as those of the citizens who would be affected directly or indirectly by public housing.

A total of fifteen (15) people were surveyed; these included five (5) of the city's nine (9) City Commissioners, five (5) City Administrators, which included the mayor, city manager, Director of Community Development, Director of Planning, as well as the City Attorney and Civil Service Director, and five (5) residents of the city who were all chosen at random.

Each of the interviewees was asked five (5) questions that tested their general knowledge of public housing and their personal opinions on its impact on the country as well as on their respective neighborhoods.

Listed below, is a breakdown and analysis of each question and its recorded responses:

Questionnaire and Responses

1. What is your opinion regarding the construction of public housing for lower income citizens of the United States? In this instance, nine of the responses were in support of public housing in the United States. On the other hand, four of those interviewed were against the construction of public housing. The remaining two had no opinion.
2. What is your assessment of the status of public housing for lower income citizens of Daytona Beach?

Eight of those polled felt that the efforts being made to increase the status of public housing were insufficient. Four felt that the situation was adequate and three felt that the amount of housing efforts being made were quite sufficient.

3. How well have you been following the city's quest for the construction of new public housing in Daytona Beach?

There seemed to be a relatively high level of citizen interest in regards to the local housing problem. This assumption is supported by the fact that six of those citizens surveyed closely followed the local housing issues, the same amount (six) casually followed the issues. The remaining three did not have any knowledge of the housing situation of the city.

4. What effect do you think the Daytona Beach News Journal's favorable position on public housing will have on the actual outcome of this issue?

It was obvious that since the Daytona Beach News Journal was the largest source of print media in the Daytona Beach Metropolitan Area, it would play a major role in the dispensing of the facts in the case of Daytona Beach's quest for additional public housing. Eight agreed that the News Journal's stance would be a positive influence for the housing program, four felt negatively and three felt that it would not have any influence whatsoever on the outcome of the case.

5. What would be your attitude if the city were to authorize new public housing units in your neighborhood?

In this case, the figures give credence to the assertion that one of the major problems that continues to plague public housing is its negative image. Of those people polled, eleven were opposed to any public housing construction in their neighborhoods. Two expressed a positive attitude in favor of the move and the remaining two had no opinion.

What do these figures suggest? The number of people surveyed was much too small to tell us anything definitive about the issues, however, the results do suggest that:

1) Locally, a large percentage of the citizens of Daytona Beach are aware of the housing situation in their city and over half of them agree that it is insufficient.
2) Even though a large portion of the citizens in Daytona Beach are sympathetic toward public housing, an even larger percentage would oppose the construction of these much needed housing developments in their neighborhood.

The second statement is one of particular interest and importance because herein lies the root cause of the rejection of public housing in Daytona Beach. Although the data reveal widespread awareness of the issues of public housing in Daytona Beach, citizen rejection of the proposed areas causes the writer to suggest that the public's perception of the public housing program in Daytona Beach is the primary cause of the ultimate rejection of proposed additional public housing in that city. Substantiation of this statement can be found by examining the following chain of events that illustrate the public housing situation in the city of Daytona Beach.

The Daytona Beach Housing Authority is responsible for the management of approximately 1025 low-income dwellings. It also manages 180 units of Section 8 Existing Housing in addition to the 48 Elderly Units under the Moderate Rehabilitation, Section 8 Program.14

In 1981, the average family income level of the public housing residents was reported as being $4,345.88 for a family of four (4) persons. During the same year, the Authority reported a tenant turnover of 100 families. With the waiting lists of public housing and Section 8 reporting 475 and 500 respective families it was obvious that a great need

for public housing existed in the City of Daytona Beach.\textsuperscript{15}

The City Commission also recognized the need for public housing and voted unanimously to pursue the idea of creating additional public housing for Daytona Beach. However, the proposed project was met with obstacles that proved too formidable for the supporters of this delicate issue.

On April 22, 1983, the Daytona Beach Housing Authority appeared before the Planning Board requesting a public use permit and site approval for 77 units of public housing to be constructed at the following locations:

- Site #1 Brentwood and Vine (57) units
- Site #2 Campbell and Oak (16) units
- Site #3 Walnut and Oak (4) units

A brief description of the above locations is appropriate before a discussion on the outcome of the Authority's request.

The Brentwood and Vine Street site (site #1) is situated on the northwest boundary of Daytona Beach and in the middle of an area that was predominantly white middle class until the arrival of black families about five years ago. Since that time, this area has been in a steady economic and social decline, slowly changing from its former white middle-class structure to black lower middle-class. Although many white families remain in the neighborhood, it is generally felt that the construction of public housing in the Brentwood and Vine street area would

cause the complexion of this particular neighborhood to change too drastically from a predominantly white middle-class area to a predominantly black lower-middle-class neighborhood.

The other sites (Walnut and Oak, Campbell and Oak) are located in the center of the black lower class neighborhoods of the city which already contain many of the various single and multi-family dwellings that house many of Daytona Beach's lower income citizens. Although these proposed sites serve as excellent alternatives for low income residents, it is realistically another case of public housing residents being located in already eroding areas of the city.

**Outcome of Request**

After several hours of discussion, the Board expressed serious concern about the site plan at Brentwood and Vine, noting that all the trees on the site would be destroyed, that there was no landscape plan, no provision had been made for stormwater runoff (the area presently has a flooding problem) and the poor layout of units in relation to interior street design. City staff reported that the site did not meet city development standards.

A motion was made to recommend the proposed site to the City Commission; however, based on the negative reports from the city staff on the site plan, the Board could not recommend approval and voted unanimously to disapprove the Brentwood and Vine Street Site.

Regardless of the reasons, the outcome remained the same; this was indeed another case of public housing being rejected in an instance when it is badly needed.
In his discussion with City Commissioners on the need for public housing, the writer found that a majority of them agreed that it was of vital importance that the city obtain public housing; however, public housing units, according to the Commission must subscribe to city building codes.

Some Commission members felt that the single cause for the denial of the city permits was the very poor site plans that were submitted by the developer. Others felt differently. For example Mr. Charles Carter, Executive Director of the Ormond Beach Housing Authority, commented that his long experience with public housing has shown that the rejection of public housing is an example of city governments taking a stand and then backing off when opposition or at least concerns are voiced by the citizens. He maintained that if the city determined a need for public housing, then it should do everything possible to find a sufficient site for public housing, even if it meant angering a few citizens of those communities located in the proposed sites.

Those concerned citizens reacted by voicing their opinions to both the Planning Board and City Commission. A majority of the citizens expressed the view that public housing would cause an increase in the crime rates in their neighborhoods and this could result in a loss of property values.

In an attempt to determine whether or not these projections were true, the writer compared the crime rates of the existing public housing areas with the crime rates of the proposed sites, which include the Derbyshire and 8th Street site. See Tables 1 and 2.
It is important to note that the Daytona Beach Police Department has divided the City into patrol zones (grids) and in some of the cases the locations involved were situated in one or more grids; however, the total number of crimes in these generalized areas will give us an indication of the frequency of criminal activities for the areas in question.

**TABLE 1**
(Proposed Sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET LOCATION</th>
<th>PATROL ZONE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CRIMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire &amp; 8th</td>
<td>60.1 - 60.0 *</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood &amp; Vine</td>
<td>65.3/65.0/65.1</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell &amp; Oak</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut &amp; Oak</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II**
(Existing Sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET LOCATION</th>
<th>PATROL ZONE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CRIMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Street Park</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinehaven Project</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Park</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Street</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax Park</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table I reveals that the number of crimes in the proposed areas were comparable to the numbers in the existing public housing areas, shown in Table II. In one specific instance, the proposed site of Campbell and Oak Streets (which falls in the same patrol zone as Walnut and Oak)*

*60.1 and other numbers under Patrol Zone indicate the location of the area as listed and referred to by the Daytona Beach Police Department.*
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showed the highest rate of criminal activity of all sites involved. In another case, the Brentwood and Vine location had a higher crime rate than all of the existing housing projects except Palmetto Park. In addition, many police officers also see a distinction in the types of crimes committed in these different areas. For example, in the areas of existing public housing, the tendency is for more criminal activities against persons. This is usually the case in lower income areas, and in the proposed areas (specifically Derbyshire and 8th, Brentwood and Vine) the crimes are usually against property.

The findings indicate that crime rates do increase in lower income environments; however, the City of Daytona Beach continues to develop additional public housing sites in conducive high crime areas, thus continuing the trend of perpetuating the negative image of public housing.
V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The public housing program and its attendant problems in cities like Daytona Beach are simply symptomatic of the shortcomings of federal programs that provide a vast majority of the funding for local housing authorities. They have been examined and re-examined countless times by various experts and critics who at some point in time, inevitably are faced with the same question: Where do we go from here?

Over the years, it has become obvious that public housing has acquired a rather poor image of large concrete structures in the core of great impersonal cities, cut off from surrounding neighborhoods by grass or cement deserts best avoided after dark, inhabited by large, mostly black families and exhibiting the full range of social and economic difficulties. This image suggests that any benefits inhabitants derive from physical housing amenities are offset by their stagnant environment.16

The focus of this study, therefore, has centered on the examination of public housing and the public’s perception of the occupants of public housing. The study, based on collected data and a careful analysis of the information obtained, concludes that the negative image of public housing is the major problem that plaques all public housing programs.

To make public improvements visible and to promise an improvement in city services, is simply not enough. These solutions do not reach deep enough to deal with the actual problem. They do not attack the cause of

the negative image of public housing. Rebuilding or replacing existing housing under the programs similar to the Federal subsidy programs of the 1960s and 1970s is not only too cumbersome, but tends to undermine neighborhood confidence and to reduce market demand when the subsidized beneficiaries are not seen as deserving of the program's benefits. These programs did not reckon with the need of low income households for jobs and more income resources. Too often they rehoused a few while scattering the majority and provoking resident owners to depart.

If programs in declining neighborhoods are to be successful in this city or any other city in the country, direct household assistance to all eligible residents of declining areas may be necessary as an alternative to housing production assistance. Direct financial assistance in the form of either housing allowances or income supports combined with job training and counseling gives priority to helping households, rather than saving or replacing specific residential structures in declining areas. Although there is no guarantee that an income approach would result in better housing (by objective standards), this approach, combined with existing assistance programs such as the food stamp program, could open a wider range of housing choices for such households.

It is recommended that the focus in declining areas in any city, should be on: (1) the household instead of the mere physical housing units; and (2) upon changing market perceptions and the demand for housing as opposed to simply providing greater government assistance focused on physical improvements.
If concerned citizens and professionals combine their efforts to combat the negative perception, as well as the physical atrocities related to public housing, then and only then will America be able to rest assured that fair and suitable housing is continually being created and promoted for the lower income residents of its cities.
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