

Meeting Minutes
Senior Services | Aging in Place Task Force
Housing Working Group
January 5, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 PM by the chair.

2. Roll Call/ Introductions

Present: Eric Brown, Cynthia DeMan, Melinda Loftin, Jim Schneider, Jerry Amber, Carol Windorf, Susan Clark, James Downing, Nancy Robinson, Joan Koelsch

Absent: All in attendance.

Others Present: Rachel Bush, Julie Lyons Bricker, Susan Barkman

3. Vision and Mission Statements of Task Force

a. Vision - Facilitator Guide (pg. 2)

b. Mission – Facilitator Guide (pg. 2)

4. Ground Rules for Effective Meetings

- a. Respect the experiences & expertise of others
- b. Do not interrupt each other
- c. Assume positive intent
- d. Be open to hearing all perspectives
- e. Be willing to participate and do the homework

5. Establish Roles and Responsibilities

a. Co-Chair

- i. Eric Brown volunteered via email on January 6, 2022.

b. Scribe (Secretary)

- i. Rachel Bush is tasked with this responsibility.

6. Meeting Dates and Format (Virtual or In-Person)

- a) January 5th, 2022 (Virtual)
- b) January 26th, 2022
- c) February 16th, 2022
- d) March 9th, 2022
- e) March 23rd, 2022
- f) April 13th, 2022

Because of the nature of the working group (volunteers, no quorum), the participants can choose to hold meetings virtually or in-person. Unanimously the group agrees a virtual platform is preferred for these meetings.

7. Review of Data Collected to date through Focus Groups, Citizen Surveys, other Outreach

- a. Review the Data summary including population trends showing 65+ growth of ~ 4,700 (47%) and decrease of under 65 of ~2,500 (5%)
- b. Review Housing specific data summary on pgs. 12-13
- c. Review Community Survey Results on Housing related questions (14,15,16,17,18 32 & 37)
- d. Review AARP Livability Index Comparisons (RO, Berkley, MH)

The data reviewed can be found in the following documents: the [Aging in Place Draft Data Summary](#), the [Aging in Place Task Force Community Survey Results](#), and the [AIP Boston Plan 2017 Housing Results](#).

There was discussion about building single-family and apartments concentrated on seniors, specifically near downtown. City departments welcome this feedback, particularly during the Master Plan update (expected to begin within the next 24 months).

Real estate development, particularly senior housing, relies on financing through HUD, the state, or federal funding. One of the issues in Royal Oak is, initially, land costs (which can't easily be solved due to high density). We can make recommendations but would be more effective if the group is realistic about what we can accomplish (financially) and the impact it will have.

The group discussed the preference for diverse demographics in their communities and wanting more intergenerational interaction. Senior high rises are highly isolating and not preferred by this group. Though they aren't preferred, it was worth noting that apartment buildings can provide efficient housing in a city that's built out like Royal Oak.

Finding unutilized space in Royal Oak was discussed, with the intention to determine if it is suitable for senior housing. The group discussed types of housing and the choices that could be made available to them early in the planning process by City staff and developers.

Co-operative management of buildings as a management practice was discussed, where property owners are encouraged to participate in the leasing of their homes, programming, etc. This relationship allows renters have a real sense of ownership and programming (i.e., block club parties) brings people out of their units and fosters a sense of community.

The state of Michigan has put additional emphasis on walkable communities, which is something that Royal Oak already succeeds at.

James will find out what the waitlist and application process is like for Barton Towers and Royal Oak Manor. The long wait lists speak to the demand for affordable senior housing.

The Villages of Royal Oak seems extremely successful - lots of components that people seem to want in terms of housing type options, adaptive reuse of land (previously a closed school)

The group discussed strategies and programs to support folks that would like to stay in the home that they're in, as opposed to building new expensive housing units.

[Beacon Hill Village](#) – A desirable community example from Boston, MA

comparing Livability Categories and the metrics and policies that go into defining them.

LOCATION	Royal Oak, Michigan ×	Berkley, Michigan ×	Madison Heights, Michigan, 48071 ×
TOTAL INDEX SCORE	56	58	53
HOUSING Affordability and access ▣	41	35	47
Metrics			
Housing accessibility ? Zero-step entrances	31.9% of units Median US neighborhood: 43.6% ●	31.9% of units Median US neighborhood: 43.6% ●	31.9% of units Median US neighborhood: 43.6% ●
Housing options ? Availability of multi-family housing	27.1% of units are multi-family Median US neighborhood: 17.8% ●	7.3% of units are multi-family Median US neighborhood: 17.8% ●	23.9% of units are multi-family Median US neighborhood: 17.8% ●
Housing affordability ? Housing costs	\$1,127 per month Median US neighborhood: \$989 ●	\$1,182 per month Median US neighborhood: \$989 ●	\$864 per month Median US neighborhood: \$989 ●
Housing affordability ? Housing cost burden	20.0% of income spent on housing Median US neighborhood: 17.9% ●	21.0% of income spent on housing Median US neighborhood: 17.9% ●	15.3% of income spent on housing Median US neighborhood: 17.9% ●

8. Discuss, brainstorm, and establish work group Vision Statement (We Envision...)

The group finds consensus to review materials and revisit the vision statement draft next week.

9. Public comment

None submitted.

10. Adjournment

The meeting ended at 8:45 PM.