

This study has been funded by the Oakland County Community and Home
Improvement Division through the

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP ACT GRANT**

and the

MICHIGAN STATE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Wayne State University and the Oakland County Community & Home Improvement Division gratefully acknowledge the assistance provided by the following individuals and organizations. Without their assistance, this study would not have been possible.

L. BROOKS PATTERSON
OAKLAND COUNTY EXECUTIVE

OAKLAND COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

**OAKLAND COUNTY TASKFORCE ON HOMELESSNESS AND
AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

OAKLAND COUNTY BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE
QUALITY OF LIFE COMMITTEE
HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

OAKLAND COUNTY CLERK/REGISTER OF DEEDS
Ruth Johnson

OAKLAND COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Sudha Maheshwari
Land Implementation Services Supervisor

OAKLAND COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF FISCAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
EQUALIZATION DIVISION

J. Ryan Runnels
Appraiser 3/GIS User Support

OAKLAND COUNTY PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES DIVISION

Bret Rasegan
Supervisor

Charlotte Burkhardt
Principal Planner

Christopher Moshier
GIS/CAD Technician I

Christopher Hanes
GIS/CAD Technician I

COMMUNITY ASSESSORS

Aaron Powers	City of Oak Park
Nino Licari	City of Troy
Michael Racklyeft	City of Southfield
Dwayne McLachlan	City of Madison Heights
D. Glenn Lemmon	City of Novi
Vicki Sievers	Township of Springfield
Gregory MacAlpine	Township and Village of Holly
Dean Babb	City of Farmington Hills
John Attwell	Township and Village of Orion
Gloria Sleep	City of Northville
David Kramer	Township of Independence
Kurt Dawson	City of Rochester Hills

RESEARCH TEAM

The author wishes to extend a special thanks to his former colleagues at the Center for Urban Studies. **Kurt Metzger's** collection, analysis, and interpretation of data were invaluable as were his guidance on available data sources and his drafts of the chapters on population and economic change. **Jackie Cutsinger's** tireless work in drafting and re-drafting the housing stock chapter are much appreciated, as are her many hours spent assembling data and assisting with other research tasks. **Duff Mahan** and **Ruth Waite** also contributed greatly to the research effort. **Doug Towns's** GIS expertise was critical to our analysis and mapping of much of the data presented in the report. **Charo Hulleza** proved adept at both shepherding the project through personnel changes and providing words of encouragement at critical points. Finally, **Amanda Fales** and **Craig Donahue** provided timely and expert assistance in preparing the final report for presentation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Oakland County, MI, one of the wealthiest counties in the country, faces an increasingly complex set of opportunities and challenges. As the county has grown and diversified, its leaders from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors have aggressively sought to ensure that the county retains its viability and attractiveness as a destination of choice for businesses and residents. As part of this approach, county leaders decided to undertake a comprehensive housing needs assessment. This assessment is designed to help county leaders deal with the ongoing demand for limited housing resources. In particular, it is intended to help stakeholders identify gaps in existing housing inventory, develop strategies to address those gaps, and prioritize the limited resources available to address housing needs. The underlying goal of the assessment is to assist the county in ensuring its long-term sustainability and high quality of life. The core element of this is ensuring the availability and attainment of decent, safe, and affordable housing for current and future residents.

This report presents the results of this housing needs assessment. It includes an analysis of population characteristics, economic trends, housing stock and housing market characteristics, housing affordability, special needs housing, the housing delivery system, land use and housing needs, housing constraints, projected housing needs, and community indicators. It also outlines a series of recommendations for county stakeholders to consider when developing housing strategies. This assessment, one of the most comprehensive of any produced throughout the country, utilizes an extensive array of public, administrative, and private sector data, as well as input from an extensive array of stakeholders.

Summary of Major Findings, Implications, and Recommendations

Strong Growth Creates Housing Challenges. Our analysis produced two overriding findings. First, over the past decade Oakland County has continued to thrive, experiencing considerable growth in its economy, population, and housing market. Second, that growth has created challenges related to housing affordability. These challenges preclude the county as a residential option for many families, thus threatening economic growth and community sustainability and inhibiting the ability of many families to share in the county's vitality. These findings suggest that government, private, and nonprofit stakeholders must address the cost and availability challenges posed by this growth to ensure that Oakland County remains a premier business and residential destination in southeastern Michigan.

County is Doing Well, but Must Address Challenges to Maintain Strength. Let us be clear, the county is doing well overall and, in spite of economic challenges facing the state and region, is projected to continue to perform strongly in the near future. Indeed, the county has what many counties throughout the country seek—economic growth, a strong housing market, a high homeownership rate, a housing stock that is in good physical condition, high property values, a solid tax base, considerable retail opportunities, and an educated population with relatively high incomes. It is also making strides in an area where progress has been slow in the past—increasing racial and ethnic diversity. However, income diversity is lacking and may even decrease in the coming years. Lower-income families simply can't access much housing in the county. Housing affordable to families earning low-income or less is highly concentrated in a small number of

communities. It is especially difficult to find in the county's high-growth communities. Even middle-income families are facing considerable affordability challenges, more so than their counterparts in other parts of the region. The rapid escalation in the number and value of mortgage foreclosures over the past decade is evidence of the mounting affordability problems for all income groups. These problems are likely to escalate as interest rates rise, the regional economy continues to grow very slowly, and the costs for infrastructure to accommodate housing growth mount and increased commuting. These factors, combined with others, are causing more people to move out of the county than move into it from other parts of the country. Birthrates and international immigration have kept the population growing, but as family size decreases, the number of people of child-bearing age decreases, the lagging economy attracts fewer immigrants, and housing prices push more residents out the future may not be as bright.

Oakland County has a particular set of challenges related to special needs populations. The most glaring immediate need is affordable housing for persons with disabilities. There is simply not enough of this housing to accommodate existing need. That which does exist is highly concentrated in a small number of communities. If not addressed promptly, the shortage of housing for persons with disabilities will only grow as the county's population ages (see discussion below). There is also a shortage of affordable housing to enable the county to reach its goal of eliminating homelessness. Actions will be necessary to address the need for transitional and permanent supportive housing for this population. The elderly have their own needs that we discuss below.

The Challenges Vary by Community. Many communities in the southeastern quadrant of the county that have served as the primary location for county growth in the past face challenges of maintaining a healthy housing market. As newer and bigger housing is built farther out in the county, the housing in several of these communities has less market appeal. Yet, many of these older communities have been able to take advantage of their comparatively lower costs, their more urban character, and their proximity to major transportation nodes to attract first time homebuyers and those moving into Oakland County from Wayne County.

A primary housing problem for these older communities is that housing costs are still too high for many of their current and potential residents. Thus, some of these communities that have typically served as a destination for young middle-class families are being passed over for communities in other parts of the region that offer larger and newer homes at comparable cost or lower. Affordability problems for existing residents in the southeastern quadrant are particularly high for the elderly. Foreclosures are also a greater concern here than in many of the newly developing communities. In these older communities infrastructure issues tend to focus on maintenance, as well as relief of congestion caused as people traverse through their communities en route to jobs at various locations throughout the county. The more exclusive communities in the southeastern core have continued to attract significant investment and housing costs have increased the exclusivity of these communities.

In the growing communities that surround the southeastern quadrant, different challenges exist. In these communities affordability is an issue mainly in terms of the inability of many households to access the new housing being constructed because of its cost. This condition will only grow in importance as economic opportunities follow the population movement. Affordability for those who do move into these communities is less of an issue here than in the southeastern

quadrant. In some of these communities, change in their rural characters is a growing concern. In response, some communities have created development restrictions that limit the potential for affordable housing to be developed. In these newer communities, infrastructure is a big issue and growing in importance. There is a mismatch between the location of existing and planned infrastructure and the location of new and projected development. Meeting the growing infrastructure demand in these communities is likely to push costs higher for many county residents.

In some communities, growth in housing is so rapid that the communities are projected to be unable to accommodate housing growth through 2030 under existing and planned land uses and zoning. In fact, a dozen communities are projected to have insufficient capacity to accommodate growth. Six of those communities are expected to account for 47 percent of the county's total growth through 2030. A shortage of over 26,000 units is projected for those six communities. If no changes are made and the growth projections prove accurate the impact on these communities and the county would be dramatic and affordability problems in these communities would likely grow.

Some of these housing issues are market driven—as demand grows, so does price. As homes become bigger, price grows. Land costs are an increasingly important determinant of cost. Yet, some of the cost increases are due to land use regulations and development procedures, which in some cases, make it difficult to produce moderate or low-cost housing, especially for people with disabilities. The capacity of the low-income and special needs housing delivery systems have grown over the past decade, but remains insufficient to address the growing need. In most cases, there are no incentives for private developers to produce low-cost housing. The funding available to nonprofit and public providers of affordable housing is insufficient to result in significant impact. These factors combine with a lack of awareness regarding the need for affordable housing, and a general opposition to low-cost and special needs housing by many existing residents and elected officials (NIMBYism) to create the current situation.

Challenges are Likely to Increase with Time. The housing challenges faced by communities throughout the county are expected to grow with time. The trend towards larger, more expensive housing does not appear to be changing; yet, there is no expectation that incomes in the region will grow substantially in the coming decades. Moreover, the housing supply available in other communities, such as Macomb County, continues to grow. With this housing growth, business growth is likely to follow. This places increasing pressure for proactive efforts among county stakeholders to ensure that the county attracts a large share of the relatively small economic and population growth expected for the region.

It is abundantly clear that the aging of the baby boomers will begin to have a dramatic impact on Oakland County beginning in 2011. The county's elderly population is expected to grow by 104%, accounting for 21% of the entire population by 2030. This will pose new challenges and opportunities for meeting the housing and service needs of the county. The need for low-cost housing for the elderly is likely to grow. The need for smaller housing is likely to grow. The need for assisted living is likely to grow. The need for new alternatives to the nursing home or traditional single-family home (e.g. active living retirement communities, continuing care retirement communities, etc.) is likely to grow. The need for services to support the elderly living out their lives in Oakland County will grow. The aging of baby boomers is also likely to lead to a large number of existing units being sold as elderly households downsize. How this will impact the

county is yet to be determined, but there is time for the county and its communities to have a stake in determining that future.

The housing challenges to the county posed by a growing elderly population are magnified when we consider migration trends and the presence of persons with disabilities. The county's population growth rate since 2000 is the lowest since the 1800s, and projections through 2030 indicate that the county would gain less than 20,000 more people than it gained during ten years from 1990 to 2000. Over the past decade, people 55 years of age and older accounted for the greatest number of people moving out of the county to other parts of the state or country. Most of them moved out of the state. If this trend continues as the county's population ages, the impact could be devastating.

The county already has a shortage of affordable housing options for persons with disabilities, and this shortage is likely to grow substantially as the county ages. As the elderly population grows, the prevalence of disabilities will grow. Moreover, a growing number of people with disabilities who lived with their parents will need to find alternative housing as their parents become elderly and unable to care for them.

Many Options for Addressing Challenges. While resources for addressing housing needs are limited, the county's relatively strong economic and fiscal positions make it better suited to address its housing challenges than many other counties in Michigan. The county and its local governments have historically demonstrated a proactive approach to ensuring that their communities are attractive to residents and businesses. Timely, proactive attention to housing affordability by the government and the private sector could ease the housing cost burden faced by many residents and help the county ensure its long-term sustainability as a community of choice for businesses and residents. In fact, Oakland County has the unique opportunity to once again demonstrate its innovative and adaptive character. If government, private, and nonprofit stakeholders expand their collaborative partnerships in a concerted effort to address affordability and other housing challenges, the county can serve as a model for the rest of the country demonstrating how to ensure economic vitality, a strong housing market, and a high quality of life while providing residential and economic opportunities to families from all economic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds. In creating such a model, the county can solidify its continued status as a primary destination of choice for residential and business investment from around the world.

We detail several options for addressing housing challenges in the recommendations chapter of the report. Here, we simply list the recommendations. In presenting our recommendations, we want to emphasize four things. First, when selecting interventions, it is critical to consider how the intervention will impact, and be impacted by, the regional housing market. Second, although there are many ways to address housing needs that do not require significant financial resources, increasing financial resources for ensuring affordable housing will be critical to success. Third, the government alone cannot successfully address Oakland County's current and future housing needs. A collaborative public-private and nonprofit partnership will be essential. All parties have special resources and insights to bring to the table. All parties will be critical for molding the proper solution and ensuring its implementation. Fourth, we want to make it clear that addressing the county's challenges will inevitably require sacrifice and compromise. There are simply too few resources and too many contentious issues to address all challenges as an outside observer might

suggest. We firmly believe that engaging the various stakeholders to address the issues and reach compromise is fundamental to the county's future. Our discussions with various stakeholders convince us that the will to do so is there.

We divide our recommendations into supply-side interventions—those adopted to increase the number of affordable units—and demand-side interventions—those adopted to make the existing units more affordable to individual households. In addition to the interventions listed below, *we strongly recommend the adoption of a series of community indicators* that can be used to continually monitor community conditions and enable adjustments in strategies in a timely and proactive manner. We identify and discuss several potential indicators in the final chapter of this report.

Supply-Side Interventions

Actions to Address Land and Development Costs.

- Initiate a thorough review of regulatory barriers
- Explicitly address affordability and regulatory barriers in the County's review of local land use plans
- Conduct a campaign to train local planners, development officials, and elected officials on potential regulatory barriers
- Explore adoption of smart rehab codes
- Enhance the training of code enforcement officials
- Consider alternative administrative arrangements for integrating disbursed regulatory functions
- Ensure greater awareness of development procedures and regulations
- Promote the utilization of innovative and cost-saving construction techniques
- Provide developer density bonuses
- Create Community Land Trusts (CLTs)
- Support urban homesteading
- Provide publicly-owned land for development of affordable housing
- Investigate the utility of creating a land bank authority for publicly owned land
- Initiate a systematic study of the impact of land costs on housing price

Actions to Directly Increase the Supply of Affordable Units.

- Increase government financial assistance for affordable housing developments
- Create a housing trust fund
- Promote the creation of employer-assisted housing programs
- Implement inclusionary zoning and/or development set-aside programs
- Provide developer density bonuses
- Increase the availability of multifamily rental housing in communities where it is lacking

- Encourage localities to provide more housing alternatives to the large lot and/or large house that is becoming prevalent.
- Promote infill construction and rehabilitation of existing units
- Work with HUD, MSHDA, and owners of subsidized projects with expiring subsidies to preserve the units as affordable.
- Consider targeting a portion of newly subsidized units to highest need populations.

Actions to Reduce Opposition to Affordable Housing (i.e. NIMBYism)

- Increase the public's understanding of the true impact of affordable housing on property values
- Increase the public's understanding of what affordability means
- Increase public awareness of the success of mixed-income communities
- Encourage builders to utilize proven design techniques for increasing acceptance of affordable housing
- Provide counseling or special services to those moving into subsidized units to help them adapt to ownership and their community
- Identify local planning and land use practices that lead to concentrations of affordable housing
- Conduct a campaign to improve racial understanding

Other Actions.

- Formally declare housing affordability as a priority for the county and appoint a central contact for making it a reality
- Support repair and energy improvements to rental units and homeowner units
- Continue to support construction of condominiums and townhouses
- Support creation of new housing options for the elderly
- Help improve the capacity of nonprofit developers
- Improve inter-jurisdictional collaboration on housing practices
- Improve coordination of housing and transportation (and other infrastructure) planning
- Investigate the desirability of increasing allowable densities in areas with existing infrastructure and surplus housing capacity
- Create geographically-targeted incentive programs to encourage development in communities with existing infrastructure and surplus housing capacity
- Track and utilize community indicators
- Consider adoption of MSHDA's recommendations for special needs populations as outlined in its five-year action plan

Demand-Side Interventions

- Promote the creation of employer-assisted housing programs
- Provide targeted property tax relief for vulnerable households

- Initiate a systematic study of the impact of property taxes on housing price since passage of Proposal A
- Increase support for utility payment assistance programs
- Increase support for mortgage foreclosure prevention counseling and financial programs
- Increase support of downpayment assistance programs
- Use government bank deposits as linked-deposits for interest buy-downs
- Promote use of FHA's home equity conversion mortgage
- Increase support for broader housing counseling
- Consider new forms of government financial assistance for rental subsidies
- Consider adoption of MSHDA's recommendations for special needs populations as outlined in its five-year action plan

Detail of Major Findings

Here we specify some of the major findings in each of our categories of analysis so that readers have a more complete understanding of the broad findings presented above. Additional detail on these findings, as well as other findings not specified here is available in the body of the report.

Economic Overview

Oakland County continues to fuel the economy of the region and state. It saw tremendous job growth during the boon years of the 1990s. Growth slowed during the first part of this decade, but has moved back towards gains that are expected to continue at a moderate, but respectable pace through the decade. It is not immune from the overall economic trends of the state, but it is better poised to adapt to economic change than much of the state. The county's jobs are increasingly high-paid and require higher education. It serves as the primary job center for its residents and much of the region, though a growing number of the commuters into the county are former Oakland County residents.

- ***The decade of the 1990's was one of consistent economic growth for Oakland County.*** By one estimate, the county gained about 183,000 jobs from 1991-2000.
- By far, ***the major drivers of this growth were service-sector jobs***, such as business services, health services, and engineering and management services. Oakland tends to have far more managerial and professional workers than most places in the state, many of them in scientific and technical industries. Almost half of all county workers (45%) have occupations that are considered management, professional or technical in nature. Sales and office jobs account for almost 27% of jobs. ***Increasingly, jobs in the county pay high wages and require a high level of education.***
- ***Recession in the early part of the 2000s led to significant job losses.*** The county experienced annual losses of 11,000 to 15,000 private sector, full-time jobs through 2004. Over half of the losses were in manufacturing, but professional and business services, particularly in technology and business support activities also accounted for many losses.
- ***Employment grew in the latter part of 2004 and is predicted to continue to grow through the end of the decade at steady, but not spectacular rates.***
- In spite of more recent losses, ***the county accounted for a growing share of all jobs in the state***—1.5 to 2 percentage points more in 2003 than 1990.
- ***Oakland County has consistently lower unemployment percentages than in most of the state.*** Only Washtenaw and Livingston counties fare better in the region for unemployment.
- ***Oakland County provides the vast majority of jobs for its residents***, and this dominance has grown over the years.
- ***Many, people are coming from outside of Oakland County to work in the county***—5.5 times more Wayne County residents, 16 times more Macomb County residents, and 18 times more Genesee County residents commuted to Oakland to work in 2000 than in 1960. ***Many of the Macomb and Genesee commuters are former Oakland County residents.***

Population and Household Change

Oakland County's population and household trends complement its economic growth. Population grew by over 10 percent, and households grew by almost 15 percent in the 1990s. Increasingly, growth has been focused in the outer, less-developed portions of the county while older communities experienced a mix of growth and decline. Generally, Oakland County residents are younger than their counterparts in other parts of the region, though the elderly represent a growing share of the population. As a result of domestic and international migration, the county is more racially and ethnically diverse than in 1990, though the overall presence of minorities is still quite low compared to other parts of the region and large counties throughout the country. Oakland County residents also tend to be better educated and earn higher incomes than residents in other parts of the state. In fact, residents' income is higher than in many comparison counties throughout the U.S.

These results are tempered by some less sanguine findings. If population growth patterns of the early part of this decade continue, this decade would create the smallest rate of growth in Oakland County since the late 1800s. This is partially attributable to a trend that began in the late 1990s—Oakland County loses more residents to other U.S. counties than it attracts from them. Birth rates of existing residents and international immigration have kept the county's growth positive. Finally, a small, but important share of Oakland County households earn very low-incomes. This problem is particularly relevant for single-parent households, and a few communities have particularly high levels of poverty.

Growth, Age, and Diversity

- ***Oakland County grew rapidly in the 1990s, gaining more people than any county in the state.*** Oakland County's 2000 population of 1,194,256 made it the 2nd most populous county in the state and the 30th most populous in the country. The increase of 110,564 people was the largest in the state. Its 10.2% growth rate was 5th highest in the region. The number of households (i.e. occupied housing units) grew at a higher rate—about 15%—with one-person households becoming more common and three- and four-person households becoming less common. Growth varied within the county. 21 communities lost population while 15 communities—mostly at the northern and western fringes of the county—grew by more than 25%. Two communities—Novi (14,431 more people) and West Bloomfield Twp (10,353 more people)—accounted for more than one-fifth of all population growth.
- ***Population growth from 2000 to 2010 may be the slowest in decades.*** Since 2000, Oakland County's rate of growth has decreased to approximately 0.4 percent per year, which, if continued, would yield the slowest decade of growth since the late 1800s.
- ***Oakland County loses more residents to other counties than it attracts from them.*** During the first half of the 1990s more U.S. residents moved into Oakland County than moved out of it. The opposite has been true since 1995-1996. Since 2000, the net number of residents moving out of the county each year has doubled the totals seen in the late 90s. ***Macomb, Livingston, and St. Clair/Lapeer Counties*** all took in more residents from Oakland than they sent to Oakland. If we back out gains from Wayne County, we find that Oakland County exported almost 13,000 people 25 and older to other southeastern Michigan counties from 1995 to 2000.

- ***The core of Oakland County’s population is relatively young.*** 35 to 44 year olds account for the largest share of the population. 45 to 54 year olds (baby boomers) account for the second largest. Most people moving into the county are 25 to 34 years old. Almost 17,000 of the people moving into the county (domestically and internationally) from 1995-2000 were 25-34 years of age. Most people moving out of the county are under 25 or over 54.
- ***The elderly represent a relatively small, but increasingly important share of Oakland County’s population. This group’s importance will grow significantly in the coming years.*** In 2000, less than 12% of the county’s population was 65 or older. This is low compared to other counties in the region. In fact, the county’s population of 60 to 69 year olds dropped during the 1990s. However, age cohorts 70 and older experienced some of the largest growth in the 1990s. Moreover, the county is projected to experience an increase of 104% in people 65 or older by 2030. This is, by far, the group with the largest expected growth. By 2030, one of every five county residents is expected to be 65 or older.
- ***The decade of the 1990s was one of great racial and ethnic change in Oakland County.*** The county’s African-American population grew by 42,907 people in the 1990s. This 55.9% increase—the largest of any racial/ethnic group—raised African-Americans’ share of the population from 7.1% to 10%. Growth in African-American households (71%) was even greater. Immigration brought large numbers of Asians to the county (129% increase in households), in addition to increasing the numbers of Hispanics (65% increase in households). The White, non-Hispanic population, grew at a very slow rate (1.4%) through births. The only racial group to experience a net loss in population through migration from 1995 to 2000 was “White Alone,” which lost over 26,000 people. “Black Alone” was the group with the largest gain—almost 14,000. Asians gained 11,000.
- ***International immigration into the county has grown significantly.*** The number of Oakland County residents born outside of the United States grew by 56.5% during the decade—from 76,175 to 119,218. Forty-four and a half percent of these immigrants (53,009) reported immigrating to the United States since 1990. Although Western European ancestries still dominate among county residents, Middle Eastern immigrant groups of Chaldean, Arab, Lebanese, and Iraqi gained prominence in the 1990s.
- ***Racial / ethnic minorities live in more communities across Oakland County than in the past.*** African-Americans were highly concentrated in a few communities in 1990, but were able to expand more broadly across the county during the 1990s. The 1990s brought growth in the African-American population in Auburn Hills, Farmington Hills, West Bloomfield, and other communities that formerly had relatively few African-American households. The Asian population, has its epicenter in Troy, followed by Farmington and Farmington Hills, Novi, Rochester Hills, West Bloomfield and Bloomfield Township. The Hispanic population is concentrated in Pontiac, Waterford Township, Rochester Hills, Farmington Hills, Troy and Southfield.
- ***In spite of these changes, Oakland County still has one of the lowest shares of minority population among large U.S. counties.*** Oakland County ranks 35th among the 37 U.S. counties with populations of one million or more in its share of minority population (20.7%). Twenty-four Oakland County communities have White, non-Hispanic population shares of 95 percent or more. Fully 83.5% of all households in the county are White, non-Hispanic households.

Education and Income

- ***Oakland County's residents are better educated than residents in most counties in Michigan.*** Oakland County exceeds the state averages in all categories of educational attainment and is surpassed by only Washtenaw County (home of two major state colleges) in terms of college graduation rate.
- ***People moving into Oakland County are better educated and earn more money than those moving out.*** From 1995 to 2000, the county gained 15,000 people with bachelor's or graduate degrees through migration. It lost almost 6,000 people with only a high school education through migration. From 1995 to 2000, the county gained over 23,000 households earning \$60,000 or more through migration, while the number earning less than \$60,000 shrank.
- ***Incomes in Oakland County grew in the 1990s and are higher than in most other counties.*** Median household income grew by almost 10% in Oakland County during the 1990s. In Michigan, Oakland County trails only Livingston County in household. It is number one in both family income and per capita income. When compared to 20 benchmark counties identified by Oakland County leaders, Oakland County is the 7th highest in per capita income—one spot higher than where it was in 1990.
- ***Household income varied considerably by community and race / ethnicity.*** Bloomfield Hills had the highest median household income at \$170,790, while Royal Oak Township had the lowest median household income at \$36,324. There was great variation between these extremes. Asians had the highest median household income (\$76,949), followed by Whites (\$63,221), Native Americans (\$52,250), Blacks (\$50,871) and Hispanics/Latinos (\$48,057).
- ***A relatively small, but important, share of Oakland County households earn very low incomes.*** Almost 5% of Oakland County households had incomes below \$10,000 in 2000; 12% (almost 57,000 households) earned less than \$20,000. Almost 21% (nearly 100,000) of households earned less than \$30,000. While these shares are lower than in many other counties in the state, they are still striking in their implications for housing affordability. Poverty is particularly problematic among single-parent households.
- ***Poverty is particularly problematic in a few communities.*** The overall poverty rate ranged from a high of 23.5% to 2.2% or less. The lowest rate for any community was the 2.2% in Novi. On the high end of the scale was Royal Oak Township (23.5%), followed by Pontiac (22.1%) and Hazel Park (12.4%). No other community had a rate of 10 percent or above.

Housing Stock and Market Characteristics

Residential life, which has historically been a strong draw for Oakland County continues to be a strong feature in the county. In the 1990s, the county's housing stock grew more than any other county's in the state. While some of the communities in the county's southeastern quadrant continue to see new construction, much of the housing growth has come from continued expansion into less developed, more rural parts of the county. Keeping with past trends, most of that housing has been traditional, detached, single-family housing. Homeownership continues to grow and is

high compared to other highly populated counties. Due to various market factors, condominiums have become increasingly prominent as part of that new construction. New housing in the county is generally larger and more expensive than in the past. New multifamily units have also been part of the mix, but the rental share of the market is declining.

For much of the period examined, the market for new housing was buoyed by a strong market for housing sales overall. Prices of homes sold rose considerably over the period as did the estimated value of all homes. Sales have decreased significantly recently to a level that has not been seen for at least a decade. The county has also seen dramatic increases in the number and value of mortgage foreclosures. These trends have been particularly problematic in six communities, all in the southeastern part of the county, but the problem is widespread. Increasingly, it is a problem impacting middle-income households.

Low-cost housing, particularly subsidized housing is scarce in the county. This is especially true in the areas where much of the new construction is occurring. The subsidized housing that exists is concentrated in very few communities—mostly in the southeastern quadrant. Most of it is reserved for elderly and most of it is too small for families with more than one or two children. While manufactured housing offers one option for improving affordability those developments that exist face difficulty expanding and the residents in many of those communities have seen the affordability of their homes erode over time. Thus, lower-income families are largely unable to take part in the new growth taking place in the county.

Housing Units and Growth

- ***2nd largest number of homes and largest number of new units.*** Oakland's 492,006 housing units in 2000 gave it the 2nd highest total statewide. The growth in the absolute number of homes was the largest in the state. Oakland's growth continued in the first half of this decade. By 2004, homes built between 2000 and 2005 accounted for 16 percent of all home sales. Homes built in the 1990s accounted for a growing share of sales from 1995 until 1999 when they peaked at 18 percent. Combined, homes built in the 1990s or 2000s accounted for almost 30 percent of homes sold in the first eight months of 2004. All other age categories accounted for a steadily declining percentage of sales over the.
- ***Growth is spreading outward.*** The outlying parts of the county have seen tremendous growth and account for a growing share of the county's housing. The greatest growth occurred in communities forming a horseshoe-like shape around the southeastern quadrant.
- ***Single-family structures dominate. There is a significant amount of multifamily housing, but it is highly concentrated.*** Oakland County's housing stock is dominated by single-family structures (78% of all housing in 2000), most of them traditional detached units. Almost 89,000 units (18% of all housing) are multifamily. In the region, only Washtenaw County had a higher share. However, multifamily housing is highly concentrated in the southern and older portion of the county.
- ***Condos are growing in importance.*** In 2000, nearly seven percent of single-family units were attached (i.e. condominiums/townhouses). Countywide, 4632 condos and/or

townhouses were added since 1990. Forty-three communities saw an increase in the number of condos and townhouses since 1990. More than 17 percent of homes sold from 1995 through 2004 were condominiums. Condominiums accounted 8% more of all sales in 2004 (22 percent) than in 1995 (14 percent). Condo sales grew faster than total sales at the beginning of the period and remained stable as total sales declined. In some communities, condos accounted for considerably larger shares of all sales.

- ***There is relatively little subsidized housing, most of it is for the elderly, and most of it cannot accommodate large families.*** In 2005, Oakland County contained about 18,000 government-subsidized housing units (about 3% of all housing). Almost all units were in multifamily structures. More than half of all units in projects with subsidies (about 7,900 units) were designated for elderly use. Most (51%) of the units in projects with subsidies contained one bedroom. Large families requiring 4-bedroom dwellings are limited to where they may locate. Only Pontiac, Auburn Hills, Royal Oak Township, and Ferndale are equipped with 4-bedroom subsidized units, and they have very few overall.
- ***Subsidized housing is highly concentrated in a small number of communities.*** Pontiac is the hub with a total of 5,161 units—about one-third of all subsidized housing in the county. Madison Heights, Troy, Rochester Hills, Auburn Hills, Waterford Township, Farmington Hills, and Southfield also had a notable share of subsidized housing. All of the communities with more than 500 subsidized units are located in the southeast corner of the county.

Ownership, Size, and Market Characteristics

- ***Homeownership grew and is among the highest for heavily populated counties.*** In 2000, the county's homeownership rate was nearly 75%—up from 73 percent in 1990. Oakland County has one of the lower rates in the region, but it has the second highest homeownership rate among the four southeastern Michigan counties with more than 200,000 housing units.
- ***Sales were strong, but have decreased in recent years.*** 195,458 residential property sales occurred in Oakland County from 1995 through August 2004. Sales peaked in 1998 and dropped through 2003. Sales for the first 8 months of 2004 were on-pace to reach a 10-year low and the largest year-to-year decline since 1995.
- ***A handful of communities account for more than 1/3 of sales.*** Six communities had more than 10,000 sales during the period and accounted for 37% of all sales in the county. These included Waterford Twp (14,619); Royal Oak (13,588); Rochester Hills (11,480); Farmington Hills (11,443); Troy (11,361); and Southfield (10,795).
- ***Homes are getting larger.*** Although three-bedroom units are most common across the county, there was a 32 percent increase in the number of 4-bedroom housing units in the 1990s. 4-bedroom units as a share of all units grew from 18 percent to 21 percent (27% of owner-occupied units). Homes are also growing in terms of square feet. By 2004, the average square feet of floor space in homes sold was 9% higher than the 1995 average. The median size in 2004 was 5% percent higher than the 1995 median. The maximum size of homes sold increased by 51% in 2004. Homes of 2500 sq. feet or more accounted for 18%

of homes sold in 2004 compared to 12% in 1995. Homes of at least 3000 sq. ft showed the largest growth, accounting for 4% more sales (9% total) in 2004 than in 1995.

- **Housing value grew and is near the top in the region.** By Census figures, median housing value grew 45% to \$181,200 in the 1990s (see affordability chapter for more detail). This increase was due both to growth in the value of existing units and the addition of many higher-priced units to the county's housing stock. Only Livingston County had a higher median housing value in the region (\$187,500). The majority (55%) of owner-occupied housing in the county was valued between \$100,000 and \$249,999. Those units that were valued at \$250,000 and above made up 27 percent of the owner-occupied housing in the county.
- **Rental costs are high, but actually decreased in real dollars over the decade.** In inflation-adjusted dollars, median gross rent charged per month went from \$735 in 1990 to \$707 by 2000 (see affordability chapter for more detail). Rent of \$500 to \$749 was most common (about 40% of renters). \$750 to \$999 was the next most common (27% of renters). Rents vary considerably by community.
- **The number and cost of foreclosures grew significantly.** From January 1990 through April 2005, the county saw an estimated 14,038 home mortgage foreclosures. Foreclosures increased 354%, from 468 in 1990 to 2,126 in 2004. This increase is disconcerting, but it is consistent with increases in foreclosures throughout the country and region. The median dollar amount for mortgage foreclosures rose 258%, from \$36,860 in 1990 to \$137,045 in 2004. Twenty-five percent of the foreclosures were for less than \$48,950 and 25% were for more than \$151,575.
- **Foreclosures were particularly problematic in six communities.** There were six communities whose share of foreclosures exceeded their share of sales—Ferndale, Hazel Park, Madison Heights, Oak Park, Pontiac, and Southfield. These communities also tended to have a relatively high share of home sales that were considered “affordable” for the period in question (see the Affordability chapter). Pontiac’s and Southfield’s share of all foreclosures countywide were two to three times their share of all sales. Growth in foreclosures in these communities was especially high in the last few years of the period.
- **Foreclosures are an increasing concern for middle- and upper-income communities.** Farmington Hills, Novi, Rochester Hills, Royal Oak, Troy, Commerce Twp, Highland Twp, Independence Twp, Orion Twp, Waterford Twp, West Bloomfield Twp, and White Lake Twp. all experienced notable increases in foreclosures over the last few years. This shows that concern that with foreclosures is increasingly relevant for communities with a large share of middle- and upper-income housing.

Housing Affordability

Oakland County’s current residents are generally not facing an affordability crisis like those in poorer communities or communities with extremely hot housing markets; however, *serious levels of affordability problems exist in both absolute and relative terms and those problems have*

increased since 1990. Affordability is more problematic for people moving into the county recently than for those who have been in the county for some time. It is becoming increasingly difficult for people moving into the county to find affordable housing. In many instances, the county's affordability problems are worse than elsewhere in the region or state.

While affordability problems are spread across age groups, *Oakland County's elderly households face affordability problems much more frequently than younger households.* Some communities in the county have especially high levels of affordability problems for elderly residents. *Affordability problems vary noticeably by race/ethnicity. Affordability is far more prevalent among Black and Hispanic households than others.*

Affordability problems impact all income groups in the county. Almost every income group in Oakland County faces higher costs than their counterparts in almost every other county in the region. While problems are especially prevalent among lower-income households, a considerable number of middle-income families also face affordability problems. Affordability problems would be even worse for low- or moderate-income households if there were more of them living in the county. However, their presence is lower than we might expect, because there is such a small supply of housing that would be affordable to them.

Housing cost is an increasingly salient determinant of housing affordability for all households. Housing has become considerably more expensive in the county over the past decade, and it is becoming increasingly difficult for both lower-income and middle-income households to find affordable housing in the county. For lower-income households affordable housing tends to be highly concentrated in a small number of communities. Some communities have far greater affordability problems than others; however, there is no clear spatial pattern of problems within the county.

- *Serious affordability problems exist* in both absolute and relative terms and *they have increased since 1990.* Almost 103,000 households (22% of all households) face affordability problems. Both the number and percentage of households with problems have increased.
- It is becoming *increasingly difficult for people moving into the county to find affordable housing.* Affordability is more problematic for people moving into the county recently than for those who have been in the county for some time.
- Oakland County's *elderly households face affordability problems much more frequently than younger households.* Oakland County's share of elderly households facing cost burden (29%) is second only to Wayne County. Some communities in the county, including several along its southern border, have especially high levels of affordability problems for elderly residents.
- Affordability problems are *far more prevalent among Black households and Hispanic households.* The proportion of black households that have cost burden is 10 percentage points higher than the proportion of White or Asian households. Hispanic households (which may be White, Black, or some other race) also tend to experience cost burden more than non-Hispanic households.

- Affordability problems **impact all income groups** in the county and **to a greater extent than in almost every other county in the region**. Almost three-quarters of extremely low-income households in the county face cost burdens. Sixty-four percent of very low-income households, and 36 percent of low-income households face this problem. These are the highest and second highest percentages for all counties in the state. Nine percent of households earning more than low-income face cost burdens. This is the *highest* percentage in the region and the fourth highest in the state.
- **Housing cost is an increasingly important determinant of housing** affordability for all households. Housing has become considerably more expensive in the county over the past decade.
- Affordability problems **vary considerably by community**. Some communities within the county have far greater problems than others; however, there is no clear spatial pattern of problems within the county.

Special Needs Housing

Of all the special needs populations, the elderly will create the most obvious pressure for change in the coming decades. Although the elderly are the best-served, in terms of government-subsidized housing, the supply is inadequate to meet the current demand. In fact, the elderly are over-represented among households with affordability problems. Moreover, with the aging of baby boomers the elderly population is expected to explode over the next three decades growing by 104% and accounting for about 21% of the county's population by 2030. Given the current level of affordability problems among the elderly, the special housing needs and preferences of the elderly, the shortage of housing alternatives for the elderly, and the sheer growth in the elderly population, significant changes in the county's housing stock and elderly services will need to take place in order for the county to accommodate this growing population.

These changes must not only seek to increase the supply of traditional elderly housing, but also new alternative housing arrangements (e.g. accessible condos, active-living retirement communities, assisted living, continuing care retirement communities, etc.) to serve this increasingly diverse population and enable it to age in place. Support services to enhance the quality of life for those elderly who choose to remain in their existing housing will also need to be enhanced. The county must also consider what will happen with the elderly's existing housing as many current homeowners will decide to sell their homes for smaller, more manageable units.

The growth in the elderly population will also increase the need for housing and support services for persons with physical and mental disabilities in two ways. First, as the population of the county ages, the disabilities among that population will grow. Second, as the population ages, more and more of the children with disabilities that currently live with their parents or other relatives will need to find alternative housing. These two trends will compound the pressures that already exist for the disabled segment of the housing market. There is already a shortage of housing and supportive services for the existing disabled population, and many of the disabled that are able to find housing supplied by someone other than their relatives face tremendous affordability challenges.

Inevitably, public, private, and nonprofit leaders in the county will need to face the challenges head-on. Their efforts will need to address funding limitations and zoning/land use laws that inhibit or prohibit the provision of affordable housing for the disabled. In addition to increasing the overall supply of housing targeted to the disabled population, they will need to aggressively enhance the capacity of organizations that provide support services to the disabled. Significantly enhancing support services could greatly reduce the need for providing new housing targeted for people with disabilities by enabling people with disabilities to remain in their current housing. Accomplishing these goals may require some changes in regulations and funding amounts for existing state and federal programs that serve the disabled. Clearly, housing needs of people with disabilities is an issue that the county cannot address on its own.

The housing needs of the other special needs populations are less obvious because their numbers are lower and their population may also fall into one of the other special needs categories. However, each group face challenges in the existing housing market. Though small relative to the total population, persons with HIV/AIDS are more common in Oakland County all other counties in the state, but Wayne. This population faces special challenges related to discrimination, medical regimens, and support services. Currently, this population is not directly served by housing developed specifically to serve its needs. The need for housing and support services for the homeless population outstrips the available supply. The capacity of service agencies to serve this population has grown recently through competitive funding from the federal government. However, given the overall decline in housing assistance from the federal government, the competition for the funds that remain is likely to grow, and the ability of Oakland County agencies to receive substantial funding in the future is uncertain.

The housing problem related to large families is one of affordability. There is no overall shortage of housing to accommodate large families in Oakland County. However, most of it is for homeowners. As we found with homeowner housing overall, the cost of the housing is relatively high and the result is that more large owner families face cost burden in Oakland County than statewide. The more critical issue is affordability of rental units for large families. Again, there is no shortage of rental units, but they tend to be expensive. To the extent that a shortage of units exists, it appears to be in the subsidized segment of the market.

Housing Delivery System

Critical to proper functioning of any housing market is an adequate system for developing, marketing, maintaining, and improving homes. This system is known as the housing delivery system. It involves multiple participants from private, public, and nonprofit sectors conducting various activities directed towards the provision of housing in the community. The specific elements of the delivery system and the system's overall capacity vary by market segment. For the upper-income segment it is well-developed, well-served, and functioning well. Its strength can be seen easily through casual observation, analysis of housing data, and discussions with housing stakeholders. In fact, important elements of the delivery system, such as land use laws and development processes are biased in favor of upper-income housing in some cases. The most commonly expressed concern for this delivery system was government regulation in the form of property taxes. These concerns must be assessed against the benefits of the services provided through those taxes.

The delivery system for the middle-income segment is functioning relatively well; however, there is growing evidence that this sector of the market is being crowded out by higher-income housing. Single-family homes affordable to middle-income households account for a smaller share of all homes than in the past. Homes are growing in size and cost. While parts of the middle-income delivery system appear to be doing well (i.e. rentals and condominiums), much of the middle-income building that is occurring tends to be on the upper end of the middle-income cost range. Increasing cost in the middle-income segment of the market is not isolated to just new units. In fact, the cost of existing units has grown tremendously. This is part of the reason new units are being sold for higher prices.

It is difficult to assess the extent to which the “crowding out” or “creaming” of middle-income housing is due to delivery system constraints versus basic housing market dynamics. Many of the system elements are in place, but the market is driving the focus of those elements towards the upper end housing. There is a demand for higher cost housing and the delivery system is trying to meet it. Recent market stagnation might cause a shift back towards middle-income, but this may take some prompting through actions from the government such as changes in zoning and changes in allowable lot-sizes, among other things. In addition, some of the inputs to the middle-income delivery system may also be driving costs higher than they would otherwise be. Materials and labor costs are two components, but the most common input identified as a limiting factor for the middle-income delivery system was land cost. Such claims are further supported by the growth in condominiums, which require less land per unit and the fact that while housing size and cost increased over the decade, average lot size did not change much. Further and direct analysis of land costs seems warranted. As noted above, and in the housing constraints chapter, planning and land use regulations may be further contributing to the shift from middle-income to upper-income housing in the county. Infrastructure costs may be having a similar effect.

The delivery systems for the lower-income and special needs market segments have the least capacity. These delivery systems are the least developed and limited to a few geographic areas. The housing stock and affordability chapters demonstrated the scarcity of lower-income housing in the county and the extent to which it is geographically concentrated. The efforts of the organizations directly focused on providing affordable housing are commendable. These organizations have improved their capacity over the years and provided much-needed housing and services. However, there are few of these organizations, they tend to focus on special needs housing (e.g. elderly and disabled), and the system components necessary to support their work are underdeveloped. There is inadequate support for lower-income and special needs segment among the general public and elected officials. Land use regulations and development processes inhibit the production of low-cost housing. In many communities there is no government infrastructure to assist with the provision of affordable units. There is inadequate funding to provide the necessary volume of affordable housing. There is insufficient knowledge of the extent of affordability problems and the options for addressing them. Arguably, there are also an insufficient number of organizations specifically focused on ensuring an adequate supply of low-cost housing. These conditions all exist within a market that is pushing delivery systems towards upper-end housing. The result is relatively little lower-income and/or special needs housing.

Housing Needs and Land Use

Oakland County is projected to gain more than 109,000 households through 2030. Most communities within the county are expected to share in that growth. Under current and planned land use, the county has ample land capacity to provide new housing to accommodate this growth. However, a dozen communities are projected to have insufficient housing capacity to accommodate growth. Six of those communities—Lyon Twp, Novi, Orion Twp, South Lyon, West Bloomfield, and Wixom—are expected to account for 47% of the county’s total household growth during the period. A shortage of over 26,000 units is projected for these six communities. Changes in land use and complementary measures appear necessary to avoid these shortages.

There is some mismatch between the spatial location of expected growth and housing capacity and critical infrastructure—roads, water, and sewers. Yet, surplus capacity is projected in several communities that have more extensive infrastructure in place. Substantial investment in infrastructure will be necessary to accommodate projected growth. The needed investment could be reduced if policies could be adopted to stimulate a greater portion of the expected growth in communities where this surplus housing capacity and existing infrastructure are present.

These findings have mixed implications for housing affordability. The overall surplus capacity has positive implications for affordability. However, many of the high growth areas face housing capacity deficits that will place upward pressures on housing price. The infrastructure needs suggest that construction and expansion of infrastructure in many growth areas will also place upward pressures on housing prices and property taxes.

Housing Constraints

Factors that limit the ability to provide affordable housing in communities with high quality of life fall into one of three categories—market constraints, capacity constraints, and regulatory barriers. Market constraints refer to obstacles that result from the interaction of housing supply and demand. Capacity constraints include a variety of factors that relate to the capacity of the housing delivery system to meet the need for affordable housing (e.g. financing, staffing, etc.). Regulatory barriers include an array of federal, state, and local laws/regulations that can make it difficult to provide housing at a price that is considered affordable. *All three types of constraints exist in Oakland County. The most significant appear to be market-related.*

- **Primary market constraints include** the insufficient availability of low-cost land that can be developed at densities sufficient to meet demand; public opposition to the development of affordable housing (NIMBYism); consumer demand for large units with many amenities; high consumer demand driven by the high quality of housing and quality of life in the county; limited housing searches by recent in-movers; cost of property taxes and utilities; and labor and materials costs for low-income housing.
- **Primary capacity constraints include** insufficient funding for public and nonprofit affordable housing and service providers; inadequate awareness of the need for, and benefits of, affordable housing among the general public and elected officials; and a lack of government infrastructure for providing affordable housing in some communities.

- **Primary regulatory barriers include** the imposition of aesthetically-oriented building requirements (e.g. percentage of exterior covered by brick, type of roofing material, etc.) within subdivisions; inconsistent application of building codes and/or adherence to development approval procedures in some communities; large minimum lot sizes in some communities; and the failure of most communities to explicitly address affordable housing, multifamily housing, or special needs housing in master plans. Additional investigation of regulatory barriers at the community level would help the county identify and alleviate regulatory barriers in specific communities.

Projected Housing Needs

Overall Need

- **Oakland County will need to add an estimated 95,700 housing units by 2030 to accommodate projected growth.** Approximately 34,000 will need to be added by 2010 with another 34,000 by 2020 and an additional 28,000 by 2030.
- To maintain existing ratios, **about 24,000 rental units would need to be added (via new units or conversion of existing owner units). About 18,000 new multifamily units would need to be created.**
- **Need for new units will vary drastically by community.** Five communities are expected to account for 43% of the growth in households by 2030.
- **Countywide there is sufficient land and delivery system capacity** to meet the overall projected need, but **substantial deficiencies are projected in some communities.** This includes **a capacity shortage of 26,000 units in the six communities projected to accommodate 47% of growth.**

Affordable Housing Needs

- **As many as 103,000 households have needs related to affordability.** About 103,000 existing residents pay more than 30% of their income on housing. About 40,500 pay more than 50% of their income on housing.
- **At least 36,935 existing households have immediate affordability needs. Most of these households earn less than \$20,000 annually.** 36,935 households earn low-incomes or less and pay more than 50% of their income on housing. Of these, **20,903 (those with extremely low-incomes) have the most urgent need.**
- If we expand our definition of immediate affordability need to include all households earning a low-income or less that pay more than 30% of their income on housing (i.e. basic cost burden) **the number of households with immediate affordability needs rises to 73,503, with 26,215 households facing the most urgent need.**
- **46 percent (16,835) of the existing households with immediate affordability needs are renters, while 54 percent (20,046) are owners (if based only on severe cost burden).** However, more of those with the most urgent needs (i.e. extremely low-income households) are renters (11,223) than owners (9,433). Under the broader definition of immediate need

(cost burden), 34,483 (46%) are renters and 39,671 (54%) are owners. Here too, more renters have the most urgent needs (14,307) than owners (11,901).

- ***Oakland County has a clear shortage of rental units (about 7,800) affordable to extremely low-income households.*** The shortage is so great that it overwhelms the surplus of units to households earning just above extremely low-income, as renters unable to find lower cost units seek units in this higher price range. There is a cumulative shortage of about 5,800 rental units for households earning less than \$20,000.

Elderly Housing Needs

- ***As many as 27,000 elderly households residents have needs related to affordability. Almost 13,000 have immediate affordability needs.*** 29 percent of elderly households (27,085) face cost burden and 14 percent (12,748) face severe cost burdens. Only Wayne County has a higher percentage of elderly facing cost burden. No Michigan county has a higher percentage of elderly facing severe cost burden.
- ***Most of the elderly households with affordability needs are owners.*** Twenty-two percent of elderly owners (15,571 households) face cost burden. Nine percent (6,779) face severe cost burden. A total of 51% of elderly renters (11,514 households) face cost burden. Twenty-six percent of elderly renters (5,969 households) face severe cost burden.
- ***Elderly housing needs will grow dramatically in the coming decades.*** The elderly population is expected to explode over the next three decades growing by 104% and accounting for about 21% of the county's population by 2030. A considerable share of this population will have modest incomes and need low-cost housing. Minimally, many of the elderly will have needs for a different type of housing to accommodate changing lifestyle, family size, or physical capabilities.
- ***Single-person elderly households would grow by 23,294 households (58%) from 2000 to 2020. By 2030, the total would grow another 18,324 to 81,528.*** The elderly living in group quarters would grow by 2,662 through 2020 and another 2,786 by 2030, reaching a total of 12,396. Clearly, these changes would call for considerable changes in the housing options available to the elderly. Most of the remaining elderly population would live with their spouses.
- ***Subsidized housing units for the elderly would need to grow by 42% (about 3,300 units) by 2020, just to keep pace with current service levels for the elderly.*** It would need to grow by another 3,200 units from 2020 to 2030 to keep pace with the growth in elderly households over the decade.

Housing Needs of Persons with Disabilities

- ***The growth in the elderly population will also increase the need for housing and support services for the physically and mentally disabled in two ways.*** First, as the population of the county ages, the disabilities among that population will grow. Second, more and more of the disabled children that currently live with their parents or other relatives will need to find alternative housing. These two trends will compound the pressures that already exist for the disabled segment of the housing market.

- ***At least 18,000 elderly people have special housing needs related to disabilities.*** This is a very conservative estimate, however, because it includes only a small segment of all elderly with disabilities—those with disabilities that prevent them from completely caring for themselves and inhibit their ability to go outside their homes.
- ***A minimum of about 37,000 elderly people will have special housing needs by 2030.*** Conservatively we could estimate the number of disabled elderly who will have housing needs at 21,000 in 2010; 29,000 in 2020; and 37,000 in 2030.
- ***An estimated 53,100 disabled people 21 to 64 years old have special housing needs.*** Presently, most of this population lives with parents or other family members. We have no estimate of how many non-elderly people will be disabled in future decades, but we know that ***many of these disabled people who live with family members will need new housing arrangements as their family members age.***
- ***Subsidies to enable the disabled to live independently fall significantly short of need.*** If we assume that 10% of all subsidized units (except for public housing which is not set-aside for the disabled) and 5% of all nursing home beds were set-aside for the disabled (both admittedly over-optimistic assumptions), we would find that almost 1,500 units were set-aside for the disabled. Income subsidies for the disabled (i.e. SSI or SSDI) are grossly inadequate to cover housing and other living costs.
- ***Oakland County had an estimated 1,740 persons living with HIV/AIDS.*** This population faces special challenges related to discrimination, medical regimens, and support services. Currently, this population is not directly served by housing developed specifically to serve its needs, though some support services are available and people with HIV/AIDS can qualify for disabled and low-income subsidized housing.
- ***The need for housing and support services for the homeless population outstrips the available supply.*** In January 2005, there was an estimated minimum of 1,293 homeless people in the county. As of early 2005, agencies serving the homeless in Oakland County had almost 950 beds in emergency shelters, transitional housing, or permanent supportive housing available to serve the homeless. From May 2004 through May 2005, emergency shelters were over capacity and turning people away an average of 103 days during the year. They were over 90 percent capacity during the rest of the year. Transitional and permanent supportive housing slots remain 100% leased with people on waiting lists.