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APA AGING IN COMMUNITY POLICY GUIDE

TALKING POINTS FOR PLANNERS

The aging of the population demands a fundamental shift in planning in order to minimize the economic, social and health challenges that will otherwise overwhelm communities.

This guide contains policies that are designed to:

- Help older adults remain functional and active in their communities so that they can successfully age in their homes and communities.
- Enhance the local economic benefits from older adults and their caregivers.
- Combat ageism and tap the assets that older adults represent by facilitating contact and interdependencies across generations.

6 Guiding Policies for Planners:

1. Actively engage the aging perspective in the planning process. Ensure participation across age, language, race, gender, sexual orientation, immigration status, ability and technology barriers, and solicit input in all dimensions of planning and policies.
2. Provide a range of affordable and accessible housing options. Promote housing development of differing sizes and costs. Better utilize existing housing resources, and advance universal design and viability standards to promote accessibility in new housing.
3. Ensure access to a variety of quality transportation options. Provide choices that facilitate the maximum degree of personal independence for people of differing abilities. Design and fund appropriate mobility components.
4. Use land-use and zoning tools to create welcoming communities. Maximize connections among housing, transportation, health care, recreation, human services and community engagement, to facilitate health, participation, security and quality of life.
5. Support the economic well-being of older adults and their caregivers. Advance local economic development policies and planning that support older adults remaining in the workforce longer, serving as employees, entrepreneurs and mentors.
6. Strengthen the community assets of and supports for older adults. Shift the housing and service design model and ensure that community services and assets are accessible to older adults. Promote and nurture the rich human asset of older adults who wish to engage in civic and community life.

planning.org/policy(guides/adopted/agingincommunity

planners and aging professionals collaborate for livable communities
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33 Countries Represented
Respondents by Country  (n=559)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/EU/A/NZ &amp; Global South</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia &amp; New Zealand</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global South</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate **which of the following actions** the local government that you work with has taken to advance LCA:

- **59%** performed a walkability/accessibility assessment
- **51%** incorporated LCA considerations in comprehensive land use/long term transportation or other major plan
- **36%** adopted an actual policy that directly improves the quality of life for aging residents
- **28%** audited community programs and services for their impact on older adults
- **24%** allocated financial resources to support the development of a LCA
- **24%** hosted LCA outreach events
- **22%** developed a citizen advisory or steering committee for LCA
- **13%** signed on to a formal LCA program

**Others** 66%

**US** 34%
**Why has this local government made planning LCA a part of their practice?**

Ranked by region (1=highest; 11=lowest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCA practice</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>A/NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantial growth in aging population and need to better serve this segment of the population</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority identified during a community planning process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A policy window that presented an opportunity (e.g., comprehensive/transportation/pedestrian planning process)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local grassroots advocacy around an issue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on interest or expertise of staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/ies (at national/regional/local/company level) that mandate this perspective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An opportunity to leverage a project or program already underway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new funding or programmatic opportunity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from local officials</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An incident such as an older pedestrian fatality at a dangerous crosswalk</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from business leaders</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most important catalysts/motivators for planners to participate in planning LCA

**United States**
- Cost-effectiveness
- Opportunities and solutions to problems/issues; success stories
- Personal experience or compelling stories

**Australia**
- A conscience and a value system which supercedes personal comfort at work
- Willingness to confront and be argued with

**Canada**
- Angry seniors getting on the Mayor's case

**Ireland**
- Continued Professional Development credits

**Nigeria**
- Passion
- Easy access to data
- Effective participation from client

**Slovenia**
- Intergenerational equity

**United Arab Emirates**
- Future economic development goals

**United Kingdom**
- Economic feasibility
- The quality of the resulting place
To what extent is an all ages lens incorporated into your planning practice in each of these areas?

- Parks & Public spaces: 51%
- Community Planning: 50%
- Community & health services: 50%
- Transportation: 46%
- Civic engagement/participation: 46%
- Housing: 43%
- Buildings & Public Facilities: 43%
- Land-use planning/zoning: 38%
- Access to healthy food and physical activity: 34%
- Resilience: 27%
- Economic development: 25%

n=567
What are the primary barriers that limit your own engagement in planning LCA?

- Lack of financial resources: 49%
- Focus on traditional planning approaches: 45%
- Not a high priority: 40%
- Lack of time: 38%
- I haven’t been asked: 33%
- Lack of knowledge, skills, or tools to plan LCA: 32%
- Lack of information on needs of all age populations: 31%
- Not engaged with the people who work on these issues: 27%
- Political directives/mandate from elected officials: 26%
- Narrow focus of work on technical issues: 25%
- Workplace leaders are not supportive: 13%
- Department policies: 10%
- Ageist bias: 7%
- Gender bias: 2%

71% in Canada (n=17)
40% in Europe (n=25)
28% in Europe (n=25)
What practices in your workplace facilitate your work on LCA?

- Colleagues support an all ages approach to planning: 63%
- Workplace policies encourage an all ages approach to planning: 43%
- Periodic focus group interactions with aging population: 35%
- Special project funding for LCA: 21%
- Elected officials holding meetings with LCA focus: 16%
- Client prioritizes LCA: 13%
- Release time to work on LCA: 10%

n=197
What strategies seem most effective to engage more planners to plan LCA?

- Engaging elected officials, legislators to talk about LCA: 65%
- Hosting training or seminars on planning LCA: 56%
- Hosting participatory meetings with planners and community residents on LCA: 50%
- Undertaking tactical urbanism activities: 42%
- Providing written information on changing demographics and related issues: 41%
- Launching public campaigns or advertisements about LCA: 38%
- Participating in a community-wide LCA initiative: 35%
- Inviting planners to speak at community meetings on LCA: 33%

- 75% in Canada (n=16)
- 65% in Europe (n=26)
- 50% in Europe (n=26)

n=284
Recommendations:

• Ensure that planners/decision-makers understand the substantial growth in aging population and its implications in their community
• Actively engage local community in the planning process for a variety of local planning efforts
• Advocate for policies that mandate an all-ages perspective in planning, while leaving room for local flexibility
• Help the business community to realize how planning for all ages can catalyze revenue-generating opportunities
• Leverage colleagues’ support for an all-ages approach to planning, to advocate for workplace policies that encourage this approach
• Invite city planners/decision-makers to present at public events, to bring them into the conversation and generate commitment
Thank you!

Stephanie K. Firestone  
Senior Strategic Policy Advisor,  
AARP International  
sfirestone@aarp.org  
Tel: 202-434-3787  
Twitter: @firekrone
Engaging Local Planners – Best Practices from Around the World

AARP, Livable Communities Conference 2018

Michael Amabile, AICP
Overview

- Background and Initial Research
- Process
- Best Practice Examples
  - City
  - Neighborhood
  - Site Specific
- Additional Research
Background and Initial Research

- Arup and AARP teamed up in late 2017
- First project was a collection of best practices in “planning livable communities”
  - Plans, Policies, Programs, Projects, People
- Presented at APA 2018
Safe Streets for Seniors

New York City Department of Transportation
New York, New York

With work in 41 designated focus areas, Safe Streets for Seniors has substantially improved the safety of New York City streets for all users, including seniors.

68% decrease in pedestrian injuries at one project area
Shaping Aging Neighborhoods

Arup
Milan, Italy

Shaping Aging Neighborhoods creates a set of 24 actions to improve life for older people in Gallaratese.

25% of the population in Gallaratese is 80 years or older
Bürgerbuses

Pro Bürgerbuses
North Rhein-Westphalia, Germany

Bürgerbuses provide seniors an affordable way to stay connected in areas where few transportation options exist.

125 bürgerbuses operate in the state of North Rhein-Westphalia
Access Advisory Panel

City of Melville
Melville, Australia

The City of Melville Access Advisory Panel provides comments on accessibility for major projects, improving their design.

40+ projects have been analyzed by the access advisory panel
Current Collaboration and Research Process

- International cities using *urban planning tools* to pursue a goal of becoming an age-friendly city
  - Initial desktop research – including Arup’s network
  - Literature review – popular and academic resources
  - Short list – 37 cities identified
  - Filtered this list with AARP
  - Case Studies – using research and interviews
- How can we use this research?
Short List

- Singapore
- Manchester
- London
- Toyama
- Birmingham
- Vancouver
- Gothenburg
- Barcelona
- Viborg
- Oslo
Age-Friendly Housing
Citywide Action

Vancouver, Canada

The Housing Vancouver Strategy built 7,131 new housing units in 2017

1,702 of these were social and supportive housing

591 were new accessory dwelling laneway houses

60 actions are in Vancouver’s Age-Friendly Action Plan
Nordre Aker
Neighborhood Action

Oslo, Norway

A pilot program in Oslo’s Nordre Aker district included the development and testing of 21 different age-friendly initiatives.

Now, Oslo is making a citywide age-friendly action plan, and they have the lessons of the pilot to inform the citywide plan.

50,000 more seniors will live in Oslo by 2040.
Kampung Admiralty
Site-Specific Action

*Singapore*

Kampung Admiralty has 100 new senior apartments integrated into a comprehensive age-friendly environment.

The development has a healthcare center, childcare center, over 15 shops, a grocery store, community garden, and more.

**50 programs** were planned for seniors in the first 10 months of occupancy.
Next Steps

- How can AARP use this research?
- What can cities learn from this research?
- How does this research help Arup’s work?
Thank You

Michael.Amable@arup.com
York
An Evolving Asset Based City, Creating Liveable Communities
Health and wellbeing challenges

• We have an aging population with people living longer
• 1 in 10 older people suffer from chronic loneliness
• 37% of respondents to the 2017 York Older People’s survey said they felt socially isolated
• Demand on services will outstrip available funding
• Often, our first contact with a person is at the point of crisis
• Our system creates dependency on services
• We don’t always take an asset based approach
• Therefore, we need to think and act differently
Civil Society Strategy - foundations of social value
Age-friendly and inclusive volunteering:
Review of community contributions in later life

Centre for Ageing Better
www.ageing-better.org.uk
Age-friendly, inclusive volunteering is:

- Enabled and supported
- Flexible and responsive
- Sociable and connected

- Valued and appreciated
- Meaningful and purposeful
- Makes good use of my strengths
Practical barriers
- Cost
- Language

Structural barriers
- Inflexible offers
- Lack of neutral spaces

Emotional barriers
- Lack of confidence
- Fear of overcommitment

Transport needs
Physical access
Lack of resources
Digital divide
Bureaucracy
Stigma/sterotype
Lack of welcome
Not feeling valued
People Helping People
Volunteering and Social Action strategy

Support Helping Others
Community Giving Skills

Make a difference involved engaged
Purpose valued
Training awareness
Make a difference involved
Funding passionate
Opportunity meaningful
Knowledge develop
Commitment appreciates
Connect contribute

People Helping People
Defining Characteristics

LEADERSHIP

SOCIAL ACTION TO ADDRESS CITY NEEDS

SUITEABLE VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES

FOCUS ON IMPACT

People Helping People
Community Health Champions
Asset based approaches connecting
WE RUN TO HELP PEOPLE AND PROJECTS IN YORK

From hanging curtains for Mr H because he can't manage it on his own, to shovelling a tonne of compost for the Food Growers Group so they can grow vegetables - every GoodGym run is different.

GET INVOLVED

MISSION RUNS
Run to help older people with one-off tasks in York
FIND OUT MORE

COACH RUNS
Run regularly to see an isolated older person in York
FIND OUT MORE

GROUP RUNS
Run with a group to help community projects in York
FIND OUT MORE
Adult Social Care

Communities Teams

Public Health

Sport & Leisure

Environmental/Parks Services

Reduced isolation and loneliness

Increased volunteering

Increased mental well-being

Increased physical activity

Improved local public realm
The Asset-Based Area

1. Mapping assets
2. Relocating power
3. Early intervention
4. Resilience
5. Social Value

Making an area asset-based is difficult, but not necessarily complex. The asset-based area:

1. Maintains a living map of local assets including: state budgets, social action, community groups and charities, services, private sector and enterprise, buildings, land and the money people themselves spend on care and support.

2. Actively relocates power to its citizens, seeing its role as working with, not for, people and bringing individuals and groups together. It sees partnership as its default mode with all of its staff and partners trained in asset-based thinking and co-production.

3. Invests in early intervention and community capacity building, understanding their outcomes and increasing investment in programmes which work.

4. Expects all its activities and services to build people’s resilience and social connections with investment in models which demonstrate this.

5. Uses the Social Value Act principles by default in all contracting and grant making.
The Asset-Based Area

6. Local enterprise
7. Mutualism
8. Neighbourhoods
9. Invests in social action
10. Shared measures

6. Builds and sustains social and community enterprise\(^\text{8}\) to increase the range of support models and accessible activities, in addition to developing and nurturing partnerships with local business.

7. Builds mutualism and shared ownership, including through use of the Localism Act, which increases year on year the proportion of the public service workforce who have current and recent lived experience of using services.\(^\text{7}\)

8. Thinks in terms of neighbourhoods rather than statutory boundaries, and invests in connecting people within and between those neighbourhoods, alongside developing community capacity using a variety of asset-based models.

9. Measures all forms of social action including volunteering, and increasing investment in them, rather than seeing volunteering as “free”.\(^\text{8}\)

10. Has a shared set of outcomes measures for changes in people’s lives, such as: wellbeing, resilience, independence, access to peer support and the ability to self-care. These measures can be used to understand the impact and cost-effectiveness of services.
OUR CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT MODEL

City leaders can build more vibrant communities with support from their citizens.

START WITH CITY LEADERSHIP
Mayors and other city leaders must be involved for effective and authentic citizen engagement.

IDENTIFY A CHALLENGE
City leaders are uniquely positioned to identify challenges that impact the city at large.

DELIBERATE WITH THE COMMUNITY
Better solutions are unearthed when citizens and city leaders come together.

GET TO WORK
When city leaders and citizens collectively take action, stronger results are generated and trust is built.

SHOW IMPACT
With real results, city leaders can celebrate success and fuel further citizen engagement.

BUILD TRUST

SUSTAIN ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION