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Different Perspectives on Sustainable Housing for Seniors

• Preliminary results from an on-going research study on how to create sustainable in-between housing for seniors and different perspectives on sustainable housing for seniors on a micro and macro level.

• Project DIABAHS - a collaboration between Chalmers University of Technology and FoU i Väst/ The Gothenburg Region of Local Authorities
  - Four different building projects in municipalities located in the Gothenburg Region
  - All cases target seniors above 65 years.
  - The cases represent buildings in different contexts and phases
Background

• An ageing society
• A housing stock that does not correspond to the needs
• An increase of ”In-between housing”
• A need to consider all aspects of sustainability, in a long term perspective
In-between housing

- Types of housing in-between the ordinary housing and the special housing (residential care, nursing homes).
- A concept including different types such as Senior housing (55+), Cohousing for seniors, and Extra Care housing (in Swedish ‘Trygghetsboende’, 65+).
- Little is known about the outcomes of such housing and how these should be designed to contribute to a sustainable society.
Ongoing research study

- Three different cases:
  - newly built apartments with tenancy right for people above 65 years.
  - the cases are located in different contexts and involves different construction clients, architects and public real estate owners.
  - the municipalities are of different sizes and reflect a small, a medium size and a bigger municipality.

- Different perspectives of sustainable housing for seniors:
  - macro level: different actors of society
  - micro level: senior tenants
Research questions

• What is described as important regarding sustainable housing for seniors?

• How does the design of in-between housing influence the motives behind wanting to move there?

• What is perceived as a reasonable rent for a new built apartment in senior housing, and how does it correspond to the actual rent?

• What similarities and differences can be discerned between the images of sustainable housing from a macro and micro level perspective?
Mixed-methods

(a) Data from a workshop with different actors
(b) A questionnaire and interviews targeting senior residents in three cases
(c) Statistics collected from the land lords about the rental costs, the age and gender of the tenants

* The project was reviewed for ethical approval by the Regional Ethical Review Board in Gothenburg
Workshop

28 participants
6 persons from pensioner organisations
9 working with city planning
4 working with elderly care
3 construction clients/landlords
5 architects or working with regional planning

Themes discussed
Health and wellbeing
Equal conditions and participation
Long-term economy
Questionnaires and interviews

Case 1
Sixteen out of 24 households answered the questionnaire (n = 11) or participated in an interview (n = 5) (67 % response rate).

Case 2
Fourteen out of 28 households answered the questionnaire (50 % response rate).

Case 3
25 out of 58 households answered the questionnaire. (43 % response rate).
The three cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1: 70+</th>
<th>Case 2: 65+</th>
<th>Case 3: Extra Care Housing, 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year built</strong></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of apartments</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apartment sizes</strong></td>
<td>2-3 rooms</td>
<td>1-3 rooms</td>
<td>1,5-4 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of housing</strong></td>
<td>Small municipality with 15.790 inhabitants</td>
<td>Medium size municipality with 40.390 inhabitants</td>
<td>Bigger municipality with 66.121 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of apartments</strong></td>
<td>Separate house</td>
<td>Separate house</td>
<td>Two separate houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common space for activities</strong></td>
<td>No**</td>
<td>No**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation rule</strong></td>
<td>Queue list</td>
<td>Special rules, prioritizing older people in the neighbourhood</td>
<td>Queue list and via Boplats Göteborg***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# The tenants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1: 70+</th>
<th>Case 2: 65+</th>
<th>Case 3: Extra Care Housing, 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Age**          | M: 81 years
                  Range: 64-95 years         | M: 77 years
                  Range: 66-97 years         | M: 76 years
                  Range: 61-97 years         |
| **Gender**       | Women: 18 (56 %)
                  Men: 14 (44 %)              | Women: 26 (63 %)
                  Men: 15 (37 %)              | Women: 39 (61 %)
                  Men: 25 (39 %)              |
| **Living alone** | 15/24 (62 %)                | 17/28 (61 %)                | 46/63 (73 %)                                  |
| **Home care**    | 3 (27 %)                    | 2 (13 %)                    | 14 (52 %)                                    |
| **Independence in daily activities** | Cannot do shopping: 2 (12 %)
                  Cannot do cleaning: 1 (6 %)
                  Cannot climb stairs at all: 4 (25 %) | Cannot do shopping: 1 (7 %)
                  Need help when climbing stairs: 3 (21 %) | Cannot do cleaning: 6 (24 %)
                  Cannot do shopping: 3 (12 %)
                  Cannot climb stairs at all: 4 (16 %) |
Does the design...affect the reasons to move?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1: 70+</th>
<th>Case 2: 65+</th>
<th>Case 3: Extra Care Housing, 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three most important reasons to move</strong></td>
<td><strong>Three most important reasons to move</strong></td>
<td><strong>Three most important reasons to move</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ageing and lack of energy</td>
<td>- Ageing and lack of energy</td>
<td>- Ageing and lack of energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning for future needs</td>
<td>- Planning for future needs</td>
<td>- Planning for future needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Closer to service and shops</td>
<td>- Easier maintenance</td>
<td>- Wish for social community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three most important reasons behind the choice of housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Three most important reasons behind the choice of housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Three most important reasons behind the choice of housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Closer to service</td>
<td>- Housing for seniors</td>
<td>- Housing for seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balcony/patio</td>
<td>- Balcony/patio</td>
<td>- Housing with social community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing for seniors</td>
<td>- Good accessibility</td>
<td>- Balcony/patio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Actual and experienced rent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cheapest apartment</th>
<th>Case 1: 70+</th>
<th>Case 2: 65+</th>
<th>Case 3: Extra Care Housing, 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 rooms (60 m²)</td>
<td>7000 SEK/month</td>
<td>2 rooms (46 m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most expensive apartment</td>
<td>3 rooms (72 m²)</td>
<td>8800 SEK/month</td>
<td>3 rooms (68 m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs per square-meter</td>
<td>1430 SEK/m²/year (140 EURO/m²/year)</td>
<td>1482 SEK/m²/year (145 EURO/m²/year)</td>
<td>1943 SEK/m²/year (190 EURO/m²/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonable rent</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tenants’ ideas of what they think characterize good housing for seniors

- elevator
- no thresholds
- easy to maintain
- close to service
- good accessibility
- good quality of utilities
- easy to reach cupboards
- washing machine
- reasonable rent
- close to green areas
- quiet
- balcony
- open plan
- social cohesion
- social community
- nice colours
- common space
- light and airy
- wheelchair-friendly
- good communications
- easy to move around
- reasonable rent
- contact with healthcare
- central location
- smart plan
- nice outdoor environment
- good accessibility
- visits by a nurse
- light apartment
- safety
- close to service
# Sustainable housing for seniors – a comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health &amp; Wellbeing</th>
<th>Aspects of sustainable housing for seniors on a macro level</th>
<th>Aspects of good housing for seniors on a micro level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good accessibility/independence</td>
<td>Good accessibility and usability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close to service</td>
<td>Easy to maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Places to meet</td>
<td>Light and airy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active life</td>
<td>Washing machine and dishwasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Balcony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not housing for certain categories</td>
<td>Visits by nurse/good contact with health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing allowing for different cultures and lifestyle</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social community/social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Close to service (also public transport) and green areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nice outdoor environment/surroundings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainable housing for seniors – a comparison (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal conditions and participation</th>
<th>Aspects of sustainable housing for seniors on a macro level</th>
<th>Aspects of good housing for seniors on a micro level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good accessibility on all levels, in the apartment, building, neighbourhood and city</td>
<td>• Good accessibility and usability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possibility to influence the rent</td>
<td>• Reasonable rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possibility to use public transport, bike, electric wheelchair etc.</td>
<td>• Close to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term economy</td>
<td>• Flexible plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flexible usage (tenancy, ownership, ages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better coordination across different sectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standardized building processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preventive actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-usage of facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary results

• What is described as important regarding sustainable housing for seniors?
  - Good accessibility/usability
  - Easy to maintain
  - Close to service/communications/green areas
  - Balcony
  - Reasonable rent
  - Open/flexible plan
  - Social contacts

• How does the design of in-between housing influence the motives behind wanting to move there?
  - Similarities between the seniors’ motives to move (e.g. Ageing and lack of energy, Planning for future needs)
  - The differences in motives behind the choice of a dwelling, have been interpreted as reflecting different characteristics of the three cases (close to service/social community)
  - Similarities between the cases in the tenants’ reasons to choose an in-between housing (e.g. Housing for seniors, Balcony/patio)
Preliminary results (2)

- What is perceived as a reasonable rent for a new built apartment in senior housing, and how does it correspond to the actual rent?
  - No direct link between the size of the rental cost and the perception of it as reasonable

- What similarities and differences can be discerned between the images of sustainable housing from a macro and micro level perspective?
  - The theme ‘Health and Wellbeing’ came up on both the macro and micro level.
  - The theme ‘Equal conditions and participation’ came up at both levels to some extent.
  - The theme ‘Long term economy’ which deals with the long term economy of the society, was not brought up spontaneously on the micro level.
  - The seniors described unique aspects about the aesthetic dimension and the soft values of the housing environment.
Questions?
Discussion