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## Background

The Designing for Healthy Cognitive Ageing (DesHCA) aimed to test, understand, and identify facilitators and barriers for various stakeholders, including older people, in achieving cognitively sustainable housing, in both new-build and retrofit contexts.

The DesHCA project has developed a co-produced legacy tool called ‘Our House’ as part of its Work-Package 4, led by Professors McCall and Rutherford. The archived data attached to this work-package has been generated from 10 playtests of the serious game legacy tool that was developed. Our House is a serious game that was developed to generate research insights on how to deliver housing for older people that is cognitively sustainable and inclusive.

## Overview

These are the first set of notes (1 of 1) from playtest session 8, which took place on the 25th of November 2023. The playtest comprised of 5 participants.

These notes have been fully anonymised, with all identifiable characteristics, including the participants’ names, removed, or replaced with pseudonyms.

**Notes from playtest on 25 Nov 2023**

Location: London, at the house of one of the participants

Number of participants – 6 (all older adults, 2 work as architects)

**Structure of playtest:**

The playtest was more informal and less structured. Shorter playtest meant that there were no financial restrictions to make modifications to the home.

**Key points arising from the playtest:**

* less discussions around tenure, funding, permissions focusing more on the actual experiences of living in the house and modifying it.
* Participants drew from experiences of family (older parents), friends etc dealing with home modifications to support physical (and cognitive) ageing.
* There were many discussions on intergenerational living, and a consensus of it as a potential solution to tackle our changing social needs as we age in place and to continue to live in our homes large part of which may seem too big or unusable (e.g., upstairs).
* one participant (architect) when choosing adaptations from the shop noted that the grab rails were not necessarily marked as 'ugly' on the card, so they were happy to pick it.
* There were some discussions on how to make garden cognitively friendly as participants saw this as a useful space.

(Susan) when deciding to add assistive tech to keep Susan from leaving her room/house in the middle of the night, considerations to daughter’s peace of mind were made. There were discussions around choosing a compassionate solution to Susan's potential wandering such as using alarms on Susan’s bedroom door and front door to alert the daughter.

(Joseph) The two main things modified for joseph were (I) adding a chair in the kitchen to support him when he is wobbly. There were discussions around improving the physical ‘score’ of the living room by decluttering the space and swapping furniture and furnishing of the home to make it more suitable for sensory experiences – such as furniture that absorb sounds better etc.

(Shawn and Kerry) took a rather future-proofing approach. In the first instance, they swapped bedroom upstairs with the living rooms downstairs anticipating the need for a bedroom in the Ground floor. I believe this was very much drawn from one of the participant’s own experiences of adapting their homes to have a downstairs bedroom to accommodate an older family member.