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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 second set of notes (2 of 2) from playtest session 3, which took place on the 18th of May 2023. The playtest comprised of 35 participants.

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Participant Number** | **Observation** | **Quotation** |
| 5.2 | Initial goal is to be creative setting up unique floor plan. |  |
| 5.2 | Outlines prioritised rooms | *“For me it's about the big four… the living room, bathroom, bedroom and kitchen… making them as accessible as possible.”* |
| 5.2 | First room choice was walk in shower and downstairs bedroom. |  |
| 4.1 | Wants to focus on creating a house that makes sense contextually. |  |
| 4.1 | Using context of housing style to influence choices in order to appreciate realistic adaptions that may be needed. |  |
| 4.1 | Chosen to create ground floor flat with stepped entry. |  |
| 4.2 | Focuses on traditional style of flats from the 70s when designing the home, aware this would reflect more peoples living experiences. |  |
| 4.2 | When asked, neither party were immediately concerned about the home’s future accessibility. Choosing to tackle as problems arise. |  |
| 3.2 | Chooses to design unique home. |  |
| 3.2 | Immediate focus on included accessible bathroom. |  |
| 3.2 | Describes their technique as being needs focused whilst considering influences on housing structure based on the time of purchase. |  |
| 5.1 | During initial planning is focusing on making the ideal home then will adjust it based on cost. |  |
| 4.2 | Initially chose medium room sizes based on older housing structures but had to reduce based on budget. |  |
| 3.1 | Chosen to build large house using all the budget. |  |
| 3.2 | Had to adjust room size to accommodate budget. Chose to sacrifice dining room and kitchen. |  |
| 3.1 | Wants a single attached garage to potentially adapt into bedroom if needs change. |  |
| 3.2 | Included conservatory that could also be adapted. |  |
| 3.1 | Showed concern toward stairs shape. | *“Some stairs even though they aren’t spiral, can have curves at the top or bottom and you can’t put stair lifts on them.”* |
| 5.2 | Believes vignette would be happy living on ground floor. |  |
| 5.2 | Focused on vignette’s social wellbeing. Included second bedroom so home is accessible to family. |  |
| 5.2 | Considers the ambiguity of their vignette's illness on their state of well-being and goes down the scale. |  |
| 4.2 | Does not feel their living situation is particularly comfortable but believes would be lower on well-being scale if the vignettes family were not supporting them. |  |
| 3.1 | Believes their vignette is happy. Considers the impact of being a widow but imagines this character to have an active social and dating life. Shows consideration towards positive aging. |  |
| 5.2 | Has mitigated needing to adapt a wet room after round two due to initial instalment. |  |
| 5.2 | Is concerned about door width if their vignette potentially needs a wheelchair. |  |
| 5.2 | Is reflective considering accessibility of their own home. |  |
| 5.2 | Concludes their home is not suitable for physical decline. |  |
| 5.2 | Dwells on the concept of widening doors. Does not feel there are many houses that have wide doors or hallways pre adaptions. |  |
| 4.1 | Post second round, team wanted to move but could not see a viable option. |  |
| 4.1 | Chosen to focus on adapting home. |  |
| 4.1 | Found it difficult to find worthwhile/targeted cognitive adaptions. |  |
| 4.1 | Struggled to afford physical adaptions. |  |
| 4.2 | Became aware of potential budget increase if they moved to Mandalorian Estate and appears more excitable about potential budget increase. |  |
| 5.2 | Applied for grant to increase accessibility of home beyond vignettes needs. Grant Manager declines based on necessity. |  |
| 4.1 | Building potential new home alone side current home to measure potential benefits to moving. |  |
|  | Is concerned moving may cause trauma for vignette whose cognitive state has declined. |  |
| 4.2 | Is frustrated at needing two bedrooms for vignette and daughter but cannot see potential solutions. |  |
| 3.2 | Trying to decide between short term adaption (bed in garage) or long-term conversion (single floor living). |  |
| 3.1 | Fights for long term conversion and one level living. Wants to save budget points for potential future needs. |  |
| 3.2 | Wants to invest in grab rails as preventative measures. |  |
|  | Wants to avoid moving at all costs. |  |
| 4.1 | Considered moving but decided based on memory needs could be too stressful. | *“We are just worried that moving could be traumatic because of her memory.”* |
| 4.2 | Chosen to fully adapt home. |  |
| 4.2 | Applied for grant to incorporate supportive technology. Approved by local authority due to social housing. |  |
| 3.1 | [discussing OT waitlist in Stirling]  Review waitlist is 18months. Believes if one can pay for private review, they should do it. | *“There is the leapfrog around social housing who can’t afford private reviews… but life is unfair.”* |
| 5.2 | Disappointed by flood impact. |  |
| 5.1 | Decided to move house. |  |
| 5.2 | Believes that the new home which is smaller in size will have bigger doorways that will not need adaption. |  |
| 5.2 | Moved to non-flooded area and believe sale of house accommodate for 20% needed to meet grant applications. |  |
| 5.1 | Moving house has increased overall budget. |  |
| 4.2 | Would say they are not as happy but relieved to not be impacted by the flood. |  |
| 4.1 | Producing new plan. | *“We are going to have to just use more adaptions.”* |
| 4.2 | [discussing happiness scale]. | *“I think her happiness has definitely dropped but not as much as it potentially could have.”* |
| 4.2 | Reflects on if this was their living situation. | *“I think if this was my situation, I would be glad to still be in my own home. I think with all the changes I would find it really overwhelming and difficult to adjust to living in the house. Especially as it keeps needing to change.”* |
| 4.1 | Reflecting on vignettes situation and their own. | *“I think it would be much worse without her daughter for company. Family is so important, and homes are so full of memories. They help in situations like this.”* |
| 3.1 | Assumes retirement pension is supporting changes to financial situation. |  |
| 3.1 | Considered moving but decided to stay. |  |
| 3.1 | Stayed because of the emotional history and memories attached to the home. |  |
| 3.1 | Believes staying would better support their emotional and cognitive wellbeing. |  |
| 5.2 | Throughout game chose a connective approach. Future proofing for the home and still having social access as they are still reasonably young. |  |