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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 3) from playtest session 5, which took place on the 14th of June 2023. The playtest comprised of 8 participants.

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

**Playtest 14 06 2023**

Derek: no diagnosis so did not apply for grant. Harder to futureproof without diagnosis. Bespoke tap control modification used to make it physically easy to use. Made adaptation with available budget to make the house usable in minimum rooms sort of a way. Home vs a place for surviving.

Joseph: future proofing bedroom and bathroom; no formal diagnosis. Tried to futureproof but physical needs couldn’t be supported. Health declines or deteriorated more than anticipated which was too much for futureproofing. Big loss of identity and relationships upon relocation – his home and neighbourhood were central to this lifestyle.

Ben: Bathrooms needed adaptations. Could have gotten away with just handrail but assessments say need other adaptations like widening doorway. Could not do these as 20% needs to be paid by Ben and no contractors available.

Susan: received dementia diagnosis. House was at ½ phy-cog score but 4/5 was needed. +1 +2 adaptations would not have made a difference anyway. applied for grant. No adaptations available in the adaptations shop with regards to supporting lifestyle of Susan and daughter. Especially difficult for daughter.

Shawn and Kerry: Identified bathroom and kitchen as needing adaptations. Level access decking floor. Not accepting her cognitive decline, Shawn helps but has his own physical challenges. Whole house became inaccessible. Started with low key adaptations such as tech assist, memory aids etc. After diagnosis of Kerry’s dementia, more proactive adaptions could be made. The couple’s ‘numbers’ are poor, but the narrative is more positive compared to other cases.

**General notes**:

* Using playtest to think about current home of parents.
* Trade-offs between repairs and maintenances vs adaptations to home within the same budget.
* Add an advice service (to the game?) as people do not know what's available or what can be done.