

Identification and Prioritization of Factors for an Adequate Housing Environment: Involvement of Community-Dwelling Older Adults in the Early Stage of a Housing Development Process

Oskar JONSSON^{a,1}, Maya KYLÉN^a

^a *Department of Health Sciences, Lund University, Sweden*

ORCID ID: Oskar Jonsson <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6492-8102>;

Maya Kylén <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2887-3674>.

Abstract. Ageing societies are facing major housing challenges. Understanding and addressing older adults' diverse housing needs and preferences are crucial. Having access to suitable and sustainable housing options can improve social cohesion, independence, health, and well-being. Participatory processes in housing development can enhance inclusion and democratic participation. This study uses Ramlösa Port (RP) – an ongoing housing development project of multi-family housing with mixed forms of tenure – as a case to increase the understanding of community involvement and general housing needs and preferences of older adults. The RP will consist of 100 rental apartments, 120 condominiums, and 30 comfort-housing units. The latter is dedicated to older adults. Two researchers, from the fields of arts and sciences of design and health, participated as ongoing evaluators in three workshops together with four staff from the housing developer Lansa Fastigheter (LF), and nine potential RP residents aged 60 years or older. The advantages and disadvantages of placing LFs comfort-housing units in a few separate stairwells or integrating them in the mixed-tenure residential area were identified. Meaningful activities and important housing accessibility and usability issues from the perspective of older adults were elicited. The post-workshop feedback includes the perceptions of both older adults and LF staff, which broadens the understanding and provides future opportunities. There is potential for innovative housing solutions like the RP, promoting health and well-being in shared residential areas.

Keywords. Ageing Population, Community Involvement, Mixed-tenure Residential Area, Multi-family Housing, Universal Design

1. Introduction

The global demographic shift demands attention to adequate housing for the ageing population. Failure to tackle the challenges of ageing and benefit from the opportunities to engage older adults in housing development processes can negatively influence people's health, well-being, and independence [1].

¹ Corresponding author: Oskar Jonsson, oskar.jonsson@med.lu.se

1.1. Population Ageing and the Housing Market

In Sweden, the number of people 60+ has increased by 65 percent in the last 50 years and is estimated to increase from 2,6 million in 2020 to more than 3 million in 2030 [2]. As people age, housing environments are associated with health outcomes [3] and are important for activity and participation [4]. The housing shortage, inefficient use of the housing stock and population ageing limit the possibilities for older adults to remain in ordinary housing. In Sweden, the category ordinary housing does not include assisted living facilities which are dedicated to people who have passed an individual assessment of needs. Despite the ageing population, assisted living facilities have decreased in numbers in recent years and the wait times have increased [5]. The paucity of affordable, accessible, and attractive housing poses a risk that many older adults find themselves in a housing situation that gradually becomes unmanageable. Moreover, the availability of more suitable housing options for older adults can enhance opportunities and choices whilst contributing to increased residential mobility. This complexity requires a holistic approach to rethink housing options that meet the changing needs of the population and sustainability issues.

1.2. The Complexity of Health and Housing

Criteria for housing to be adequate include accessibility, adaptability, affordability, attractiveness, availability of services, facilities and infrastructure, habitability, location, and security for tenure [6]. Barriers to achieving progress include the lack of recognition and understanding of the complexity of the housing challenge, its contextual and interrelated factors, competing priorities, and the “silo” mentality hampering collaboration between stakeholders [7]. Many questions remain about multiple interrelations and how the need for housing that creates conditions for health, well-being, and independence for as many as possible can be met [8]. Comprehensive studies incorporating health and social factors as well as factors related to the housing environment are lacking [9] with knowledge gaps about the inherent dynamics and outcomes. Integration of ageing considerations is often neglected in the early stages of housing development despite most older adults preferring to spend later life in ordinary housing [1, 10].

1.3. Involve Future Generations of Older Adults

The global age-friendly movement has identified collaboration with multiple stakeholders and the involvement of community members as key components to meet the needs of the ageing population [11]. Community involvement is advocated as having the potential to contribute to the development of novel residential areas that both meet residents’ diverse needs and tackle sustainability issues. The involvement of stakeholders is at the core of Universal Design to prevent overlooking humans’ genuine and diverse needs [12]. Universal Design can be seen as an approach of embedding choices and cues for as many as possible to improve social participation, health, well-being, human performance, and independence [13, p.11].

1.4. Aim

This paper aims to increase the understanding of general needs and preferences to inform decision-making at an early stage of housing development processes targeting older adults. In addition, we aim to describe lessons learned from this case study and give recommendations for future activities involving older adults in development and research processes. Research questions:

- What are older adults' needs and preferences regarding future multi-family housing?
- How do housing developers reason about older adults' needs and preferences?
- What are the lessons learned to inform the best practice of involving local communities in housing development?

2. Method

To conceptualize and examine the complexity of factors influencing housing decisions in later life, we used a framework developed by Roy et al. [9]. The framework is based on an overview of research in the field and covers six dimensions: 1) socioeconomic and health; 2) built and natural environment; 3) social; 4) time and space; 5) psychological and psychosocial; and 6) economic dimensions. This framework was used as inspiration in the data collection and analysis.

2.1. Study Context

The study took place in a context where the housing developer Lansa Fastigheter (LF) was working with the ongoing housing development project Ramlösa Port (RP; Figure 1-2). The plan for the RP includes new construction of a mixed-tenure residential area consisting of 250 apartments, whereof 100 rental, 120 condominiums, and 30 what LF refers to as comfort-housing units (i.e., 65+ units with common spaces indoors and outdoors, and associated services) with a shared courtyard and rooftop terraces. LF's comfort housing aims to support individuals to live independently in ordinary housing for as long as possible and provide opportunities for social interactions. In addition, LF plans to facilitate the start-up of a comfort-housing residents' association with the intention that the association will be able to self-manage future social activities.

2.2. Study Design

A workshop activity was chosen as the method [14]. The aim was to generate mutual learning outcomes for all involved, and reliable and valid data about forward-looking processes in a specific area [15]. The levels of participation [16] were *consultation* (i.e. sharing of needs and preferences) and *placation* (i.e. provision of advice), however the needs, preferences and advice elicited did not have to be considered since power lay entirely with LF. Therefore, it was not a co-design workshop as we adopted a more traditional approach.



Figure 1. Early visualization of Ramlösa Port. Semrén & Månsson. March 2023. [Accessed 06.08.2024]
Available at: <https://ramlosaport.se/>.



Figure 2. Early visualization of Ramlösa Port. Semrén & Månsson. March 2023. [Accessed 06.08.2024]
Available at: <https://ramlosaport.se/bostader-forstklassig-livskvalitet-i-livets-alla-faser>.

LF arranged and managed the activity in collaboration with the two authors of this paper operating as ongoing evaluators [17]. The workshop activity had been preceded by one public information meeting about the RP arranged by LF in December 2021, where the first author of this paper was invited to give a short popular science presentation on housing for the ageing population. More than fifty community-dwelling older adults attended the meeting.

Three two-hour workshops were held during the period April to September 2022 (Figure 3). In total nine potential RP residents aged 60 years or older participated in the workshops, together with four LF staff, and the two authors of this paper. A few of the nine participants and the four staff were unable to attend all three workshops. The participants (Table 1) were recruited by LF through local pensioner's associations with a convenience sampling method based on willingness to engage in the workshops, availability at the given times, and geographical proximity. LF would like to know more about the community-dwelling older adults' needs and preferences to inform decision-making at an early stage of the RP development process. Informed consent for audio recordings and photos was collected before the data collection. LF administered all the contacts with the participants.

Table 1. The participants' characteristics, housing situation, and relocation plans

Variable	n=7*
Age group	
60-64	1
70-74	2
75-79	4
Sex	
Woman	3
Man	4
Education	
No post-secondary school	2
Post-secondary school	5
Type of housing	
Singel family house	4
Apartment	3
Time horizon for relocation	
Yes, in 1-2 years	2
Yes, in 2 years or more	5

*Two of the nine participants did not answer the online post-workshop survey

During the two-hour workshops (Figure 4), the participants shared their unique needs, preferences, and perspectives. To engage all the participants, a consistent three-step varied ways to engage [14] procedure was used in all the workshops where they were asked to use Post-it notes to 1) individually write, 2) in two groups discuss and sort their points of view, and 3) summarize their discussions and conclusions in front of the whole group. A week before each workshop, one of the LF staff sent an agenda to the participants that included a focus-related preparation task to reflect on. The agendas were co-produced by the LF staff and the two authors of this paper.



Figure 3. Photos from the three workshops with the nine local older adults, the four housing developer staff and the two authors of this paper. Photo: Oskar Jonsson.



Figure 4. Timeline of the three workshops, their focus, and how many of the nine participants (N=9) attended.

The first workshop focused on what the participants considered to be important aspects, in general, of LFs comfort housing, including benefits and barriers. The participants also discussed the conditions required for creating a residents' association and maintaining shared interests, facilities, and spaces. Based on the output from the previous workshop(s), the LF staff and the two authors discussed and chose the focus for the subsequent workshop(s). The second workshop focused on what the participants considered to be meaningful activities in the shared indoor and outdoor areas of the RP, including facilities and products that could support prioritized activities. The third workshop focused on indoor housing accessibility and usability containing perspectives from the Swedish Building Regulations, LFs ambitions, current research, and concrete examples presented by the LF staff and the two authors.

In addition to the data that was collected through field notes, material produced, memos, and audio recordings from the three workshops, we included data from a participants' online post-workshop survey, and audio recordings from a one-hour follow-up online group interview with three of the LF staff in October 2022. We used a tape-based approach [18, p.131] to capture the data from the audio recordings. To process and analyze the data, we used content analysis as described by [19].

3. Findings and Discussions

From a neighborhood characteristics perspective [9], the participants stated the importance that the multi-family housing should fit into the area, that noise (e.g. the adjacent roads, roundabouts, railway, industries, and new RP-related disturbances such as waste collection vehicles) should be minimized, and that the close surroundings do not become a large parking lot cluttered with vehicles such as bikes. However, plenty of secure car parking and proximity to city bus stops were highlighted as important.

3.1. Older Adults' Diverse Needs and Preferences

General suggestions from the participants were for example solar panels, not only on the roofs but also on the facades and implementation of smart home solutions. This shows

that the participants were active advocates who were willing to selectively adopt new technologies [20]. Issues reported regarding health status were the importance of considering and including individuals with allergies and hypersensitivity (e.g. cat, dog, smoke, allergenic plants/trees).

The participants' needs and preferences regarding relocation, form of tenure, and residential-area composition were diverse (Table 2). However, the need for an accessible home that enabled independence (i.e. no steps) was a major reason for considering relocation. An understanding developed among the participants that most of their diverse suggestions had pros and cons and that some of them could not possibly be met and implemented by the housing developer within the limits of the specific context, location, and financial conditions.

Table 2. The participants' answers from the online post-workshop survey.

Variable ("check-all-that-apply" format)	n=7*
Reasons for considering relocation	
I want to live in a single-storey home	6
Health reasons	4
Don't want or can't take care of the current home	3
I want a home that provides better conditions for meaningful activities	2
Preferred form of tenure	
Condominium	4
Owner-occupied apartment	4
Rental	3
Preferred location of the comfort-housing units	
Integrated in the RP	4
In one or two separate stairwells of the RP	3

*Two of the nine participants did not answer the online post-workshop survey.

Many of the issues elicited about needs and preferences indicate the relevance of a Universal Design approach [13, p.11] and the importance of details in the realization of an adequate and age-friendly housing environment.

3.1.1. *Comfort-Housing Units in a Mixed-Tenure Residential Area*

The participants had different perspectives and reasoned about the pros and cons of integrating the comfort-housing units with the other types of apartments or having one or two separate stairwells in the mixed-tenure residential area. Early in the series of workshops, voices were raised for integration and not lumping older adults together to counter stigmatization, and increase a sense of community, inclusion and belonging. In other words, make the residential area a place that enables the residents to reach their aspired identities as independent individuals. Later in the series of workshops, the discussions changed and advantages of a solution with separate stairwells were raised to enable especially age-friendly entrances, stairwells, and apartments, lift to parking in the garage, proximity to the shared facilities to promote independence, and more distant children's playgrounds to reduce possible disturbances. However, no consensus was reached (Table 2).

3.1.2. Prioritized Activities

When asked about what the participants would like to do in the residential area, their accounts included a large range of activities. Examples of social outdoor activities were boule, playing with grandchildren, barbecues, and greenhouse or open-sky dining and coffee. Outdoor exercise-related activities mentioned were walking and group fitness training. Landscape-related activities included cultivation work, sunbathing, relaxing, and experiencing varied greenery. Sauna and spa bathing, and bike repairs were examples of activities dependent on premises and products for the purpose. Social indoor activities included bingo, bridge, meetings, lectures, study circles, theme evenings, clothes and books swaps, wine tasting, and watching live streamed events together. All activities should be age-friendly and easy to take part in according to the participants. Possible disturbances from loud and late activities were an issue raised by some.

3.1.3. Important Outdoor Factors

The participants suggested shared outdoor exercise facilities such as boule courts, ping-pong tables, paddle courts and gyms. Facilities supporting social activities included greenhouses (with access to tap water, dining furniture and simple cooking facilities), and barbecue areas (electric grills to avoid the smell of smoke). In addition, the participants raised the importance of alternative sitting places with both fixed seating groups and portable outdoor furniture (e.g. to adapt to the sun, shade, rain, time of day, season, individual preferences, and diverse activities). Other important general outdoor factors mentioned were varied landscape elements (e.g. greenery, trees, ponds, rocks, grass lawns, pergolas, nice views) with well-designed lighting (powered by solar cells), and walking paths with surfaces that are regular, even, and stable. A security issue mentioned was gates to the courtyard with locks at certain times. According to the participants, the courtyard and rooftop terraces should be designed to promote well-being, and both enable social and contemplative activities. The outdoor areas should be adapted to the needs of older adults, including the use of assistive devices, to enable all residents to benefit and enjoy them.

3.1.4. Important Factors for Shared Supplementary Housing Facilities

The participants expressed wishes for shared supplementary-housing premises such as guest apartments and multi-activity rooms with cooking facilities and comfortable furniture that are possible to rearrange for various activities such as dining with 20–30 people or watching large screen together. In addition, laundry rooms, waist sorting rooms, parking for cars, bikes, and wheelchairs, charging systems for electric vehicles, large storage areas, hobby workshops, and a sauna and spa were also mentioned. All these facilities should be nearby, accessible, safe, secure, and equipped with adequate lighting and security systems. The design of the facilities and products should support social activities. In addition, a car-sharing system, a cart that can be borrowed for the transport of goods, and pallet collars for the cultivation of plants, vegetables and flowers were suggested.

3.1.5. Important Indoor Factors

Apartment-related factors that the participants expressed wishes for were ample natural light, floor-to-ceiling windows, panorama views, and accessible large balconies which can be reached from both living rooms and bedrooms, located not too close to the

neighbor's balconies. Preferences related to the floor plan included the possibility of converting larger apartments into smaller units, spacious hallways with room for walkers and other assistive devices, two WCs in the larger apartments, and large adequate wardrobes, and storage facilities. Security systems including smoke and burglar alarms, and safety doors with peepholes or cameras were mentioned.

Common themes discussed related to the apartments were minimizing risks for falls and other accidents, and the application of Universal Design. Reported needs and preferences related to general accessibility and usability in the apartments including fully reversible windows, wide doorways, low thresholds, TV/data outlets available in all rooms with adequate placement, systems to minimize loose cabling, and individual heating systems. Kitchen-related needs and preferences reported were kitchen cupboards that were not too high or height-adjustable, pull-out drawer and carousel systems, raised dishwashers, built-in microwaves, full-size refrigerators and freezers, and food waste disposers. In hygiene areas, accessibility, and usability-related needs and preferences included spacious rooms, no bathtubs, grab bars in suitable places, combined washing and drying machines and easy-to-use laundry drying.

3.1.6. Residents' Association for Maintenance and Well-Being

A committed steering committee for the comfort-housing residents' association and engaged residents was considered fundamental to making social activities and the use of shared spaces work smoothly. The participants reasoned that some of the shared facilities such as greenhouses, rooftop terraces, and multi-activity rooms may need to be booked for a fee. One suggestion was that members of the residents' association could assist with maintenance work such as gardening. The importance of a reasonable number of members of the residents' association was discussed. The fact that the comfort-housing residents will age must be considered. According to the participants, the RP residents outside the comfort housing should be able to choose if they would like to be part of the resident's association and share facilities. The participants discussed the need for a landlord and ongoing work with visions and activity programs for the comfort-housing residents' association.

3.2. The Reasoning of the Housing Developer Staff

The LF staff gave three background reasons for the workshop initiative. Firstly, they would like to establish contact with community-dwelling older adults to learn more about their housing needs and preferences. Such information could benefit further housing project planning and incremental design. Secondly, they would like to increase their credibility, better understand the interest, and market potential, influence the participants to think about relocation well in advance, and create positive ambassadors for the RP to counter local resistance. Thirdly, to meet the city's objectives with the mandatory housing supply action plans by complementing the area with larger apartments as well as apartments that are attractive for older adults. The latter shows that the city used its agreement with LF as a policy instrument to increase mobility in the housing market and free up detached housing units for families with children. The three background reasons indicate that there may be several underlying motives for involving local communities in housing development projects. In this case, motives for community involvement included benefits for residents, businesses, and local public authorities.

According to the LF staff, the needs, preferences, and perspectives elicited from the participants confirmed their assumptions about what was perceived as important. The LF staff were strengthened by the fact that there was a consensus around a lot, apart from how to establish a residents' association.

3.2.1. How does the Housing Developer Plan to Consider the Needs and Preferences Elicited?

The LF staff said they will try to include as much as possible from the workshop discussions in their plans and concept formulation. However, the fulfillment of needs cannot be too cost-driving according to the staff. Some of the needs and preferences elicited were perceived as challenging to meet, such as sauna, gym, and large balconies, especially in a period of economic downturn. Challenges meeting balcony preferences were said to be related to issues regarding economy, daylight, noise, and the circular composition of the multi-family housing without gable ends of the houses.

According to the LF staff, the needs and preferences elicited must be put in a larger context with the diverse needs and demands of other societal stakeholders. Many different categories of stakeholders were reported, such as citizen groups including other RP residents (i.e. the need for generalizability and flexibility) and RP neighbors. From a housing quality and affordability perspective, the stakeholders reported were thus impacting the housing market's upper limits which LF must consider minimizing vacancies, offering competitive housing options in the local area, and the Swedish definition of utility value² which governs possible rent levels. Stakeholders within regulatory policy included the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning, and their current building regulations, the Swedish Transport Administration and the County Administrative Board in Skåne, since the RP is close to roads with national interest and industries, regulations in The Swedish Environmental Code, the Regional Rescue Service for reasons related to safety for the residents, stormwater management companies, and currently ruling politicians at national, regional and local levels. Last but not least, the LF staff highlighted that the owner of LF has high demands on energy efficiency and environmental performance striving for long-term sustainable housing solutions and properties that they want to own and manage over time. This impressive list of stakeholders, which is by no means complete, indicates that it is necessary to collaborate and fully recognize the stakeholders' diverse agendas and truly understand interrelated factors and competing priorities to address the complexity of housing for the ageing population. The LF staff reported that the city has been more involved in the RP than in usual housing development projects.

Related to the housing quality and affordability perspective, the LF staff reasoned that they will not be able to receive rent for the shared spaces, however, they must balance thus reduced income opportunities with values such as a secure environment, increased living comfort, residents that stay put, reduced vandalism and fewer vacancies.

3.2.2. Lessons Learned from the Perspective of Housing Developer Staff

The LF staff reasoned about the importance of daring to take personal meetings with the local community, which may differ from location to location. They experienced the workshops, with 6-7 participants who got to know each other, easier to manage than the preceding public information meeting with over fifty older adults. In the follow-up

² <https://www.sverigesallmannytta.se/in-english/rent-setting-in-sweden/>

interview, the LF staff said that they felt reassured that they could meet and discuss with their target group and felt that they were on the right track with their plans for the RP.

Regarding the forms of tenure, the LF staff reasoned that the participants were open and flexible, not oriented to one form and that each household needed to further explore what it would mean for them in terms of costs. A lesson learned was the importance of details to address needs and preferences such as space-efficient sliding doors and adequate placement of electrical outlets. An unexpected benefit for the LF staff was that the workshop activity gave them a lot of positive energy. They concluded the importance of not falling into a rut, but instead taking the initiative to make housing adequate for the ageing population.

3.3. Methodological Reflections

The methodological reflections are based on findings from the participants' online post-workshop survey, the follow-up interview with the LF staff and reflections from the two authors.

All participants answered that the workshops functioned well. The number of workshops was considered suitable by all the participants and LF staff at the current housing development stage. The participants, the LF staff and we thought that two hours for each workshop was adequate, although it was stressful and there was more to discuss. A weakness was that only nine older adults participated in the workshops and not all of them were available to attend all three. A strength was that the participants were engaged, interested and information-rich individuals from the local community. The participants represented potential residents and could convey perspectives from other potential residents' groups. A limitation was that marginalized groups such as people with functional limitations, low income or low education were probably not represented in the group of participants. One participant had a non-Swedish ethnic background.

The LF staff reasoned that they could manage five more participants in each workshop and thus elicit a broader perspective. However, a smaller group made it easier for the participants to talk, get to know each other, form a togetherness, and share perspectives, as well as for the LF staff and the two authors to facilitate the workshops. About the same number of participants answered that it was just the right number of participants as it was too few participants.

A strength was the varied ways to engage [14] and the use of the three-step procedure in each of the three workshops, from individual reflection to dialogue in two groups and whole-group discussions. The participants valued this procedure which was easy to grasp and allowed all of them to put forward ideas and contribute with competence. All participants agreed that everyone in the workshops had a say and almost all answered that their participation gave new knowledge or insights personally. This shows that the aim of generating mutual learning outcomes was achieved. The workshops worked well and generated many insightful reflections, ideas, and advice. However, facilitation was needed so that everyone could have a say.

The LF staff reasoned about the challenges with continuity in long planning and housing development processes, and that they needed to follow up with the group of participants to not lose momentum and contact with them. According to Fang et al. [21], maintaining the relationships built with participants is one of the major challenges in community involvement. At the time of the interview, LF had no plans for follow-up activities with the group of participants. They reasoned that such activities were dependent on the uncertain planning process and possible appeals that may delay the

housing development process. The LF staff added that the RP was extremely complicated in that matter, for example, due to the proximity to a major road and the fact that many societal stakeholders were involved.

Floor plans were not shown in the workshops, with the argument that it may create expectations and questions that the LF staff could not answer at such an early stage. The LF staff reasoned about whether it would have been better to have something more concrete as the starting point, such as physical visualization, floor plans, and videos from newly built housing projects to provide a broader view and more basic information for discussion. They concluded that a restrained approach was right in this stage, but a more concrete starting point with extensive and detailed information would be essential in follow-up activities with the group of participants to elicit more actionable feedback. In this study, we adopted a rather “traditional” engagement approach including presentations and various ways to engage with a single stakeholder category – older adults – in reflections, active dialogue, and shared learning. An unusual tactic was that the approach was co-facilitated by housing developer staff and the two authors of this paper. Future studies may benefit from more novel engagement approaches such as photo-elicitation and model-making [14] and involving multiple stakeholders [11,21]. In addition, the LF staff reported that they did not learn so much regarding the services that may be linked to the comfort housing – this would also be beneficial to include in follow-up activities. A suggestion would be to use engagement approaches such as participatory community mapping workshops [21] to identify the needs and preferences for services, health, well-being, and social participation. However, according to Hoof et al. [16] the engagement approaches chosen are very much dependent on the context (i.e. aim of the stakeholder who invites, scale, type of housing, time, and phase). When choosing an engagement approach, it is important to consider how to assess the long-term outcomes and impact to overcome one of the major challenges in community-based participatory initiatives [21].

The LF staff concluded that it was nice to collaborate with the researchers – it provided a valuable part of the activity that guaranteed quality for the city and the group of participants. An increased interest due to research collaboration was also something that the LF staff noticed in their contacts with the participants.

3.4. Conclusion

This paper shows that older adults represent a heterogeneous group with different needs and preferences, but who share the opinion that housing that supports independent living is important. Hence, a variety of housing options that enable older adults to live independently is needed to account for different experiences, expectations, and resources. However, the development of multi-family housing according to the principles and goals of Universal Design has great potential regarding inclusive approaches, activities, and outcomes. Housing developers must consider older adults’ perspectives and put them in a context with issues about how the national and local housing market has been shaped, building regulations, and goals that they and other societal stakeholders strive to achieve. This is a complexity seldom acknowledged in research on place and ageing. This paper indicates that stakeholders within regulatory policy have great opportunities to influence long-term sustainability, whose needs and preferences should be met, and which measures should be prioritized. Ideas and concrete opportunities for influence are policy tools through which governments can stimulate, accelerate, and legislate, and cities/municipalities can enhance conditions and processes and set demands on private

and public housing developers. The latter is also something that financial institutions can do to create conditions for everyone to live in adequate housing. This study also shows that collaboration between researchers and relevant stakeholders from citizens to decision-makers on different levels is a promising path for future social sustainable housing development initiatives. In addition, the study shows the importance of evaluating various ways to involve older adults in housing development processes and its outcomes to follow-up and develop such participatory initiatives.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the housing developer Lansa Fastigheter for inviting us to collaborate with the workshop activity, and the participants for being engaged in the workshops and contributing with ideas, competence, and feedback.

References

- [1] Ajani AA, Olapade DT. Building design considerations for healthy and active aging-in-place. *Int. J. Build. Pathol. Adapt.* 2024 Vol. ahead-of-print, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBPA-05-2023-0069>.
- [2] Statistics Sweden [SCB]. (2022). After 60: A description of older people in Sweden [Efter 60: En beskrivning av äldre i Sverige]. [Accessed 13.05.2024] Available at: https://www.scb.se/contentassets/c4ac9fb5ad10451aab0885b7160de9b0/be0701_2022a01_br_be51br2_202.pdf.
- [3] Wahl H-W, Fänge A, Oswald F, Gitlin LN, Iwarsson S. The home environment and disability-related outcomes in aging individuals: what is the empirical evidence? *The Gerontologist.* 2009;49(3):355–367, <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnp056>.
- [4] Haak M, Malmgren Fänge A, Iwarsson S, Dahlin-Ivanoff S. The importance of successful place integration for perceived health in very old age: a qualitative meta-synthesis. *Int J Public Health.* 2011;56:589–595, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-011-0282-4>.
- [5] The National Board of Health and Welfare [Socialstyrelsen]. Healthcare for older people: Status report 2023 [Vård och omsorg för äldre: lägesrapport 2023]. [Accessed 13.05.2024] Available at: <https://www.socialstyrelsen.se/globalassets/sharepoint-dokument/artikelkatalog/ovrigt/2023-3-8444.pdf>.
- [6] World Health Organization. WHO housing and health guidelines. 2018. 172 p. [Accessed 13.05.2024] Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241550376>.
- [7] Jonsson O, Frögren J, Haak M, Slaug B, Iwarsson S. Understanding the wicked problem of providing accessible housing for the ageing population in Sweden. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health.* 2021;18(3):1169, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031169>.
- [8] Lawrence RJ. Constancy and change: Key issues in housing and health research, 1987–2017. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health.* 2017;14(7):763, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14070763>.
- [9] Roy N, Dube R, Despres C, Freitas A, Legare F. Choosing between staying at home or moving: A systematic review of factors influencing housing decisions among frail older adults. *PLoS ONE.* 2018;13(1): <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189266>.
- [10] Müller L. (2023). Bridging the gaps: Realising human diversity in the built environment through Universal Design. PhD thesis. Lund: Certec, Department of Design Sciences, Lund University.
- [11] Pestine-Stevens A, Greenfield, EA. Giving, receiving, and doing together: Interorganizational interactions in age-friendly community initiatives. *J. Aging Soc. Policy.* 2022;34(2):218–236, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959420.2021.2024412>.
- [12] Eikhaug O, Gheerawo R. Innovating with People: Creating an Inclusive Design Publication and Toolkit. *Des. Manage. J.* 2021;16(1):16-30, <https://doi.org/10.1111/dmj.12066>.
- [13] Steinfeld E, Maisel J. *Universal Design, creating inclusive environments.* Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2012. 400 p.
- [14] Brookfield K, Scott I, Tinker A, Ward Thompson C. Perspectives on “novel” techniques for designing age-friendly homes and neighborhoods with older adults. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health.* 2020;17(5):1800, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051800>.
- [15] Ørngreen R, Levinsen KT. Workshops as a research methodology. *Electron. J. E-Learn.* 2017;15(1):70-81. <https://vbn.aau.dk/en/publications/workshops-as-a-research-methodology>.

- [16] van Hoof J, Rusinovic, KM, Tavy, ZKCT, van den Hoven RFM, Dikken J, van der Pas S, Kruize H, de Bruin SR, van Bochove ME. The participation of older people in the concept and design phases of housing in the Netherlands: A theoretical overview. *Healthcare*. 2021;9:301, <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9030301>.
- [17] Bienkowska D, Norrman C, Nählinder J. Research, facilitate, evaluate-the role of ongoing evaluation in triple helix projects. In BOOK OF ABSTRACTS 2010 (p. 33). [Accessed 06.08.2024] Available at: [http://www.leydesdorff.net/th8/TRIPLE%20HELIX%20-%20VIII%20CONFERENCE/PROCEEDING S/0012_Bienkowska_Dzamilia_O-059/Bienkowska%20Norrman%20Nahlider%20Triple%20Helix%208%20Paper_O-059.pdf](http://www.leydesdorff.net/th8/TRIPLE%20HELIX%20-%20VIII%20CONFERENCE/PROCEEDING%20S/0012_Bienkowska_Dzamilia_O-059/Bienkowska%20Norrman%20Nahlider%20Triple%20Helix%208%20Paper_O-059.pdf).
- [18] Krueger R, Casey MA. *Focus Groups*, 5th edition. A practical guide for applied research. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications, Inc; 2014. 280 p.
- [19] Graneheim H, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Educ. Today*. 2004;24(2):105-112, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001>.
- [20] Zhang, M. Older people's attitudes towards emerging technologies: A systematic literature review. Zhang, M. (2023). Older people's attitudes towards emerging technologies: A systematic literature review. *Public Understanding of Science*, 2023;32(8), 948-968. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096366625231171677>.
- [21] Fang ML, Woolrych R, Sixsmith J, Canham S, Battersby L, Sixsmith A. Place-making with older persons: Establishing sense-of-place through participatory community mapping workshops. *Soc. Sci. Med*. 2016;168:223-229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.07.007>.