



Share Housing Facilitated Session

Developing a model and incubating ideas

- Using what we have
- Creating something new
- A synthesis of what exists and what is yet to exist

Who is share housing appropriate for? Who is this model for?

When is share housing not appropriate?

What building infrastructure exists and could be harnessed towards share housing solutions?

What customised approaches to building design and location could be explored?

What creative approaches to funding and resources can we identify?

What support arrangements currently exist that could be harnessed?

What service delivery model for providing support is ideal? How would you design a program of support geared to housing sustainability including share housing options?

Who provides support?

What support is provided?

Where is support provided?

What is the level of intensity of support?

What is the approach to support? Assertive, proactive, persistent, protective, what else?

How is support coordinated?

What skills do support workers need?

How will the model be sustained?

What are the risks and how can they be managed?

What are the opportunities and how can we realise them?

How can we support share housing models that exist and are emerging? How can we generate momentum and share ideas.

Draw a picture that explains a share house model:

Mental Health Providers Forum – Mental Health and Housing Report

Source:

https://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/sites/default/files/Mental_Health_and_Housing_report_2016_1.pdf

Housing options for older people - USC

Source: <http://www.usc.edu.au/explore/structure/faculty-of-arts-business-and-law/faculty-research/senior-living>

‘Student-style share housing for seniors and residential developments throwing the young in with the old are ideal outcomes from a major southeast Queensland report on living arrangements for older Australians.

The University of Sunshine Coast research, which focused on the accommodation needs of the over-55s in Brisbane and the Sunshine Coast, also found a clear need for more variety, choice and flexibility of housing models for the region’s booming seniors community.

But the paper’s authors, who accepted the Planning Institute of Australia Queensland award for research and teaching at the weekend, found planning laws and cultural stereotypes were standing in the way of progress.

Deicke Richards’ architect Phil Smith, who collaborated with USC’s Claudia Baldwin and Caroline Osborne on *Infill Development for Older Australians in South East Queensland*, said there was a growing need to “get it right” when it came to housing seniors.

That was especially the case for Brisbane’s so-called “Peter Pan neighbourhoods”, which the report described as being built to for residents “who will never age, will never face unexpected disabilities or economic fallouts, will always be able to count on substantial affluence and valid driver’s licenses, acting according to frozen-in-time lifestyles”.

Based on these and other findings from the year-long study, Mr Smith said the right approach meant fresher, more innovative in-fill planning and development that ran counter to commonly held assumptions the needs of older people were vastly different from the rest of the community.

“While we get these messages from the community that there are big, insurmountable differences between these two social groups – old people and young people – what we found through our research was that there’s actually a whole lot of alignment in terms of what seniors want and what young people want from their housing,” he said.

“We found that seniors, especially in Brisbane, valued being close to public transport, service, and employment – especially casual employment – and a diversity of housing stock which is typically what’s taken into account when planning housing for younger people.

“So, in an ideal world, I’d like to see a greater acceptance of seniors and young people living closely together – there are ways to ‘design out’ some of the conflicts that may occur, but at the end of the day you’re still facilitating the kind of interaction we identified as being vital to the health and wellbeing of seniors.”

As part of the project, various housing typologies were presented to, and considered by, a group of more than 40 seniors from Brisbane and the Sunshine Coast.

Though several of the designs were like the mixed-use, high-rise infill developments unfurling across the city, one design showed a conceptual share-house featuring communal living spaces and private quarters.

Mr Smith said the idea was conceived in response to the number of seniors who lived in suburbia and were usually ultimately forced to sell-up and move into aged care facilities, often suffering a financial loss at a time they could least afford to.

“We designed the house with the idea that two, three, or four people may come together to share their backyards and create a communal building, possibly looking to tenant their main houses as a source of revenue, and living together in the shared facility,” he said.

“It would be a bit like one big granny flat that works like a university share-house.”

Ms Osborne, a USC researcher, said the ability to share helped mitigate some of the problems associated with social isolation seniors Australians faced.

But she said current planning laws and questions about titling made the outcome beyond the realm of immediate reality.

“We hope that the paper will stimulate discussion between planners, policy makers, seniors and the wider community,” the PhD candidate said.

“We did find that there was a range of really practical, economic and sustainable housing outcomes supported by the seniors – things that may not currently feature in designs from developers such as less parking spaces for the sake of more shared green space, or housing with an aspect that makes the most of the sun to help improve energy costs, etc.

“One key message was that it’s about creating places where people can meet, have a community and remain in that community as they age – these are housing solutions that work for families and young people just as they do for seniors.”

Other key findings from the research include that most participants tended to favour complexes with less than 25-30 units designed to ensure privacy yet enable familiarity with neighbours.

The report also found older residents in Brisbane were significantly concerned for their personal safety than their counterparts at the Sunshine Coast, with differences in the urban environment, including a lack of community atmosphere and transient neighbourhoods, were outlined as key contributing factors.

Infill Development for Older Australians in South East Queensland, beat a field of high quality research from larger universities and institutions across the state and will now be considered for a national award to be decided in Canberra in March.

The report is available for free download at www.usc.edu.au/seniorliving

Share housing models

Samantha Jenkins

Source:

http://www.disability.wa.gov.au/Global/Publications/About%20us/Count%20me%20in/Research/trials_ends_local_national_international.doc

‘Where government or non-government organisations are providing housing and support there are shared housing options. These come under a number of names such as group homes, shared supported accommodation and community residential units. Typically, they are houses in the community of four to six individuals often with similar disabilities and support needs and with staff coming in to support all residents. These homes can provide quite individualised support and can assist people to be more connected to their local community.

Active Support is a method of encouraging residents in group homes to do as much as they are able to in their own homes and community with person centred plans to assist in identifying abilities, skills, likes and support needed. Research in Victoria on power sharing and active participation in group homes has led to this strategy being used extensively in state run facilities as well as being picked up by non-government accommodation providers (DHS 2002a). It is these types of residential facility that could and sometimes have, started to increase in size to take 10 residents or more.

Cluster housing is the other main model used where people have high support needs and economies of scale still play a factor in costs. People with disability have their own units or

houses close together with staff in an office in one unit or something similar. Sometimes these can be quite large like a retirement village, but there are also quite innovative versions where houses or units are within a 2km radius for ease of sharing support staff without being a segregated block of disability housing. Some co-operative models of housing support have also got co-operatives for personal support where they are close geographically. Some cluster housing is segregated into disability types because they are owned by disability specific groups such as the MS society. A recent report by the Centre for Developmental Disability Studies for the Victorian Department of Human Services (DHS 2008) says “Existing evidence indicates poorer outcomes for people with a disability living in cluster housing as against dispersed housing.”

A small percentage of people with disability live in innovative situations such as lead tenancy arrangements or free rent for support type arrangements. L'arche is a community group that are very well established in Europe and has started some communities in Australia that use this type of arrangement. They are about developing a community where people with disability are supported to live in a share house with community members.’

Every Australian Counts

Source: http://www.everyaustraliancounts.com.au/wp-content/uploads/EAC_HousingPaper1.pdf

- There is a huge difference between what kind of housing people would like for the future and what they currently have.
- A majority of people want to live in a home of their own (with or without formal supports) that would not involve living with people other than their immediate family.
- Around a third would like a form of shared living such as a share house with one or two others, or community with others of similar disability.
- No-one expressed a wish to live in a large residential centre
- One of the biggest concerns for older parents and their children is what will happen when the parents are no longer able to care for their child
- Housing affordability is a very common, strong and recurring driver and concern.
- The most common theme of all relates to personal autonomy of people with disability. In whatever way it is expressed – and there are many ways in which it is said – across every form of housing type, tenure and model of support, people say they want themselves or their family members to live in circumstances and with support models that maximise personal freedom.

L'Arche

Source: <http://larche.org.au/model-care/>

Sharing home life together is at the heart of L'Arche

L'Arche communities consist of a small number of households integrated into a local neighborhood. Homes usually consist of four to six people, with and without intellectual disabilities. These people live in a family-like environment where each person contributes as

he or she is able, helping with chores or cooking or perhaps bringing the gift of helping others to slow down and be more present to the moment. The core members, as the people who have intellectual disabilities are called, are at the heart of the home. The assistants represent diverse cultural and religious traditions and may come from various countries. Some of our L'Arche communities also have some supported independent living settings or tenancy support programs. These programs include people with intellectual disabilities who live in their own tenancy setting and participate as much as they choose in the life of the L'Arche community and often have a particular relationship with one of the households.

NOTES