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by Emily Chmielewski, Perkins Eastman Research Collaborative

About the Design Competition and Insights Study

In the summer of 2013, the American Institute of Architect’s Design for Aging Knowledge Community (DFA) conducted its 12th biennial Design for Aging Review design competition (DFAR12). In total, there were 64 submissions, 34 of which were recognized by the jury for an award or publication. Eleven projects received an award of merit; 7 projects were given a citation award; and 16 projects were recognized for publication within this book.

Projects submitted to DFAR12 and recognized by the jury include:

Merit award winners:
- Atria Valley View
- Brandman Centers for Senior Care
- Camphill Ghent
- Cosby Spear Highrise
- Marian’s House
- The Mather
- Moorings Park
- Rockhill Mennonite Community
- The Summit at Central Park
- The Townhomes on Hendricks Place
- White Oak Cottages at Fox Hill Village

Citation award winners:
- Armed Forces Retirement Home
- Cohen Rosen House
- Creekside Homes at Givens Estates
- Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
- Mather More Than a Cafe
- Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street
- Tohono O’odham Elder Home

Published:
- Asbury Place at Arbor Acres
- The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages
- The Friendship House at Royal Oaks
- Haven Hospice Custead Care Center
- Laclede Groves
- Legacy Place
- Mary Helen Rogers Senior Community
- Merritt Crossing
- Orchard Cove
- Rydal Park Repositioning
- Sharon Towers Dining Renovation
- St. Ignatius Nursing & Rehab Center
- Sun City Tower Kobe
- The Village at Orchard Ridge
- The Village at Rockville
- Worman’s Mill Village Center

Categories for submission included: Built (with 46 submissions, 21 of which were recognized by the jury); Planning / Concept Design—formerly called Not Built (with 9 submissions, 7 of which were recognized by the jury); and Small Projects, for those with $3 million or less in total construction costs (with 9 submissions, 6 of which were recognized by the jury). Note that the Research / POE category included in previous DFAR cycles was eliminated this year due to low submission rates since its introduction.

Project Statistics

The following graphs are derived from all 64 projects submitted to DFAR12, with comparisons to 3 previous design competition cycles (DFAR9, 10, and 11) where possible.
NOTE: Under DFAR9 & 10, dementia/memory support was not specified as AL or SN populations. Accordingly, for this chart, all entries are listed as AL-DMS for simplicity. Similarly, Short-term Rehab was not an option listed under DFAR9 & 10.
### Resident Unit Space Breakdowns, by Facility Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th>DFAR12 DISTRIB.</th>
<th>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</th>
<th>DFAR11 DISTRIB.</th>
<th>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</th>
<th>DFAR10 DISTRIB.</th>
<th>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</th>
<th>DFAR9 DISTRIB.</th>
<th>AVERAGE UNIT SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>441 NSF</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>463 NSF</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>457 NSF</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>509 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One bedroom</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>645 NSF</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>629 NSF</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>763 NSF</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>645 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One bedroom plus den</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>809 NSF</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>933 NSF</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bedroom</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1,176 NSF</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1,380 NSF</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1,183 NSF</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1,194 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bedroom plus den</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,629 NSF</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,798 NSF</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1,612 NSF</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,607 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bedroom</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>2,045 NSF</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,520 NSF</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,607 NSF</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,270 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>504 NSF</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>554 NSF</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>397 NSF</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>318 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One bedroom</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>520 NSF</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>629 NSF</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>468 NSF</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>584 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One bedroom plus den</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>907 NSF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bedroom</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>625 NSF</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>639 NSF</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,179 NSF</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1,317 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bedroom plus den</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bedroom</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living—dementia / memory support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private room</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>445 NSF</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>397 NSF</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>316 NSF</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>371 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-private room</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>497 NSF</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>591 NSF</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>451 NSF</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>795 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared room</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>348 NSF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Skilled Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private room</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>264 NSF</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>285 NSF</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>297 NSF</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>270 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-private room</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>429 NSF</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>527 NSF</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>567 NSF</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>427 NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared room</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>348 NSF</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>197 NSF</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Skilled Nursing—dementia / memory support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private room</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>209 NSF</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>281 NSF</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-private room</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>474 NSF</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>474 NSF</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared room</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>274 NSF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private room</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>269 NSF</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>249 NSF</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-private room</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>455 NSF</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>474 NSF</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared room</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>413 NSF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private room</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>384 NSF</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>311 NSF</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-private room</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>475 NSF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared room</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Values marked with an asterisk (*) were derived from fewer than five projects.
- "Private room" consists of a single occupant.
- "Semi-private room" consists of two occupants with separate bed areas but a shared bathroom.
- "Shared room" consists of two occupants with a shared bed area and a shared bathroom.
- Under DFARs 9&10, Skilled Nursing was not distinguished between semi-private and shared rooms. Accordingly, for this chart, all entries have been listed under semi-private.
- Under DFARs 9&10, dementia / memory support was not distinguished between Assisted Living and Long-Term Skilled Nursing. Accordingly, for this chart, all entries have been listed under Assisted Living—dementia / memory support.

### Average Accessibility of Units

![Average Accessibility of Units](chart)

### Average Resident Age, by Facility Type

![Average Resident Age, by Facility Type](chart)

### Source of Resident Payments

![Source of Resident Payments](chart)

### Average Resident Gender Breakdown

![Average Resident Gender Breakdown](chart)

### Average Resident Cohabitation Status

![Average Resident Cohabitation Status](chart)

### Notes
- Values marked with an asterisk (*) were derived from fewer than five projects.
- "Private room" consists of a single occupant.
- "Semi-private room" consists of two occupants with separate bed areas but a shared bathroom.
- "Shared room" consists of two occupants with a shared bed area and a shared bathroom.
- Under DFARs 9&10, Skilled Nursing was not distinguished between semi-private and shared rooms. Accordingly, for this chart, all entries have been listed under semi-private.
- Under DFARs 9&10, dementia / memory support was not distinguished between Assisted Living and Long-Term Skilled Nursing. Accordingly, for this chart, all entries have been listed under Assisted Living—dementia / memory support.
Project Themes

Though the 34 DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury are quite diverse, several common and often interrelated project themes were identified based on the similarities among the submissions’ building components, project descriptions, and goals. The following describe the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects’ common themes.

The common themes described by the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects include:

- Ecological sustainability (97% of the projects recognized by the jury)
- Using research in the design process (79%)
- Collaborative designing (76%)
- Connection to nature (65%)
- Contemporary (56%) vs. traditional (44%) interior aesthetics
- Household model and person-centered care (50%)
- Extensive amenities (41%)
- Connecting to the greater community (29%)
- Promoting a sense of community (26%)
- Fitting the local context (26%)
- Flexibility (24%)
- Holistic wellness (15%)

Ecological Sustainability

Ninety-seven percent of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects (and 91% of all submissions) report having green / sustainable features. However, only 8 of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects (24%) actually discussed ecological sustainability within their project description text.

DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that specifically described how their submission is ecologically sustainable include:

- Armed Forces Retirement Home
- Atria Valley View
- Cohen Rosen House
- The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages
- Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
- The Mather
- Merritt Crossing
- The Summit at Central Park

Thirty-eight percent of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects (and 33% of all submissions) are, or are registered to be, certified as ecologically sustainable by an independent organization (e.g., LEED). This percentage of projects is slightly higher than the previous cycle, where 32% of all DFAR11 projects were green certified. However, these rates are up from DFAR10’s 19% of submissions. Of the certified jury-recognized DFAR12 projects, 12 out of 13 pursued LEED ratings. One project pursued the “Design to Earn the ENERGY STAR” (DEES) program.

The green features with the greatest impact on the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects’ designs include: maximized daylighting (64% of the green DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury); energy efficiency (61%); and site design considerations (42%)—the same top 3 influencers as for DFAR11.

In addition, for the jury-recognized DFAR12 submissions, 26% are built on greenfield sites (no previous development other than agricultural or natural landscape); 18% are on greyfields (an underused real estate asset or land, such as an outdated / failing retail and commercial strip mall); and 9% are on brownfields (land previously used for industrial or commercial use, often requiring remediation of hazardous waste or pollution).
When asked about the primary motivation for including ecologically sustainable features, responses were similar to those from DFAR11. Supporting the mission / values of the client / provider was the most popular response among all jury-recognized DFAR12 submissions. Other common responses included: lowering operational costs, making a contribution to the greater community, and supporting the mission / values of the design team.

The DFAR12 submission form also asked about the challenges faced by the projects when the design team attempted to incorporate green features. Seventy percent of the green jury-recognized DFAR12 projects reported that they had difficulties. Perceived first-cost premiums were the greatest deterrent, followed by actual costs—a reversal from DFAR11, where actual costs had a greater impact than perceived costs.

In Their Own Words

Cohen Rosen House

“...to achieve LEED Silver certification, many parts and pieces of the home, from concept to construction to operation, come together. Innovations in design (green roofs) and thoughtful follow through during construction (recycling materials) are just as integral as the staff’s cleaning and maintenance methods (low VOC products). This commitment to sustainability further paints the picture of a priceless whole in view of its parts.”

From green roofs to clerestory windows for extensive natural light indoors, the LEED Silver Certified Cohen Rosen House incorporates many green design features. Photography: Alain Jaramillo
Using Research in the Design Process

Based on past submissions and the growing practice of evidence-based design, DFA decided that for this cycle of the design competition, applicants should be asked specifically about how their projects use research. We found that 79% of the jury-recognized DFAR12 submissions reported using some form of research during the design process.

Of those that conducted research (formally or informally) during the design process: 89% incorporated building occupant feedback, from existing and / or prospective users; 22% created 3D views or computer models to better explore the proposed design; 22% made observations of existing spaces to understand operational issues and / or building users’ needs, desires, and expectations; 19% made use of existing data (i.e., post-occupancy evaluation findings or benchmark data); 7% built full-scale mock-ups so that design details and actual layout could be assessed prior to construction; 4% performed sun-angle computer modeling to better understand how daylight could permeate the building; and 4% piloted a built environment by building a case study setting and allowing it to function, while recording associated outcomes to inform the final design and replication of the setting.

DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that described using research in the design process include:

- Armed Forces Retirement Home
- Asbury Place at Arbor Acres
- Brandman Centers for Senior Care
- Cohen Rosen House
- Cosby Spear Highrise
- Creekside Homes at Givens Estates
- The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages
- The Friendship House at Royal Oaks
- Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
- Laclede Groves
- Legacy Place
- Marian’s House
- Mary Helen Rogers Senior Community
- The Mather
- Mather More Than a Cafe
- Moorings Park
- Orchard Cove
- Rockhill Mennonite Community
- Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street
- Rydal Park Repositioning
- Sharon Towers Dining Renovation
- St. Ignatius Nursing & Rehab Center
- Sun City Tower Kobe
- Tohono O’odham Elder Home
- The Townhomes on Hendricks Place
- The Village at Rockville
- Worman’s Mill Village Center

In Their Own Words

**Creekside Homes at Givens Estates**

“We hosted a series of face-to-face and web-based meetings with prospective residents to introduce the concept and solicit reactions… [In addition, to] allay the owner’s concern about the height of the homes, the architect provided photorealistic computer generated renderings of the homes nestled in the existing trees and terrain.”

To help the owner of Creekside Homes at Givens Estates understand the scale of the proposed design, the architect provided a rendered image of the project well before anything was built.

**Marian’s House**

“The designers applied 25 years of experience designing special care environments with a recently completed post-occupancy evaluation of 5 buildings built over a 20 year period. [The study] confirmed many powerful findings about the role of outdoor space, the central image of the kitchen, and the importance of sightlines for unobtrusive surveillance of the environment. Just as powerful was seeing how innovative concepts from 20 years ago were either still relevant or [how the] spaces were adapted to new needs as programs evolved.”
**Collaborative Designing**

More than ever, working with collaborators (i.e., those outside of the traditional architectural design team) has become a popular and effective way to improve project outcomes. In fact, 76% of the jury-recognized DFAR12 submissions reported collaborating during the design process (compared to 25% of DFAR11 projects).

Of those projects that used a collaborative process, 92% incorporated feedback from existing and/or prospective building occupants. Forty-two percent worked with the client/owner’s senior management team during the design process. Nineteen percent tapped into the expertise of another organization, such as the Marian’s House team working with the Alzheimer’s Association to expand the offerings of their community-wide resource center, or the Legacy Place team who commissioned a consultant to learn from a similar project in Great Britain that was also designed for a population of Jehovah’s Witnesses.

**The Mather**

“The entire development of The Mather is a result of market surveys, lifestyle surveys, [and] discussions with existing residents and future prospects to understand their wants and desires for a new community.”

**Moorings Park**

“A digital virtual tour was created in great detail during the design process, not after, to further vet the design and provide the design team, stakeholders, residents, and operational management a clear picture of the space qualities … [The] clinic exam room was mocked-up full scale and then revised upon user input from physician and nurses.”

**Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street**

“The design team conducted 5 separate focus groups comprised of senior management, staff members, independent living residents, adult children of residents, and family members. Each group responded to a series of open-ended questions regarding existing facilities and programs, as well as potential areas of improvement.”

**St. Ignatius Nursing & Rehab Center**

“Early in the design process, the client researched the decentralization of dining and providing choice for meal options. A small dining room was set up as a study. After a period of time the staff found that residents’ health had dramatically improved with significant weight gain with a number of residents able to be taken off of their feeding tubes. This was the encouragement the facility needed to pursue the project with the ultimate goal of decentralizing dining and offering choice throughout the facility.”

---

**DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that described a collaborative design process include:**

- Armed Forces Retirement Home
- Asbury Place at Arbor Acres
- Brandman Centers for Senior Care
- Camphill Ghent
- Cosby Spear Highrise
- Creekside Homes at Givens Estates
- The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages
- The Friendship House at Royal Oaks
- Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
- Laclede Groves
- Legacy Place
- Marian’s House
- Mary Helen Rogers Senior Community
- The Mather
- Mather More Than a Cafe
- Moorings Park
- Orchard Cove
- Rockhill Mennonite Community
- Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street
- Rydal Park Repositioning
- St. Ignatius Nursing & Rehab Center
- Sun City Tower Kobe
- Tohono O’odham Elder Home
- The Townhomes on Hendricks Place
- The Village at Rockville
- Worman’s Mill Village Center
In Their Own Words

**Asbury Place at Arbor Acres**

The project used "an inclusive process that also involved all the vested stakeholders: residents, operations, senior management, activities, physical therapy, nursing, Board of Directors, finance, social workers, marketing, physical plant, housekeeping, and dining services."

**The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages**

"The project team had the added benefit of a Culture Change Planner, who directed the provider to visit communities where culture change models had been incorporated into the campus."

**Laclede Groves**

"The project commenced with [a] strategic planning workshop that was structured to help the client determine strategic ways to develop new opportunities and to create, reposition, and reinvent existing services and environments for seniors. Meetings engaged executive teams, board members, and key staff in a process that integrates forward-thinking design, thoughtful economic analysis, and thorough market assessment to create sustainable strategies."

**Rydal Park Repositioning**

Designing was an “interactive team process involving all stakeholders including administration, architect, development consultant, staff, selected residents, resident committees, and zoning and code officials.”

**Orchard Cove**

"Specifically focused resident committees were formulated by the Orchard Cove administration with the sole purpose of getting [the] participation of respected individuals who had been acknowledged as fair and well informed people, best suited to represent the community in their respective areas of expertise. The committees included: library, dining, acoustics, fitness / wellness, interior design, and artwork. This process resulted in capitalizing upon the excellent ideas and insights that the existing residents already had and allowed us to gain their trust soon after the first phase was completed. By working closely with the various resident committees, the majority of the residents felt that they had been listened to, and the final preferred solution was often close to [being] unanimously embraced."

Incorporating feedback from building occupants, like these residents of Orchard Cove, adds to a collaborative design process—this has become a popular and effective way to improve project outcomes. Photography: DiMella Shaffer
Insights and Innovations

While exploring the ways in which the designers worked with stakeholders, we started to see a trend: Seven projects (21% of the DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury) discussed using a charrette during the design process. The submissions that described using a charrette include: Armed Forces Retirement Home, Asbury Place at Arbor Acres, The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages, Laclede Groves, Legacy Place, Rockhill Mennonite Community, and Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street.

Charrettes are not an innovative technique per se but the prevalence of these sessions and the effectiveness described by the submissions indicate that charrettes are being used as a powerful tool to improve project outcomes and gain stakeholder buy-in. In addition to the traditional architectural design team, charrette participants included: the client / owner / developer, board members, executives / administrative staff, marketing staff, care team and operational staff, design consultants, civil engineers and contractors, residents (existing and prospective), and / or residents’ families.

The submissions described charrettes that allowed the participants to “create a shared vision, understand needs, desires, and trade-offs, and effectively build group consensus” (Laclede Groves). Sessions were held so that participants could “collectively agree on the approach and design for the project” (Legacy Place), and to “clearly define relevant design and development issues, structure alternative solutions, and [create] a graphic presentation of preliminary project designs” (Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street). The charrettes provided “a forum in which all voices could be heard and future options considered within the context of financial capacity and land development constraints” (Asbury Place at Arbor Acres). The charrette conducted for the Armed Forces Retirement Home project even included the construction of full-scale mock-ups for people to respond to.
Connection to Nature

Sixty-five percent of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects described a connection to nature. This was similar to DFAR11, both in the percentage of projects (at 67% for DFAR11) as well as the types of natural amenities described. For DFAR12, projects noted views to parklands, oceans, gardens, and orchards. Buildings were planned around natural site features, like wetlands and mature trees. Submissions described providing access to shared gardens as well as private outdoor spaces (i.e., residential unit patios / balconies). Projects include walking paths, raised planter beds, and rooftop gardens. Some submissions even described their use of natural materials, colors, and textures.

Many projects also noted their indoor / outdoor connections, and al fresco dining and social / event spaces. One project, Tohono O’odham Elder Home, even offers outdoor cooking spaces to accommodate the cultural background of its residents, who spent their lives cooking outdoors and wished to continue doing so. Many projects include abundant natural light, both in common spaces and within residential units. Two projects (Cohen Rosen House and Legacy Place) specifically noted the inclusion of daylight to regulate circadian rhythms and minimize the effects of sundowning in their buildings’ dementia populations.

DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that described the theme of connecting to nature include:

- Armed Forces Retirement Home
- Atria Valley View
- Camphill Ghent
- Cohen Rosen House
- The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages
- The Friendship House at Royal Oaks
- Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
- Haven Hospice Custead Care Center
- Legacy Place
- Marian’s House
- Mary Helen Rogers Senior Community
- The Mather
- Merritt Crossing
- Moorings Park
- Rockhill Mennonite Community
- Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street
- The Summit at Central Park
- Sun City Tower Kobe
- Tohono O’odham Elder Home
- The Village at Orchard Ridge
- White Oak Cottages at Fox Hill Village
- Worman’s Mill Village Center

In Their Own Words

**Armed Forces Retirement Home**

The project offers “a view of the ocean from every apartment and a balcony that is canted toward the ocean. The balcony is large enough to have a couple of chairs and a small table for eating or socializing.”

**Atria Valley View**

“The building concept incorporates the use of natural materials and introduces details rich with earth-tone colors and textures.”

**The Friendship House at Royal Oaks**

“Outdoor garden courtyards with an emphasis on visibility promote ‘fun’ therapy. In lieu of going to a therapy room, residents are encouraged to take a walk in the garden which incorporates specific therapy elements such as changes in surface materials, steps, and other associated activities as deemed necessary for each resident along their walk through the garden.”

**The Village at Orchard Ridge**

“The master plan capitalizes on orchards bordering the community not only by taking advantage of appealing long-range views, but also incorporating an apple tree grove into the Village Green … [The project also] responds to the challenging site by maintaining acres of existing wetlands and wooded area as a campus amenity.”
**Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.**

“The building provides a vibrant and engaging lifestyle by focusing on direct access to social areas that have abundant natural light and multiple connections to the outdoors ... The patios and outdoor gardens on the first floor become places for residents to interact. The second floor has accessible common decks with view of the San Gabriel Mountains.”

**White Oak Cottages at Fox Hill Village**

“Natural light is always important in any residential project, but takes on a higher level of importance for those with dementia and Alzheimer’s, and is often a struggle on projects employing the Green House® and small house models because of the relatively high ratio of resident rooms to commons. It can be difficult to get multiple exposures in the commons spaces, limiting the quality of natural light in those spaces. In this project, the building was articulated in such a way as to allow large exposures into the main common spaces, and additional skylights were used in those other public or semi-public spaces that otherwise lack access to more conventional sources of natural light.”

**The Mather**

“A rare commodity in an urban setting is the availability of a welcoming garden or outdoor terrace. A truly unique feature of The Mather is the availability of outdoor dining terraces, walking paths in an informal multi-faceted garden with climbing roses, quiet sitting enclaves, and resident planting beds.”

**Even projects in urban locations can offer outdoor connections, like The Mather’s rooftop patio and gardens.**

**White Oak Cottages at Fox Hill Village allows daylight to permeate via large windows, bay windows, clerestory windows, skylights, and the careful articulation of the exterior wall.**
Contemporary vs. Traditional Interior Aesthetics: What “Home” Looks Like Today

It is now just as common to find a senior living community with a contemporary interior aesthetic, as opposed to a traditional setting, which was the standard not too long ago. Fifty-six percent of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects were classified as having a contemporary interior aesthetic; 44% had a traditional interior aesthetic. This is slightly different than the jury-recognized DFAR11 submissions, which had slightly more traditional projects (52%) than contemporary (48%).

A contemporary interior aesthetic may be recognized by such features as clean lines, geometric patterns, and minimal details. A traditional interior aesthetic, on the other hand, is more likely to include crown and base molding, rolled arm furniture, pleated curtains, and more ornate details and patterns.

Interestingly, for both DFAR11 and 12, we saw that the aesthetic style tended to vary based on the facility type. Projects aimed at a younger market (i.e., Independent Living residential buildings and community centers / common spaces) were typically designed with a contemporary interior aesthetic. Assisted Living, Skilled Nursing, and Hospice projects, on the other hand, more often had a traditional style. In fact, for the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects, IL / Commons projects had a ratio of 7:3 contemporary to traditional, whereas AL / SN / Hospice projects had an inverse ratio of 3:7.

Not only is the market responding to contemporary interior aesthetics, but these settings are now considered to be as “home-like” as traditional-style projects. In fact, 5 of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects actually noted in their project descriptions that their submission has a homey feel alongside a contemporary aesthetic (Marian’s House, Cohen Rosen House, Legacy Place, Brandman Centers for Senior Care, and The Friendship House at Royal Oaks).

It is clear that no matter what a person’s personal aesthetic preference is, there are high-quality senior living environments from which to choose.

DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that were categorized as having a contemporary interior aesthetic include:

- Brandman Centers for Senior Care
- Camphill Ghent
- Cohen Rosen House
- Cosby Spear Highrise
- The Friendship House at Royal Oaks
- Laclede Groves
- Legacy Place
- Marian’s House
- Mather More Than a Cafe
- Mary Helen Rogers Senior Community
- Merritt Crossing
- Moorings Park
- Orchard Cove
- Rockhill Mennonite Community
- Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street
- Sharon Towers Dining Renovation
- The Summit at Central Park
- Sun City Tower Kobe
- Tohono O’odham Elder Home
DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that were categorized as having a traditional interior aesthetic include:

- Armed Forces Retirement Home
- Asbury Place at Arbor Acres
- Atria Valley View
- Creekside Homes at Givens Estates
- The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages
- Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
- Haven Hospice Custead Care Center
- The Mather
- Rydal Park Repositioning
- St. Ignatius Nursing & Rehab Center
- The Townhomes on Hendricks Place
- The Village at Orchard Ridge
- The Village at Rockville
- White Oak Cottages at Fox Hill Village
- Worman’s Mill Village Center
Household Model and Person-Centered Care

Because building occupants’ mental, social, emotional, and physical wellbeing—and, therefore, quality of life—are affected by operational and design decisions, it is important to provide person-centered care and create physical environments that empower people.¹ Fifty percent of the jury-recognized DFAR12 submissions described a physical environment that supports person-centered care and / or includes a Household in the project. However, only 12 of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects (35%) actually discussed person-centered care and / or Households within their project description text (comparable to 33% of the jury-recognized DFAR11 projects).

“Person-centered care promotes choice, purpose, and meaning in daily life. Person-centered care means that nursing home residents are supported in achieving the level of physical, mental, and psychosocial well-being that is individually practicable. This goal honors the importance of keeping the individual at the center of the care planning and decision-making process.”²

DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that specifically described person-centered care and / or Households include:

- Armed Forces Retirement Home
- Camphill Ghent
- Cohen Rosen House
- The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages
- The Friendship House at Royal Oaks
- Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
- Haven Hospice Custead Care Center
- Legacy Place
- Rockhill Mennonite Community
- Tohono O’odham Elder Home
- The Village at Orchard Ridge
- White Oak Cottages at Fox Hill Village

Based on plan analysis, 11 of the jury-recognized DFAR12 submissions include a Household, typically defined as 8–12 private residential bedrooms organized around a shared living / dining / kitchen area. Five additional projects were classified as “Neighborhoods,” where 2–3 groups of eight to 8–12 private residential bedrooms are organized around a shared living / dining / kitchen area. (One project that indicated they had a Household did not submit a floor plan so, therefore, could not be analyzed.)

In terms of the size of the Households, we found that the average* was 8,693 square feet. The range* was 6,780–11,080 square feet. Regarding the number of residents per Household, we found an average* of 11 people, with a range* of 9–14 residents. The overall average* square footage per resident was 763, with a range* of 484–996 square feet per person. As would be expected, we saw in the larger Households that there typically was a smaller square footage per resident—that Household size does not stay relative (i.e., the building did not necessarily have a larger square footage per resident when there was a greater number of residents).

*Excluding outliers

In Their Own Words

Legacy Place

“These small houses are designed to reflect the look, feel and scale of a traditional residential home … This was accomplished by creating small houses and locating the community in an already established residential neighborhood.”

Rockhill Mennonite Community

“A small house design for 10 residents in each Household encourages socialization and family living while promoting independence. The project includes small Households with gracious living units and an emphasis on community and socialization instead of traditional apartment living with services.”

Households like this one at the Rockhill Mennonite Community typically offer 8–12 private residential bedrooms organized around a shared living / dining / kitchen area.
**Insights and Innovations**

The typical Household floor plan offers short walking distances, opportunities to participate in the day-to-day life of the home (e.g., cooking, folding laundry, etc.), and family-like social interactions. One industry complaint that is sometimes heard, however, is that even though Households are made up of the standard house “kit-of-parts” (i.e., the spaces found in most Western-style homes), their arrangement does not support the traditional public-to-private hierarchies expected in our culture. For instance, in most American homes, bedrooms are not located off of a living room—they are instead clustered with other private spaces, accessed by semi-private hallways. Yet this is often not the case in Household design, where it is not unusual to find a bedroom opening to the living or dining room.

However, this may be beginning to change, as seen in the Households included in the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects: The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages, Legacy Place, Rydal Park Repositioning, and White Oak Cottages at Fox Hill Village. All 4 of these projects arranged their Household floor plan so that “the private areas, such as the bedrooms and spa, [are] separated from [the] more public spaces of hearth room, dining, and kitchen areas” (The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages).

Legacy Place notes that its Household is “consistent with a traditional home where you enter into the more public living and dining area, then move through the more private bedroom area.” The Rydal Park Repositioning project is “similar to a well designed home [in that] there is a public to private gradient consisting of an entry ‘threshold’ adjacent to more public areas such as kitchen, dining and living rooms, proceeding to private bedroom areas.” White Oak Cottages at Fox Hill Village similarly aimed to provide a layout that “is more like the arrangement you would find in a typical house, where bedrooms rarely are accessed directly off of the main living spaces.”

Several DFAR12 projects, like The Deupree House and Nursing Cottages, are reworking the layout of the Household for a better hierarchy of public-to-private spaces. Bedrooms no longer open into common areas, like living or dining rooms.
Extensive Amenities

Forty-one percent of the DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury discussed the extensive amenities offered on-site (comparable to the 38% of jury-recognized DFAR11 projects). Furthermore, when the projects with residential components were asked what was more critical to the success of the project—improving common spaces / amenities or improving units / private spaces—63% stated that the common spaces were more important (again comparable to DFAR11’s 59%).

Taking an overall look at the amenities described by the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects, we see that 76% specifically described formal and informal dining venues, including: casual dining spaces (e.g., bistros and cafes), formal dining rooms, coffee shop / grab-and-go venues, and marketplace / convenience stores. Several projects also described Household-like dining spaces.
Eighty-two percent of jury-recognized DFAR12 projects described spaces where learning, meetings, activities, and hobbies occur. These learning/activity spaces included: large multi-purpose rooms, dedicated conference/meeting spaces, library/information resource centers, art studios/craft rooms, dedicated classroom/learning spaces; religious/spiritual/meditative spaces; and small-scale cinema/media rooms. Several projects also described Household-like community/activity spaces.

![Bar chart showing percentages of submissions for learning/activity amenities in DFAR12 compared to DFAR11.](chart)

**LEARNING / ACTIVITY AMENITY SPACES**

- Large multipurpose room
- Dedicated conference/meeting space
- Library/information resource center
- Art studio/craft room
- Dedicated classroom/learning space
- Religious/spiritual/meditative space
- Small-scale cinema/media room
- Outdoor event/activity space
- Community/activity kitchen

*Source: Jury-recognized projects, DFAR12 compared to DFAR11.*

![Images of various community spaces from Asbury Place at Arbor Acres, The Village at Orchard Ridge, Atria Valley View, Armed Forces Retirement Home, and Laclede Groves.](images)
Sixty-five percent of jury-recognized DFAR12 projects described fitness / wellness amenities, including: dedicated fitness equipment rooms, dedicated exercise classrooms, dedicated rehab / therapy gyms, swimming pools / aquatics facilities, salons, and massage / aromatherapy rooms.

Fifty-three percent of jury-recognized DFAR12 projects described outdoor amenities, including courtyards / gardens and resident-maintained gardening spaces.
Connecting to the Greater Community

At only 29% of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects, fewer submissions placed an emphasis on connecting to the greater community, compared to DFAR11 (at 42%). However, the projects that do focus on being a part of and / or taking advantage of the surrounding neighborhood do so through: close proximity to area services and amenities, easy access to public transit, providing programming to members of the greater community, offering mixed-use developments, and / or being embedded within existing neighborhoods.

Three projects also described creating partnerships with other service providers / organizations: Marian’s House worked with the Alzheimer’s Association and other senior care agencies when developing their dementia training / resource center; the Mary Helen Rogers Senior Community was planned in conjunction with another senior living building, located about a block away, to offer shared programming; and Worman’s Mill Village Center is creating a town center for the surrounding naturally occurring retirement community and will provide dining, retail, and other services for anyone living nearby.

DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that described connecting to the greater community include:

- Brandman Centers for Senior
- Marian’s House
- Mary Helen Rogers Senior Community
- Mather More Than a Cafe
- Moorings Park
- Rydal Park Repositioning
- The Summit at Central Park
- Sun City Tower Kobe
- The Townhomes on Hendricks Place
- Worman’s Mill Village Center

Perhaps not surprisingly, 70% of the projects that connect to the greater community are located in urban settings; the remaining 30% are suburban. Many additional submissions offer community connectivity through conscientious siting: out of all of the DFAR12 submissions, 69% have sites within 1,000 feet of public transportation, such as a bus stop or rapid transit line; and 52% are within 1,000 feet of everyday shopping and / or medical services.

Insights and Innovations

Two projects stood out for the innovative way they are delivering services to the greater community: Mather More Than a Cafe and Marian’s House.

The Mather More Than a Cafe project consists of 4 decentralized programs, located in several Chicago neighborhoods. “The cafes serve as neighborhood-based administrative outposts as well as senior services centers. Along with the social component of the cafe, the senior services provided include computer classes, medical assistance, financial counseling, and exercise classes.” The cafes encourage healthy eating, socialization, and are a place to find support so that people who are aging-in-place can remain in their homes.

Marian’s House is a guesthouse for people with dementia who are living at home with a caregiver. The building is embedded in an existing residential neighborhood and looks like any other house along the street. However, it offers a dementia day center, an on-site caregiver’s suite, and several bedrooms that allow for respite care (or, when not in use for overnight stays by people with dementia, can act as guest bedrooms for the caregiver’s suite). In addition to allowing for one-on-one interaction and specialized group activities, the spaces in Marian’s House also double as an after-hours resource center, providing training and support for family caregivers.

Marian’s House is specially designed for both one-on-one interaction and group activities. Day center spaces are designed to double as an evening resource center for classes and discussion groups.
Promoting a Sense of Community

When senior living projects provide spaces that encourage residents to leave their private homes and interact with others, it encourages relationships to form and promotes a sense of community. Social interactions among residents help minimize isolation, improve quality of life, and even foster a sense of security as residents look out for each other. In fact, research has shown that social activities and productive engagement are as influential to elder survival as physical fitness activities.³

Among the DFAR12 submissions, 26% of the jury-recognized projects described ways in which their project improved or supported the sense of community. Though slightly less than DFAR11 (at 33%), this cycle’s projects included similar features to bring people together. A sense of community is promoted by common spaces that encourage socialization—both informal / spontaneous social interaction spaces (e.g., residents running into each other in the lobby or at the mailboxes), as well as formal / planned social interaction spaces (e.g., the interactions that occur in an activity room or theater). Also described were communal dining venues, wide hallways with places to sit and chat, spaces that encourage and support visitors, and providing a circulation system that promotes socialization, with short walking distances and ease of access to common areas to encourage use.

DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that described promoting a sense of community include:

- Cosby Spear Highrise
- Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
- Haven Hospice Custead Care Center
- Laclede Groves
- Mather More Than a Cafe
- Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street
- Rydal Park Repositioning
- Sharon Towers Dining Renovation
- Sun City Tower Kobe

In Their Own Words

**Moorings Park**

“The Center for Healthy Living will be open to the greater community for a monthly membership fee.”

**Sun City Tower Kobe**

The project offers an “urban solution that fosters community, internally and externally. Integration into the surrounding community and sustainable transport were very important. This is a high-density project on a transit hub including two city bus lines; [it is also] conveniently [close] to rail and taxi. The provider offers hourly daytime shuttles to cultural and commercial areas, and the nearby train station.”

**The Townhomes on Hendricks Place**

“The neighborhood of 12 attached, two-story cottage-style townhomes offers residents the opportunity to live, work and play within blocks of their new homes … An interconnecting sidewalk network provides residents with direct pedestrian access to the Center Green and to Lititz Borough’s sidewalk and trail network. The townhomes are in close proximity to the Main Street shops and restaurants, Lititz Springs Park, farmers’ markets and other amenities including physicians’ and dental offices each located less than a block away … the townhomes continue the community’s practice of seamlessly blending into the town, rather than trying to recreate the small town feel on a separate campus … The goal of strengthening connections to the town rather than creating the more typical inward-focused campus resulted in a number of measures to blend the townhomes into the existing context.”
In Their Own Words

**Cosby Spear Highrise**

Through the new design, residents “are finding increased interaction with family, friends, and service providers. Now fully operational, the new open social spaces and programming are bringing residents out of their [private residential] units and allowing them to engage as never before … Such openness increased social interaction among residents and adds to the value of the programming.”

**Haven Hospice Custead Care Center**

“Multiple family members often participate in the hospice experience together. They are joined together during this difficult time and find themselves sharing a similar experience with other patient’s families at the same time. The building was designed with this phenomenon in mind. Four distinct yet centrally located living rooms create casual settings where related and ‘unrelated’ families can sit, chat, or help console one another. A community dining area allows social interaction between family members and staff. All can share the family kitchen and children’s play area. And of course the outdoor spaces, whether enclosed porches or landscaped courtyards, are common destinations that can be shared as well.”

**Mather More Than a Cafe**

To help residents hear one another in the cafes “the acoustic environment was improved to eliminate the echoes and background noise that dominates the larger regional centers.” In addition to providing good acoustics that allow for conversations, “a variety of seating options were included on the periphery for those preferring to talk with staff at the lunch counters or observe from a distance,” thereby recognizing people’s varying needs for interaction versus privacy outside one’s home.

**Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.**

“The creation of engaging space addresses the common challenge of isolation in the elderly. The building provides a vibrant and engaging lifestyle by focusing on direct access to social areas that have abundant natural light and multiple connections to the outdoors. The floor plan, with a central communal living room, provides options for both group and private activities. The patios and outdoor gardens on the first floor become places for residents to interact … A natural flow between indoor and outdoor space and open relationships with surrounding campus buildings creates a sense of interconnectivity.”

Spaces that encourage residents to interact outside their private home, like this cafe in the Cosby Spear Highrise project, promote social interactions and a sense of community.

The dining spaces in the Mather More Than a Cafe projects have good acoustics, making it easier to hear conversations. Poor acoustical design (a common problem in dining settings) can make it difficult for older adults to hear and be heard, and can potentially contribute to social discomfort, fear, embarrassment, depression, or isolation. On the other hand, spaces that support conversation promote a sense of community.
In Their Own Words
Marian's House

The project aimed to "create a daytime home for people with dementia that fits into the surrounding community. The house looks like the houses around it, with the narrow side turned to the street to visually reduce its larger size for passersby; it also sits back from the street abiding by the neighborhood’s setback restrictions. The residential scale of materials, massing, and roofs allow this large house to feel homelike."

Fitting the Local Context

For this cycle, fewer projects—26% of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects—described how they fit the local context (compared to 54% of DFAR11 projects recognized by the jury). Of those submissions that do respond to their surroundings, half of the projects implemented a design that blends into the surrounding neighborhood. The other half described their adoption of the local vernacular architectural style.

DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that described how they fit the local context include:

- Asbury Place at Arbor Acres
- Haven Hospice Custead Care Center
- Legacy Place
- Marian's House
- Mary Helen Rogers Senior Community
- The Mather
- The Townhomes on Hendricks Place
- The Village at Orchard Ridge
- Worman's Mill Village Center

Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street

"Creating a smaller ‘community within a community’ resulted in the introduction of pocket neighborhoods. Each pocket neighborhood consists of 7 cottage homes organized around an intimate garden setting that promotes a close-knit sense of community and neighborliness through an increased level of contact. Neighbors are naturally acquainted through the daily flow of life, by the simple fact of shared space and small-scale living. The courtyard space provides a natural setting for outdoor picnics and group gatherings."

At Rose Villa Pocket Neighborhoods & Main Street, the sense of community is supported by the day-to-day interactions that occur between people. Residents share common courtyards and paths, which increase the likelihood of running into one’s neighbors.

Marian’s House (pictured to the left) had a goal of fitting into the surrounding neighborhood. Through careful siting, massing, and use of materials, this dementia day center does not stand out from the single-family homes around it.
The Townhomes on Hendricks Place

“The townhomes are designed to architecturally emulate the character of their surroundings … [The project] complements the historical context of the surrounding downtown.”

Mary Helen Rogers Senior Community

“For an affordable senior building in an area of high-end condominiums and market rate developments it was important that this project blend with the surrounding neighborhood and not stand out as a stigmatized low-income project. As such, it was designed with a contemporary flair that embodies the urban feel of the area and uses color and materials, such as the stone at the ground floor, which enriches the look and sophistication of the building, all within a very limited budget.”

The Village at Orchard Ridge

“Historic Old Town Winchester is a unique highlight of the region and serves as the design inspiration for the town center which features a clock tower, chapel, and Village Green featuring fountains, gardens and walking paths. Varied facade treatments and awnings reflect the vernacular of neighboring towns. Regional products, including Virginia brick, help to keep the project in context with Western Virginia.”

From Florida Cracker style to Virginian Colonial, embodied here by The Village at Orchard Ridge, several projects aimed to fit the local context by adopting the region’s vernacular architectural style.

Worman’s Mill Village Center

“To reinforce the Village Center concept, the buildings were designed to resemble the texture, scale, style, and materials of the historic downtown of the Middle Atlantic city in which this community is located.”

The aesthetic of Worman’s Mill Village Center is based on the historic downtowns of the mid-Atlantic region where this project is located.
**Flexibility**

Twenty-one percent of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects described ways in which their submission incorporated built-in flexibility—a new theme (not seen to a great extent in the analysis for DFAR11). Projects described how they were designed to: support aging-in-place, with features such as extra wall blocking in shower areas for future grab bar installation; accommodate different levels of care in one setting for if / when the market shifts (e.g., switching from Assisted Living to Skilled Nursing); allow for an easy remodel that would combine two smaller residential units into one larger unit, or to have one larger unit split into two smaller units to address market demand; offer flexible commons spaces that serve different users / purposes depending on the time of day and on the program / building occupants’ needs; and consider the future expansion of the project, minimizing the need for moving or replacing major equipment and / or systems.

**DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that described a theme of flexibility include:**

- Asbury Place at Arbor Acres
- Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
- The Friendship House at Royal Oaks
- Marian’s House
- The Mather
- Moorings Park
- Sharon Towers Dining Renovation
- The Townhomes on Hendricks Place

---

**Insights and Innovations**

Taking the idea of flexibility to a new level, Moorings Park offers Independent Living apartments that “were designed to be completely customized by the owner—essentially blank slates to be configured and finished to suit the resident’s lifestyle.” Apartments can be personalized to accommodate such features as a large space for entertaining guests, or a high-end kitchen for cooking. An artist can devote floor area to a studio; an athlete can have space for exercising. Many options abound and residents are able to “work backwards from their price point, matching lifestyle and entrance fee with square footage and interior design choices.”

---

At Moorings Park, the Independent Living apartments can be fully customized to accommodate the interests of the resident. Interior settings can support a person’s lifestyle, from providing a great kitchen and a space to entertain, to creating an artist’s studio, or fitness space.
In Their Own Words

Asbury Place at Arbor Acres
The project built in “flexibility so that the two-bedroom units could be converted into a studio and one-bedroom unit in the future if needed.”

Good Shepherd Cottage, Santa Teresita, Inc.
“In order to allow for future flexibility as the master plan is built out, the original design intent of the Cottage is that it can be used as Memory Care, Skilled Nursing, or Assisted Living.”

Marian’s House
“Some [of the] daycare spaces are designed [to] double as an evening resource center for classes and discussion groups. Media and technology have been integrated for participant use and for evening presentations and training videos / presentations. There is [also] flexibility of use with two respite bedrooms, which can be open to either the caregiver as private guest rooms or open to the daycare portion of the home when residents stay over.”

The Mather
“We have unique ‘flex’ spaces that can be sub-divided—using moveable glass partitions with curtains or large sliding doors—to serve as meeting venues, private dining rooms or the location of a bridge tournament or a game of Mahjong.”

Sharon Towers Dining Renovation
“The project required the addition of multiple, equipment-intensive programs within a limited space while planning for a future expansion … [The project was planned] for future service area expansion without moving major equipment such as hoods and washing equipment. The ‘Center Stage’, buffet cabinet work and equipment is planned so that it can be easily relocated with the future expansion without major rework.”

The Townhomes on Hendricks Place
“While one of the primary design goals was to accommodate aging in place, those accommodations could not be at the expense of the residential aesthetic. Prospective residents were clear that they did not wish to live in a home where accessibility features were apparent. Therefore, wider doorways and similar measures, such as extra blocking in showers, allow for future accommodations, when needed by the residents living in the home.”

Several projects integrate built-in flexibility—from accommodating a change in the level of care provided within the setting, to the design of the residential units, like these at Asbury Place at Arbor Acres, which can easily convert to larger or smaller apartments, depending on market demands.
Holistic Wellness

According to the National Whole-Person Wellness Survey, there are 7 dimensions of wellness.⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Wellness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational (Occupational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Physical | Promotes involvement in physical activities for cardiovascular endurance, muscular strengthening, and flexibility. Advocates healthy lifestyle habits, encourages personal safety, and appropriate use of the healthcare system. |
| Social   | Emphasizes creating / maintaining healthy relationships by talking, sharing interests, and actively participating in social events. |
| Intellectual | Encourages individuals to expand their knowledge and skill base through a variety of resources and cultural activities. |
| Emotional | Involves the capacity to manage feelings and behaviors, recognize and express feelings, control stress, problem solve, and manage success and failure. |
| Spiritual | Includes seeking meaning and purpose, demonstrating values through behaviors, such as meditation, prayer, and contemplation of life / death, as well as appreciating beauty, nature, and life. |
| Vocational (Occupational)               |
| Environmental                           | Focuses on protecting and improving their personal environment and the environment at large for health and safety benefits for themselves and the generations that follow. |

Fifteen percent of the jury-recognized DFAR12 projects described approaches and / or community features that support holistic wellness (similar to DFAR11’s 17%). Wellness-related features described include: biodynamic farming on-site, gardens and paths that encourage walking and connecting to nature, medical clinics and therapy spaces, fitness / spa amenities, educational settings, spaces that support group gatherings and encourage a sense of community, dining venues that support healthy eating, and ecologically sustainable design practices (as previously described).

DFAR12 projects recognized by the jury that discussed providing environments for holistic wellness include:

- Asbury Place at Arbor Acres
- Camphill Ghent
- Moorings Park
- Orchard Cove
- The Summit at Central Park

In Their Own Words

Orchard Cove

“The new fitness / wellness center has become one of the new hubs of the community … The space is designed for residents to exercise [and] fosters a lifestyle geared towards wellness.”

Moorings Park

“The Center for Healthy Living offers concierge medical services and amenities that include a spa, exercise studios, fitness / weight rooms, and a rehabilitation center. To encourage wellness dimensions beyond the physical, the Center also offers a meditation room, Zen garden, creative arts studios, and [a] lecture space for visiting speakers. Wellness programs are customized to fit each resident’s specific desires.”

At Moorings Park, the concept of whole-person wellness heavily influenced the design. There are “five areas of core wellness activities—a medical clinic, physical therapy, fitness, comprehensive spa, education and social interaction” spaces. The Center for Healthy Living even includes a wellness store.

Endnotes

Insights and Innovations

Holistic wellness is a personal objective for many people, with multiple senior living projects providing spaces and programming to support this goal. One project, in particular, was designed to a philosophy that takes holistic wellness to another level: Camphill Ghent was designed under the community’s guiding philosophy of anthroposophy, which is dedicated to supporting the potential of all people regardless of physical or other disabilities. Grounded in the teachings of Rudolf Steiner, anthroposophy is based on the idea that inner development can positively change oneself and the greater world around us.

At Camphill Ghent “the Steiner principles affected the overall building geometry, creating many irregular angles in building form and corridor configuration. As a result, the design avoided flat ceilings and right angles where possible to create the sense of a living environment as opposed to a closed box.” The buildings also “encourage movement and balance and the activity spaces are light-filled. The design enlivens surfaces with different textures, colors evoke certain emotions, and the design integrates color in an anthroposophic way: blue / violet evokes reverential feelings, green evokes new life, yellow / orange: light and brightness, red / blue: deep emotions / contemplation.”

Along with community leaders, the designers of Camphill Ghent envisioned a nurturing, supportive residence for developmentally disabled seniors based on the philosophy of Anthroposophy. Photography: Sarah Mechling / Perkins Eastman