

RESEARCH REPORT



Housing Options for Older Canadians: User Satisfaction Study Part 2: Resident Satisfaction Survey Results



CMHC—HOME TO CANADIANS

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has been Canada's national housing agency for more than 60 years.

Together with other housing stakeholders, we help ensure that Canada maintains one of the best housing systems in the world. We are committed to helping Canadians access a wide choice of quality, affordable homes, while making vibrant, healthy communities and cities a reality across the country.

For more information, visit our website at [**www.cmhc.ca**](http://www.cmhc.ca)

You can also reach us by phone at 1-800-668-2642
or by fax at 1-800-245-9274.

Outside Canada call 613-748-2003 or fax to 613-748-2016.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation supports the Government of Canada policy on access to information for people with disabilities. If you wish to obtain this publication in alternative formats, call 1-800-668-2642.

Housing Options for Older Canadians: User Satisfaction Study

Part 2: Resident Satisfaction Survey Results

**Prepared for:
Luis Rodriguez
Research Division
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation**

**by
Dr. Gloria Gutman and Mary Ann Clarke Scott, MAIBC,
of the Gerontology Research Centre
at Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia**

**and
Nancy Gnaedinger, consultant in gerontology, Victoria, British Columbia**

**and in collaboration with
Danielle Maltais of the Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, Québec,
Luba Serge, private consultant, Montreal, Quebec,
and David Bruce of the Mount Allison University,
Sackville, New Brunswick.**

ABSTRACT

This research included 24 case studies of housing options for older Canadians from across the country. During site visits to each of these housing options, focus groups were held with key stakeholders involved in establishing and operating the projects (planners, managers, owners, service-providers, etc.), a sample of residents participated in "walk and talk" evaluations of their dwelling units, and study staff completed an architectural checklist. Additionally, photos, architectural drawings, brochures and policy manuals were collected from each of the 24 sites and a resident satisfaction survey was distributed (n=544 respondents from across the 24 sites)

This report is Part 2 of three prepared by the Study Team under direction and contract from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Part 1 report, entitled "*Housing Options for Older Canadians: User Satisfaction Study -Part 1: Case Studies*" presents a detailed description of the characteristics and development process of the 24 housing projects included in the study. Data in this report derive from a variety of sources including telephone interviews, a mailed information request, the focus groups, the architectural checklist and the "walk and talk" evaluation. The report also contains a summary of findings from a Resident Satisfaction Survey completed by a sample of residents from 23 of the 24 sites.

Part 3 report, entitled "*Housing Options for Older Canadians: User Satisfaction Study -Part 3: Appendices*" contains the frequency tables from which the data in Parts 1 and 2 reports derived, as well as the various forms, checklists, and research and survey tools that were used to carry out the study.

This Part 2 report focuses exclusively on the Resident Satisfaction Survey. Following a brief introduction, detailed data from the Resident Satisfaction Survey are presented grouped under the following nine headings: Respondent Characteristics, Personal Housing History, Current Housing, Satisfaction with Housing Features, Satisfaction with Tenure Arrangement, Satisfaction with Social Involvement and Interaction, Satisfaction with Management and Operational Approaches, Satisfaction with Support Services and Amenities and Overall Satisfaction with Housing Project. In contrast to the Part 1 report where comparisons are mainly within the six categories of housing options, in this report comparisons are made across the full set of 24 case studies.

When read in conjunction with the Part 1 report, this report enables the reader to identify and learn from projects where a particular housing aspect is exemplary. In identifying projects at the bottom of the distribution for a specific question or housing aspect, the objective is to alert readers to areas where sensitivity to person-environment fit is needed and where the fit could be improved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	7
1.1	Purpose of Resident Satisfaction Survey.....	7
1.2	Method of Distribution.....	7
1.3	Number of Respondents and Unit Representation Rate.....	8
1.4	Organization of this Report.....	8
1.5	Method of Analysis.....	10
1.6	Frequency Tables.....	10
2.	RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS.....	11
2.1	Socio-Demographic Characteristics.....	11
	2.1.1 age.....	11
	2.1.2 gender and marital status.....	11
	2.1.3 highest level of educational achievement.....	11
	2.1.4 current work status.....	11
2.2	Health and Mobility Status.....	11
	2.2.1 health self-ratings.....	13
	2.2.2 use of mobility aids.....	13
3.	PERSONAL HOUSING HISTORY.....	15
3.1	Duration of Residence in Current Home.....	15
3.2	Household Composition.....	15
3.3	Geographic Location of Prior Home.....	15
3.4	Structural Type of Prior Home.....	15
3.5	Household Composition of Prior Residence.....	15
3.6	Motivations and Pathways into Current Residence.....	17
	3.6.1 reasons for moving from prior housing.....	17
	3.6.2 reasons for moving to current housing complex.....	17
4.	CURRENT HOUSING.....	17
4.1	Structural Type.....	17
4.2	Dwelling Unit Type.....	19
5.	SATISFACTION WITH HOUSING FEATURES.....	19
5.1	5.1.1 size.....	19
	5.1.2 visual privacy.....	19
	5.1.3 soundproofing.....	22
	5.1.4 windows, doors, closets and cupboards.....	22
	5.1.5 kitchen.....	22
	5.1.6 bathroom.....	22
	5.1.7 lighting.....	22
	5.1.8 ventilation.....	23
	5.1.9 private outdoor space.....	23
	5.1.10 general satisfaction with unit.....	23
5.2	Common Areas in Multi-Unit Projects.....	23
	5.2.1 front door, entrance and mail arrangement.....	25
	5.2.2 recreational and special activity areas.....	25
	5.2.2.1 lounge.....	25
	5.2.2.2 library.....	25
5.2	5.2.2.3 craftsroom.....	27
	5.2.2.4 clubhouse.....	27
	5.2.2.5 workshop.....	27

5.2.2.6	games room.....	27
5.2.2.7	music room.....	27
5.2.2.8	exercise room.....	28
5.2.2.9	greenhouse.....	28
5.2.2.10	pool/spa.....	28
5.2.2.11	chapel or meditation room.....	28
5.2.2.12	other small meeting room.....	28
5.2.2.13	gift shop/convenience store.....	28
5.2.2.14	cafe/snack bar.....	28
5.2.2.15	beauty parlour/barber shop.....	28
5.2.3	elevators.....	29
5.2.4	circulation area.....	29
5.2.4.1	wayfinding.....	29
5.2.4.2	hallway and walkway surfaces.....	29
5.2.5	project appearance and size.....	29
5.2.5.1	attractiveness of architectural design.....	29
5.2.5.2	satisfaction with project size.....	31
5.2.6	outdoor environment.....	31
5.2.6.1	importance to resident.....	31
5.2.6.2	satisfaction with grounds.....	31
5.2.7	parking.....	31
5.2.7.1	satisfaction with parking for self.....	31
5.2.7.2	satisfaction with parking for visitors.....	33
5.2.8	location.....	33
5.2.8.1	key locational considerations.....	33
5.2.8.2	convenience of location.....	33
5.2.8.3	satisfaction with neighbourhood.....	36
5.2.9	transportation.....	36
5.2.9.1	most frequently used.....	36
5.2.9.2	accessibility of public transportation.....	36
5.2.10	safety.....	36
5.2.10.1	inside the home.....	37
5.2.10.2	common areas of the project.....	37
5.2.10.3	grounds of the project.....	37
5.2.10.4	parking area.....	37
5.2.10.5	neighbourhood.....	37
6.	SATISFACTION WITH TENURE ARRANGEMENT.....	37
6.1	Liked and Disliked Aspects of Current Tenure Arrangement.....	39
6.2	Understanding of and Satisfaction with Life-lease Arrangements.....	41
6.3	Monthly Housing Costs, Use of Services and Residual Funds: Life-lease Holders.....	41
7.	SATISFACTION WITH SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT AND INTERACTION.....	41
7.1	Sociability Self-ratings.....	44
7.2	Estimated Degree of Interaction with Other Residents.....	44
7.3	Change in Social Life Since Moving to the Project.....	44
7.4	Locations Where Socializing Takes Place.....	44
7.5	Neighbour Assistance.....	47
7.6	Satisfaction with Social Life and Opportunities to Socialize.....	47
7.7	Perceived Connectedness.....	47
7.7.1	loneliness.....	47
7.7.2	sense of community.....	47
8.	SATISFACTION WITH MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL.....	48

	APPROACHES.....	
8.1	Perceived Importance of Involvement in Decision Making and Actual involvement	48
8.2	Feeling Welcome in the Administrative Area.....	48
9.	SATISFACTION WITH SUPPORT SERVICES AND AMENITIES.....	48
9.1	Meal Service.....	48
9.2	Housekeeping Service.....	50
9.3	Sports/recreational Amenities.....	50
9.4	Transportation Service.....	50
9.5	Personal Care Services.....	50
9.6	Laundry Service.....	54
9.7	Fitness/Exercise Equipment.....	54
9.8	Beauty/Hair Care Salon.....	54
9.9	Physiotherapy service.....	54
9.10	On-site Counselling.....	54
9.11	Religious Services.....	54
9.12	Outings.....	54
9.13	Cultural Events/Entertainment.....	54
9.14	Workshop/Activity Area.....	55
9.15	Convenience Store.....	55
9.16	Satisfaction with On-staff Staff.....	55
	9.16.1 information provision.....	55
	9.16.2 availability and attitude.....	55
9.17	Overall Satisfaction with Services & Amenities	55
10.	OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH HOUSING PROJECT.....	56

List of Tables

<u>Table No.</u>		
1	Number of Respondents and Percent of Units Represented in Resident Satisfaction Survey, by Option Category and Case Number.....	9
2	Socio-Demographic Characteristics, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	12
3	Health and Mobility Status, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	14
4	Percent Living Alone Now and in Prior Residence, Duration of Residence in Current Home and Location of Prior Residence, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	16
5	Housing Form Currently Occupied, by Number of Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	18
6	Satisfaction with Selected Aspects of Dwelling Unit, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	20
7	Satisfaction with Lighting in Common Areas, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	24
8	Easy of Use of Front Door and Satisfaction with Mail Arrangement, and Use of Recreational and Special Activity Areas, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	26
9	Satisfaction with Elevators, Circulation, Architectural Design, and Project Size, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, By Option Category and Case Number.....	30
10	Importance of Outdoor Area and Satisfaction with Grounds and Parking, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	32
11	Locational Factors Important in Choosing a Residence, Satisfaction with Project Location, and Use and Perceived Accessibility of Public Transportation, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	34
12	Perceptions of Safety, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	38
13	Tenure Arrangements, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	40
14	Contribution, Understanding, Tenure Satisfaction, Housing Costs and Use of Services, Life-lease Holders, by Option Category and Case Number.....	42
15	Social Involvement and Interaction, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number.....	45
16	Participation in Management and Operation of the Project, Resident Satisfaction Survey, by Option Category and Case Number.....	49

17	Use and Satisfaction with Services, Resident Satisfaction Survey, by Option Category and Case Number.....	51
18	Overall Housing Satisfaction, Resident Satisfaction Survey, by Option Category and Case Number.....	57

Resident Satisfaction Survey

1. INTRODUCTION

This report is Part 2 of three prepared by the Study Team under the direction and contract from Canada Mortgage and Mortgage Corporation. The Part 1 report, entitled “*Housing Options for Older Canadians: User Satisfaction Study –Part 1: Case Studies and User Satisfaction*” presents a detailed description of the characteristics and development process of 24 housing projects from across Canada selected to illustrate six categories of housing. The six categories include housing projects that:

- A) allow older persons to live in close proximity to their family, such as accessory apartments, garden suites and bi-family units;
- B) comprise a large house shared by 7-10 unrelated persons each with their own private living quarters, such as Abbeyfield housing, group homes, and shared housing;
- C) comprise planned retirement communities, such as retirement subdivisions, retirement residences, mobile home communities, and university-linked retirement communities;
- D) emphasize lifestyle by providing a wide range of social and recreational activities to persons living in low density housing;
- E) provide support services, such as congregate housing, sheltered housing and assisted living; and
- F) guarantee increasing levels of health service, such as continuing care and life-care retirement communities.

Some data from the Resident Satisfaction Survey is contained in the Part 1 report. It is presented, however, on a case study by case study basis, with some comparisons made but only within categories. This report compares data across 23 projects.

1.1 Purpose of Resident Satisfaction Survey

The Resident Satisfaction Survey was designed to obtain detailed information from a sample of residents at each of the case study sites concerning their satisfaction with selected aspects of their individual dwelling unit, common spaces in the project, opportunities for social involvement and interaction, tenure arrangement, degree of input into management and operation of the project and support services and amenities. The purpose was to permit generalization beyond the small number of individuals whose actual dwelling units were visited during the “walk and talk” phase of the study.

1.2 Method of Distribution

The general procedure was to ask the management to notify residents that the site was to be visited by a study team from Simon Fraser University and invite them to an informational meeting at the end of which, they were given a self-report questionnaire to complete anonymously and deposit with their manager.

1.3 Number of Respondents and Unit Representation Rate

In total, 544 individuals completed the Resident Satisfaction Survey. Table 1 shows the percent of units from each site represented in the survey, cross-tabulated by Housing Option Category (A-F). As can be seen, while all of the options in Category A were fully represented by their single occupants, the representation rate ranged from 40-56% of units among the three case studies in Category B.

The range of representation was very wide in Category C, from only 6% at Heritage Village (Case Study #8) to 44% at Cedar Hill Court (Case Study #10).

In Category D individual Resident Satisfaction Survey data are available for two of the three sites. Recognizing cultural differences, it was felt advisable to gather data at the third site in this category, Jimmy Erasmus Senior Citizens Home, in Rae-Edzo, North West Territories (Case Study #12) by group interview. The representation rates among the two participating sites where individual surveys were completed were 18% and 50%.

In Category E, the representation rate was from 20% to 53%. In Category F, the rate ranged from 33-44%.

The low response rate at Heritage Village (Case Study #8) was due to a combination of circumstances including short notice with respect to when the researchers would come to the project, and active lifestyles and a desire for privacy on the part of the residents. Initially the response rate was also low at Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22), the largest project in the study. A subsequent special request for volunteers to complete the Resident Satisfaction Survey resulted in 197 useable questionnaires.

1.4 Organization of this Report

Chapters 2-8 follow the order in which questions appear in the Resident Satisfaction Survey. Chapter 2 describes the characteristics of Resident Satisfaction Survey respondents. Data are presented separately for the 23 sites at which individuals completed the survey, indicating respondents' socio-demographic characteristics (average age, gender and marital status distribution, highest level of educational achievement, and current work status) and health and mobility status. Chapter 3 presents respondents' personal housing history (duration of residence in current home, household composition, geographic location and structural type of residence occupied immediately prior to moving to current home, household composition in prior home, and motivations and pathways into their current residence). Chapter 4 describes the structural type and unit type of their current housing. Chapter 5 focuses on respondents' satisfaction with features of their current home. Data are presented concerning their satisfaction with: (1) their dwelling unit (its size; the degree of visual privacy it affords from the street, neighbours and hallway; soundproofing, ease of opening and closing windows, doors, closets and cupboards; kitchen, bathroom(s), lighting, ventilation; and balcony/patio) (2) common areas in multi-unit projects (front door and entrance area, elevators, circulation within the project, project appearance and size, location, transportation, and perceived safety inside their unit, in common areas of the project, on the grounds, in the parking area, and in the neighbourhood). In Chapter 6 attention turns to respondents' tenure arrangements. Chapter 7 describes respondents' degree of social involvement and interaction and their satisfaction with their social life. Chapter 8 is concerned with respondents' satisfaction with their degree of participation in management and operations of the project. The focus of Chapter 9 is on respondents' satisfaction with services and amenities. Fifteen are examined. Chapter 10, the concluding chapter, discusses respondents' overall reaction to their project, as reflected in any serious plan to leave the project, their willingness to repeat the move to the project if given the opportunity to do things over, and their pride and happiness at living there.

Table 1: Number of Respondents and Percent of Units Represented in Resident Satisfaction Survey, By Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	no. of respondents.	no. of units in project	% of units represented
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC`	1	1	100
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	1	1	100
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale, Ste-Foy, QC	1	1	100
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	10	18	56
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	4	10	40
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	8	15	53
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	36	137	26
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	14	250	6
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	19	71 bung & duplex**	27
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	18	41	44
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	8	16	50
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	12	65	18
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	23	117	20
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	30	88	34
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	20	87	23
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	37	115	32
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	8	25	32
	19	La Maison des Ainés 1, Montreal QC	24	45	53
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	26	85	31
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	8	24	33
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	197	443 apts**	44
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	10	30 apts	33
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	29	164 apts & supp. h **	18
		Total	544		

** There are other housing forms on the campus but these were the forms represented in the survey

1.5 Method of Analysis

Descriptive statistics, mainly percentages, are used to present the overall response (n=544) to a particular question. Attention is then drawn to those of the 23 case studies that are at the extremes of the distribution (i.e. show the highest and lowest proportion of responses).

Unless otherwise specified, it should be noted that throughout this report, we have taken the conservative position of using all respondents at a particular site as the denominator for percentage calculations rather than just those who answered the question. It is our belief that in many cases non-response is the seniors' way of expressing indecision or voicing a "soft no" or criticism. Assuming this to be the case, it would be misleading to base percentage calculations only on those who answer a question.

An examination of the data shows considerable variation in response rates across the 156 questions in the Resident Satisfaction Survey, supporting our contention that non-response is selective and deliberate.

1.6 Frequency Tables

The numbers that constitute the numerators in the percentages reported in this document and in the Part 1 report entitled "Housing Options for Older Canadians: User Satisfaction Study –Part 1: Case Studies," are contained in a series of frequency tables that are found in the Part 3 report entitled "Housing Options for Older Canadians: User Satisfaction Study –Part 3: Appendices." Readers wishing additional detail from the Resident Satisfaction Survey, as well as information from selected cross-tabulations, may wish to refer to these tables. It should be noted, however, that these are "raw tables." They reflect the data, in most cases, exactly as transcribed from the returned questionnaires and, as such, contain some inconsistencies that have been corrected in the percentage tables that are presented in this report.

2. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics

2.1.1 age

Table 2 presents a summary of the socio-demographic characteristics of the Resident Satisfaction Survey respondents. Consistent with differences in the mission, service package and target market of the different projects, there is considerable variation in the average age of respondents. Respondents from Sandalwood Adult Resort (Case Study #13) were the youngest (mean age = 64). Respondents from the Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4) were the oldest (mean age = 86).

2.1.2 gender and marital status

There was a predominance of females (72%) among the respondents and of unattached persons (69%). There was considerable variation across sites, however, in the gender ratio and in the proportion of married respondents, again reflecting differences in the mission, service package and target market of the projects.

Among multi-unit sites, the project with the lowest proportion of female respondents (25%) was Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5) and the site with the highest proportion (100%) was L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6). The project with the greatest proportion of married respondents (83%) was Sandalwood Adult Resort (Case Study #13). Three projects had no married persons among their respondents: Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4), Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23).

2.1.3 highest level of educational achievement

Table 2 shows considerable variation in the education level of respondents. Overall, 50% had not graduated from high school but the range was from 0% to 78% across the 23 sites.

There were three multi-resident sites where the proportion who had not graduated from high school was 70% or more: Residence Wilfred-Lecours (Case Study #17 - 78%), Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5 - 75%), and Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15 - 70%). At the other end of the scale, all respondents from The Wellington (Case Study #14) had at least a high school education and 48% had one or more university degrees.

2.1.4 current work status

Only 16 respondents (3%) were currently working. Of these, five were residents of Holland Christian Homes (Case Study # 22), two were from Brinkworthy Place (Case Study #7) and two were from Residence Wilfred-Lecours (Case Study #17). Of the remaining seven, there was one each from L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6), Cedar Hill Court (Case Study #10), Garden Suites (Case Study #11), Sandalwood (Case Study #13), Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15), Harmer House (Case Study #16) and The Elliot (Case Study #24).

2.2 Health and Mobility Status

In the Resident Satisfaction Survey, respondents were asked to rate their health, compared to other persons their age, using a five-point scale that included the response categories: "excellent", "good", "fair", "poor" or "very poor". As a means of assessing mobility status, they were asked if they used a wheelchair, walker, scooter, cane, some other mobility aid or none of these.

Table 2: Socio-demographic Characteristics, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	mean age	%female	% married	% < H.S. grad.	% now working
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	82	100	0	100	0
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	69	100	0	100	0
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	68	100	0	0	0
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	86	90	0	40	0
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	79	25	0	75	0
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	80	100	25	63	13
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	74	72	39	25	6
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	73	64	50	29	0
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	73	58	58	42	0
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	80	89	28	22	6
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	79	88	25	38	13
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	64	42	83	8	8
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	82	74	35	0	0
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	78	67	27	70	3
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	78	65	35	15	5
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	73	84	8	78	5
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	77	88	50	50	0
	19	La Maison des Aïnés 1, Montreal QC	77	75	25	67	0
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	78	96	27	58	0
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	70	88	25	38	0
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	80	67	33	61	3
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	84	60	0	40	0
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	82	69	31	21	3
		Total	78	72%	31%	49%	3%

2.2.1 health self-ratings

In total, 132 respondents (24%) rated their health compared to others their own age as “excellent” and 241 (44%) self-rated their health as “good”. Approximately one-third (31%) rated their health as “fair”, “poor” or “very poor”.

As shown in Table 3, among multi-unit sites, Garden Suites, the converted motel in Nova Scotia (Case Study #11) and Aven Court in the Northwest Territories (Case #21) had the lowest proportion of respondents rating their health as “good” or “excellent” (only 25% at each site). The Wellington (Case Study #14) had the highest proportion (87%) with “good” or “excellent” health self-ratings, followed closely by Heritage Village (Case Study # - 86%) Sandalwood Adult Resort (Case Study #13 - 84%), and Brinkworthy Place (Case Study #7 - 81%).

2.2.2 use of mobility aids

A majority of respondents (325 or 60%) did not use any mobility aids. Among the 40% who did, the most common aid was a cane (used by 25% of all respondents), followed by a walker (used by 13%), a wheelchair (5%) and a scooter (3%).

As shown in Table 3, use of mobility aids was greatest among respondents from Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 - 90% of respondents) and Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (80%) and lowest at Sandalwood Adult Resorts (none use aids) and Brinkworthy Place (only 8% use mobility aids).

Table 3: Health and Mobility Status, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

category	case #	project type/name & location	% rating their health as excellent or good	% using no mobility aids
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	100	100
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	100
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	100	100
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	60	20
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	75	75
C	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	50	38
	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	81	92
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	86	79
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	79	74
D	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	56	56
	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	25	63
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	84	100
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	87	52
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	67	77
F	16	Harner House, Nepean, ON	75	55
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	41	38
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	38	38
F	19	La Maison des Aïnés I, Montreal QC	54	38
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	81	54
	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	25	63
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	73	59
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	60	10
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	72	72
		Total	69%	60%

3. PERSONAL HOUSING HISTORY

3.1 Duration of Residence in Current Home

When asked how long they had lived in their current home, 30% indicated a duration of less than two years, 31% had lived there for from 2-3 years, 27% from 4-9 years and a small minority (11% and mostly from Holland Christian Homes) were long term residents, having lived there more than 10 years. As shown in Table 4, Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9) had the fewest new residents among its respondents. Sandalwood (Case Study #13) had the most.

3.2. Household Composition

As shown in Table 4, at the time of the Resident Satisfaction Survey, approximately two-thirds (67%) of the respondents were living alone while 30% were living with a spouse. Only a very small number lived with a non-relative (2.2%) or with their son or daughter (0.1%).

As expected from the marital status data, there were three sites at which all residents either lived alone or with a non-relative: Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4), Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #3). Sandalwood Adult Resort (Case Study #13) had the lowest proportion living alone and the highest proportion (83%) living with a spouse.

3.3 Geographic Location of Prior Home

As is typical in seniors housing, most respondents came from nearby: 44% had lived in the same town/city as their current residence, 21% in the area surrounding it, 27% had come from elsewhere in the same province, 7% from another province and 1% from another country.

As shown in Table 4, proportionately, inter-provincial migrants were most heavily represented at Sandalwood (Case Study #13) where they comprised 67% of the respondents.

3.4 Structural Type of Prior Home

Just over half (53%) of the respondents had lived in a single family detached house immediately before moving to their current residence, 19% had lived in a high-rise apartment, 11% in a low-rise apartment, 6% in a semi-detached house and 6% in a townhouse. The remaining 6% had lived in a secondary suite, mobile home, vacation home or supportive retirement home. The predominance of ex-single family detached house dwellers among respondents was evident in all except three of the case studies: at Residence Wilfred-Lecours (Case Study #17) most had lived in an apartment block (15 of 37 in a high-rise and 10 in a low-rise), La Maison des Aînés 1 (Case Study #19) where most had lived in a low-rise apartment or semi-detached house and Aven Count (Case Study #21) where respondents were almost equi-distributed across six housing forms.

3.5 Household Composition of Prior Home

When asked who they had lived with immediately before moving to their current residence, 39% indicated that they had lived alone, 53% with their spouse, 4% with their children, 1% with other relatives and 1% with unrelated persons. As shown in Table 4, both overall, and at all multi-unit sites except Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4), more were currently living alone than was the case when they lived in their prior residence.

Table 4: Percent Living Alone Now and in Prior Residence, Duration of Residence in Current Home and Location of Prior Residence, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% living alone now	% living alone in prior res.	duration of residence in current home			location of prior residence										
					less than 2 years	2-10 years	10+ years	same town or city	surrounding area	other part of prov.	other prov.	other country						
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	100	0		100												
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	100		100												
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	100	100		100												
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	75	90	75	25					10							10
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	50	25	75	25							25					
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	88	50	14	86					38							
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	61	33	22	69	8				17							11
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	50	14	29	71					21							16
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	42	11	5	95					53							21
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	82	50	18	82					6							6
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	75	75	75	25					38							13
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	8	8	100													67
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	74	57	48	52												13
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	63	40	36	64					17							23
	16	Harner House, Nepean, ON	65	35	30	55	15				35							15
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	86	78	26	74					5							
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	50	13	13	88					25							25
	19	La Maison des Aïnés 1, Montreal QC	68	58	27	73					4							
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	77	58	52	48					15							15
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	75	50	63	25	13											25
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	65	26	22	52	26				31							3
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	60	50	40	60					10							20
7	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	68	45	32	68					10							7
		Total	67%	39%	30%	59%	11%				21%							27%
											44%							7%
																		1%

3.6 Motivations and Pathways into Current Residence

In exploring motivations and pathways into their current residence, respondents were asked for their reasons for moving from their previous home and their reasons for moving to their current housing complex.

3.6.1 reasons for moving from prior home

The most common reasons given by respondents for leaving their prior residence were “change in health or physical strength” (28%), “difficulty looking after residence” (20%) and “wish to be with others of the same age” (21%).

There was some variation across the six categories of housing examined in this study. For example, as one might expect, for residents in Category A, the primary and in fact, only reasons given for moving from their prior home were “pressure from children” and “to be near family”. For respondents in Category B (small group homes), “change in health or physical strength” and “difficulty looking after residence” were the primary factors. Category C respondents gave similar responses but also commonly mentioned “needs or wishes of spouse” and that their prior residence was too large. Category D respondents living at Garden Suites (Case Study #11) were similar to those in Category B, citing “change in health or physical strength” most commonly. Residents of Sandalwood Adult Resort, on the other hand, most commonly mentioned that their prior residence was too big or that they wanted to be near family.

3.6.2 reasons for moving to current housing complex

With respect to moving to the particular site at which they now reside, the most common reasons were: “quality of the dwelling units” (mentioned by 40% of respondents), “attractiveness of the project” (mentioned by 39%), “close to facilities and services” (36%), “services available on the premises” (36%), “recreational facilities and activities” (31%), “friends or relatives live here” (27%), and “children or relatives live nearby” (27%).

4. CURRENT HOUSING

4.1 Structural Type

In total, 64 (12%) of the respondents currently live in a single family detached house, 36 of which are manufactured/mobile homes; 13 (2%) live in duplexes, 17(3%) in townhouses, 280 (51%) in high-rise apartment blocks (i.e. buildings over 3 storeys), 145 (27%) in low-rise apartment blocks, 22 (4%) live in group homes and 3 (1%) in secondary suites (see Table 5).

One of the accessory suites (Case Study #1) constitutes the lower level of a single family detached house. The occupant’s daughter lives above. A second is a freestanding pre-fabricated one-storey cottage-like structure located on the same property as the home of the occupant’s son (Case Study #2). The third is a one-bedroom suite, which occupies half of the ground floor level of the occupant’s daughter’s two-storey, half-basement home.

One of the group homes (Case Study #4) combines a large 3.5 storey single family heritage house containing nine bed-sitting rooms with a new two storey purpose built dwelling also containing nine bed-sitting rooms. Another (Case Study #5) is a 10-bedroom project converted from two townhouses. The third group home in Category B (Case Study #6) is a purpose built 15 bed-sitting room project, unanimously classified by its residents as a low-rise apartment block.

Among the four high-rise projects represented, one consists of a single 6 storey building containing 88 units (Case Study #15), one is a four story building with 45 units, one consists of

Table 5: Housing Form Currently Occupied, by Number of Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	single detached house	semi-detached (duplex)	townhouse	high-rise apartment	low-rise apartment	group home	manufactures home	secondary suite
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC								1
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB								1
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC								1
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC						10		
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON						4		
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC						8		
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	2						36	
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON			9		3			
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	14	5						
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC					18			
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS			8					
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	12							
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB					23			
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON				30				
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON					20			
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC					37			
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON					8			
	19	La Maison des Aïnés 1, Montreal QC				24				
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB					26			
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT		8						
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON				197				
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE					10			
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON				29				
		Total	28 (5%)	13 (2%)	17 (3%)	280 (51%)	145 (27%)	22 (4%)	36 (7%)	3 (1%)

four high-rise towers (Case Study #22) and one has on its campus an 85 unit six story supportive housing block, a 75 unit 5 storey apartment block and a one storey long term care facility (the latter was not part of this study).

The eight low-rise buildings from which respondents were drawn, while mainly three storeys buildings, varied considerable in size and configuration. For example, Case Study #8 combined a 3 storey, 63 unit apartment block with single and 1.5 storey townhouses and bungalows; Case Study #10 consisted of a single three storey, 41 unit low-rise; Case Study #14 is a three storey 117 unit project; Case Study #16 consists of three connected three storey buildings; Case Study #17 features two retrofitted and rehabilitated two-storey former technical schools; Case Study #18 is a three storey apartment block with 25 units, Case Study #20 is a three storey apartment block with 85 unit, and Case Study #23 has on its campus one three storey 12 unit apartment, one two-storey 10 unit apartment, one two storey eight unit apartment and a nursing home (the latter not part of this study).

4.2 Dwelling Unit Type

In total, 40% of respondents live in a one-bedroom dwelling unit, 44% live in a two-bedroom unit, 5% live in a studio apartment, 4% have a bed-sitting room, 3% have one-bedroom plus a den, 1% have two-bedrooms plus a den, while 1% have a three-bedroom home.

5. SATISFACTION WITH HOUSING FEATURES

5.1 Dwelling Unit

Respondent's satisfaction with their dwelling unit was measured along a number of dimensions including: size; degree of visual privacy it afforded from the street, from neighbours and from the hallway; soundproofing; ease of opening and closing doors, windows, closets and cupboards; user friendliness of kitchen; lighting; ventilation; and view from the balcony or patio.

5.1.1 size

Overall, 82% of the respondents considered their unit to be "about the right size", 13% thought it was "too small" and 7% "too large". As shown in Table 6, the projects with units thought to be too small included: two of the three in Category A -- the garden suite in New Brunswick (Case Study #2) and Maison Bi-Familiale in Ste-Foy, Quebec (Case Study #3) and, one from Category B - the Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4) where only 20% of respondents rated their bed-sitting rooms as "about the right size." Complaints about small unit size were also voiced by a sizeable proportion of respondents from three other projects: Harmer House, Suomi-Koti and Whisperwood Villa. In these projects 30%, 23% and 20% respectively checked "too small" in response to the question about their unit's size.

5.1.2 visual privacy

Overall, 78% of the respondents were "very satisfied" with the degree of visual privacy afforded by their unit. As shown in Table 6, the projects with the highest rating along this dimension (100% of respondents "very satisfied") were the three in Category A and Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4), Garden Suites (Case Study #11), and The Wellington (Case Study #14). Those with the lowest ratings with respect to visual privacy included: #13 - Sandalwood (50% "very satisfied"), # 17 - Residence Wilfred-LeCours (54% "very satisfied"), #19 - La Maison des Aïnés 1 and #9 - Woodside on the Green, (58% and 53% respectively "very satisfied").

Table 6: Satisfaction with Selected Aspects of Dwelling Unit, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% rating their unit size as "just right"	% very satisfied w/ visual privacy	% very satisfied w/ soundproofing	% very satisfied w/ lighting	% very satisfied w/ ventilation
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	100	100	100	0	100
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	0	100		0	100
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	0	100	100	100	100
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	20	100	60	60	55
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	na	75	75	100	75
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	88	75	100	75	50
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	86	69	75	58	86
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	93	71	43	57	79
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	95	53	42	74	68
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	83	72	61	67	67
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	88	100	75	100	75
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	92	50	75	83	100
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	96	100	91	70	74
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	67	80	83	73	77
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	70	75	50	55	40
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	89	54	68	46	38
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	100	75	100	88	100
	19	La Maison des Aïnés I, Montreal QC	88	58	79	88	71
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	96	88	81	65	31
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	88	75	75	88	75
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	81	88	83	67	73
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	60	80	50	80	60
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	93	93	97	86	86
		Total	82%	78%	77%	68%	69%

Table 6 (continued): Satisfaction with Selected Aspects of Dwelling Unit, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% with easy to open/close windows doors closets cupboards			% with easy to use kitchen	% liking view from their unit "very much"	% who would stay in same unit if able to move
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	100	100	100	0	100	na
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	100	0	100	100	na
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	100	100	100	100	100	na
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	70	70	70	n/a	40	90
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	75	100	100	n/a	100	100
C	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	100	88	100	n/a	na	na
	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	94	92	92	92	64	83
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	100	100	100	79	50	93
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	89	79	79	95	63	84
D	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	61	78	72	78	50	83
	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	88	75	75	75	50	100
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	100	100	92	92	67	75
	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	96	91	91	96	70	78
E	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	90	90	90	93	53	77
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	80	95	80	70	25	65
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	92	84	84	89	na	70
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	100	75	100	75	100	100
F	19	La Maison des Ainés 1, Montreal QC	96	88	88	92	25	79
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	77	88	92	77	50	81
	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	100	38	100	100	75	88
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	81	90	92	92	66	84
Total	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	70	90	70	40	60	80
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	100	93	93	93	62	83
			86%	88%	89%	88%	55%	80%

5.1.3 soundproofing

In total, 77% of the respondents were “very satisfied” with the soundproofing between their unit and their neighbours. There were four projects with 100% of respondents “very satisfied”. These included the accessory apartment (Case Study #1) and the bi-family unit from Category A (case Study #3), L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6) and Fenelon Falls Independent Living Centre (Case Study #18). As noted in the Case Studies report, in the case of the accessory apartment there was disagreement between the resident and her daughter who lived in the upper part of the house. The resident was satisfied with the soundproofing; the daughter was not. Among multi-unit projects, dissatisfaction with soundproofing quality was highest at Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9 - 42% “very satisfied”), Heritage Village (Case Study #8 - 43% “very satisfied”), Harmer House and Whisperwood Villa (Case Studies #16 and #23) 50% “very satisfied”.

5.1.4 windows, doors, closets, cupboards

Table 6 shows that the vast majority of respondents reported that their unit’s windows, doors, closets and cupboards were easy to open. The most sizeable proportion complaining about windows was at Cedar Hill Court (Case Study #10) where only 61% found them easy to open and close. At Aven Court in Yellowknife (Case Study #20) only 38% of respondents found their unit doors easy to open/close.

5.1.5 kitchen

As shown in Table 6, respondents from two of the three projects in Category A and 70% or more of the respondents at each of the multi-unit sites reported that their kitchen was easy to use. The occupant of the accessory suite (Case Study #1) indicated that there were too many hard to reach areas in her kitchen and that her kitchen cupboard doors were hard to open. The most common complaints from multi-unit sites were that there was not enough counter-top space in the kitchen and that there were too many hard to reach areas. Among the multi-unit projects, Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23) stands out as the least satisfactory with respect to kitchens (only 40% found their kitchen easy to use).

In responding to the question “How safe do you think your kitchen is?” survey participants were asked to use the categories “very safe”, “adequate” or “not very safe”. As shown in Table 12, 66% of the respondents rated their kitchen as “very safe”; a further 23% said it was “adequate”. The proportion rating their kitchen “very safe” ranged from highs of 88% at Aven Court (Case Study #21) and 83% at La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19) to a low of 25% at Harmer House (Case Study #16).

5.1.6 bathroom

As shown in Table 12, the overall ratings of bathroom safety were similar in magnitude to those for the unit kitchens: 61% rated their bathroom as “very safe”; 34% rated it as “adequate”. Among the multi-unit projects, the sites with the highest proportions rating their bathroom “very safe” were Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5 - 100%) and La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19 - 96%). The lowest proportions were at Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4 - 20%) and Southside Manor (Case Study #20 - 23%).

5.1.7 lighting

The Resident Satisfaction Survey asked respondents: “In general, how satisfactory is the lighting in your unit?”. Response categories provided were: “very satisfactory”, “somewhat satisfactory”, and “not satisfactory”. Respondents were also asked to rate the lighting outside their unit, in the hallways, at the building entrance at night, outside on the grounds at night and in the parking area at night.

Overall, 68% were “very satisfied” with the lighting in their unit. Some complaints were voiced by residents of both the accessory apartment (Case Study #1) and the garden suite (Case Study #2). As

shown in Table 6, among the multi-unit projects, those with the lowest proportion “very satisfied” with their unit’s lighting included: Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17- only 46% “very satisfied”), Harmer House (55% “very satisfied”), Heritage Village (57%), Brinkworthy Place (58%) and Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (60%).

Table 7 shows respondents’ ratings of the lighting in common areas of the building and outside at night. As can be seen, Sandalwood (Case Study #13) and Harmer House (Case Study #16) stand out as having the lowest proportion rating lighting in these areas as “good” (only 35%-55%).

5.1.8 ventilation

Overall, 72% were “very satisfied” with the ventilation in their dwelling unit. As shown in Table 6, in five projects there was 100% satisfaction among residents with respect to ventilation. These included the three projects in Category A, Sandalwood (Case Study #13) and Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18). Satisfaction was lowest at Southside Manor (Case Study #20 - only 31% “very satisfied”), Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17 - 38% “very satisfied”), Harmer House (Case Study #16 - 40% “very satisfied”), L’Oasis des Batisseurs and Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (50% at each “very satisfied”).

5.1.9 private outdoor space

Three-quarters of the respondents (74%) have a balcony, patio or deck attached to their unit. Of these individuals, 48% reported that they often sat on it in summer, 47% said that they occasionally sat on it and 4% said that they never sat on it. Respondents were not asked about their satisfaction with their balcony. They were, however, asked if they liked the view from their unit. Respondents from all three of the projects included in Category A said “very much”. Respondents were also unanimous in their approval of the view at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5) and at Fenelon Falls Independent Living Centre (Case Study #18). There was less enthusiasm for the view at other sites, particularly Harmer House (Case Study #16) and La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19). At both of these sites only 25% of the respondents liked their view “very much”. Unfortunately, the question about the view was omitted in surveys handed out at L’Oasis des Batisseurs and Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Studies #6 and #17).

5.1.10 general satisfaction with unit

As a means of assessing respondents’ overall liking for their unit, they were asked “If you had your choice of units in this project, would you stay in this one or move to another?” As shown in Table 6, the majority at each site would remain in their current unit. The largest proportion who would do so (100%) were at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5), Garden Suites (Case Study #11) and Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18). The smallest proportion (65%) was at Harmer House (Case Study #16).

5.2 Common Areas in Multi-Unit Projects

Respondents were asked a series of questions about common areas in multi-unit projects. These included questions about their satisfaction with the front door of their building, the entrance and the central mail area (if there was one); about 15 different recreational and special activity areas; about the elevators; circulation areas; project appearance and size; outdoor environment; parking; the

Table 7: Satisfaction with Lighting in Common Areas, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% rating lighting as "good"				
			outside their unit	in hallways	bldg entrance at night	grounds at night	parking area at night
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	90	80	60	30	n/a
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	100	100	100	n/a	n/a
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	75	88	88	100	100
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	72	n/a	n/a	64	n/a
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	100	n/a	n/a	93	69
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	89	n/a	n/a	58	78
D	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	94	89	83	78	75
	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	88	75	88	88	75
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	58	75	58	42	50
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	100	100	74	87	74
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	93	87	87	80	73
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	55	50	55	35	30
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	73	84	70	65	32
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	100	100	88	88	75
	19	La Maison des Aïnés 1, Montreal QC	79	96	88	71	42
F	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	65	73	69	54	54
	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	75	75	63	63	50
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	86	90	87	72	62
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	80	100	80	70	50
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	97	97	90	86	79
		Total	83%	87%	81%	70%	

location of the building; public transportation use and ease of access and, about their perception of personal safety in and around the project.

5.2.1 front door, entrance and mail arrangement

As shown in Table 8, 96% of respondents from the 14 multi-unit projects where there is a common front door reported that it was easy for them to get in and out of.

With one exception, half or more of the respondents from the 14 projects with a waiting area near the front door, were satisfied with the waiting area's decor, location and size. The waiting area in Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15) was particularly well received by respondents. The waiting areas at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5), Harmer House (Case Study #16) and La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19) had the smallest proportions of respondents who were satisfied with their decor, location and/or size.

As shown in Table 8, with the exception of those from Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9) and Aven Court (Case Study #21), the vast majority of respondents from projects with a central mail delivery area answered "yes" to the question "Is it easy to get your mail?". The same two projects had the smallest proportions saying "yes" to the question "Is there enough light there to see who your letters are from?" Only seven projects had high proportions of respondents reporting that there was a ledge/table nearby the mail delivery area for setting down parcels. Only 10 of the multi-unit projects had 60% or more of their respondents reporting that there was a mailbox conveniently located for all weather.

5.2.2 recreational and special activity areas

The Resident Satisfaction Survey asked how many hours per week respondents used each of 15 different recreational and special activity areas sometimes found in seniors' housing projects. These included: lounge, library, craftsroom, clubhouse, workshop, games room, music room, exercise room, greenhouse, pool and/or spa, chapel or meditation room, small meeting room, gift shop/convenience store, cafe or snack bar, and beauty parlour/barber shop. Since many respondents simply placed a check mark beside the areas they used rather than specifying the hours they spent there, the percentages reported below and in Table 8 reflect any use of the space at all.

5.2.2.1 lounge

All of the multi-unit projects except Brinkworthy Place (Case Study #7) and Aven Court (Case Study #21) have a common space, either in the building or clubhouse, which at least two respondents considered to be a lounge. Proportions using this space ranged from a high of 86% at The Elliot (Case Study #24) to lows of 11% at Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9) and 16% at Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17).

5.2.2.2 library

Eleven of the multi-unit projects have an area that at least two respondents considered a library. As shown in Table 8, proportions using this area ranged from highs of 69% and 70% respectively at The Wellington and at Heritage Village (Case Studies 14 and 8) to lows of 19% and 22% at Southside Manor and Cedar Hill Court (Case Study #10). Note: at Southside Manor the library consisted of bookshelves in a large social room accommodating fireside seating, garden views and games and activities. At Heritage Village the library is located in a quiet room on the second floor of the clubhouse.

Table 8: Ease of Use of Front Door, Satisfaction with Mail Arrangement, and Use of Recreational and Special Activity Areas, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, By Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	front door		wait area			central mail area				mail box	lounge	library	craft room
			% rating it easy to use	% satis. w/ decor	% satis. w/ location	% satis. w/ size	% rating mail easy to get	% rating light ok	% w/ place to put parcel	% w/ conv. locat.	% using				
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	80	75	60	60	80	50	40	50	20	n/a	50	n/a	
B	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	75		50	50	75	75	50	50	50	25	n/a		
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	88	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	75	n/a	n/a	n/a		
	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	86	72	0	75	n/a	6	n/a		
C	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	86	71	21	69	57	69	n/a		
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	53	21	0	16	11	n/a	n/a		
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	94	72	72	67	89	72	11	28	56	22	28		
	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	88	88	88	38	n/a	13		
D	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	100	25	100	42	33	17		
	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	83	87	83	91	96	87	83	96	78	70	9		
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	97	83	100	63	100	80	77	90	50	57	30		
E	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	90	55	50	50	90	60	65	60	70	50	25		
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	97	96	54	57	97	92	38	32	16	3	n/a		
F	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	100	50	63	63	100	88	88	75	50	25	n/a		
	19	La Maison des Aïnés I, Montreal QC	100	83	46	31	96	92	79	46	29	n/a	n/a		
F	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	85	74	58	54	96	77	27	35	50	19	n/a		
	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	n/a	63	50	50	63	38	13	50	n/a	n/a	n/a		
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	97	88	66	63	97	86	69	88	28	26	14		
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	100	80	100	70	90	60	40	50	40	50	50		
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	100	97	76	76	97	76	17	72	86	34	7		
		Total	96%												

5.2.2.3 craftsroom

Eight of the multi-unit projects have a space that at least two respondents considered to be a craftsroom. Usage of this space was generally low, ranging from a high of 50% of respondents at Whisperwood Villa (Case Study # 23) to lows of 13% and 14% at Holland Christian Homes and Garden Suites (Case Studies #22 and #11).

5.2.2.4 clubhouse

Four projects have a free-standing clubhouse: Brinkworthy Place (Case Study #7), Heritage Village (Case Study #8), Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9) and Sandalwood Adult Resort (Case Study #13). The first three, all from Category B, are used by about half of their respondents. The clubhouse at Sandalwood is used by 100%. Elements of each are shown below.

	Brinkworthy	Heritage Village	Woodside on the Green	Sandalwood
A/V room	X	X		
crafts room		X	X	
exercise room	X	X		
fireplace lounge	X	X	X	X
games room/tables (e.g. pool, ping-pong, shuffleboard)	X	X	X	
kitchen	X	X	X	X
library	X	X		X
newsletter office		X		
party room		X		
sauna, Jacuzzi, hot tub		X (indoor)		X (outdoor)
swimming pool		X (indoor)		X (outdoor)

5.2.2.5 workshop

Only two projects have designated woodworking areas: Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15) and Harmer House (Case Study #16). These were used, respectively, by 20% and 25% of the respondents from their site.

5.2.2.6 games room

A total of 15 projects were reported by respondents to have a games room or to have a pool table, ping-pong table etc. as part of a multi-purpose space. As shown in Table 8, these spaces were used by from 5% to 75% of the respondents, with major use occurring at Heritage Village (Case Study #8 -69%) and Sandalwood (Case Study #13 - 75%).

5.2.2.7 music room

Few projects have a dedicated music room but several have a piano in a large multi-purpose area (e.g. The Wellington - Case Study #14) or in the clubhouse (e.g. Brinkworthy - Case Study #7). This space was used by relatively few respondents. Of nine sites where respondents said there was a music room, five were used by fewer than 10% of the respondents.

5.2.2.8 exercise room

Fourteen projects appear to have a room in which there is some exercise equipment. The proportion of respondents using the room ranged from lows of 3% at Brinksworthy (Case Study #7) and 5% at each of Woodside on the Green and Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Studies 9 and 17) to 63% at Garden Suites (Case Study #11). The high usage at Garden Suites is likely due to the presence of a resident who functions as an activity director, taking responsibility for organizing exercise classes and social and recreational activities.

5.2.2.9 greenhouse

Harmer House (Case Study #16) has a greenhouse used by 20% of its respondents. There also were 4% of respondents at Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22), who said they used a greenhouse.

5.2.2.10 pool/spa

Six projects have a swimming pool/spa. Those at Garden Suites (Case Study #11) and at Sandalwood (Case Study #13) are outdoors. Those at Heritage Village (Case Study #8), Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15), Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22) and The Elliot (Case Study #24) are indoors. Usage rates are highest at Sandalwood (75% of respondents), followed by Suomi-Koti and Heritage Village (53% and 50% of respondents respectively). Rates at the other three projects were less than 15%.

5.2.2.11 chapel or meditation room

Respondents from eight of the 20 multi-unit projects said they used a chapel or meditation area. The rate was highest with respect to the chapel at Harmer House (Case Study #16 - 65%).

5.2.2.12 other small meeting room

Respondents from 13 sites said that they used small meeting rooms. Usage rates were again highest at Harmer House (Case Study #16 - 60%).

5.2.2.13 gift shop/convenience store

Five projects had a gift shop/convenience store. Those at The Wellington (Case Study #14) and Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22) were used by 28% and 32% respectively; those at Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15), Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23) and The Elliot (Case Study #24) were used by 10% or fewer respondents.

5.2.2.14 cafe/snack bar

Respondents from seven multi-unit sites reported using a cafe or snack bar on their site. Usage rates were highest at Holland Christian Homes (47%) but involved under 15% at three of the remaining six sites.

5.2.2.15 beauty parlour/barber shop

Nine sites were reported to have an on-site hair salon/barber shop. Usage rates ranged from zero among respondents from L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6) to 55% and 60% respectively among respondents from Harmer House (Case Study #16) and Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22).

5.2.3 elevators

Fifteen of the 20 multi-unit projects provide one or more elevators for resident's use. Overall, 61% of survey respondents reported having no problems with the elevators in their building. Table 9 suggests that problems were most in evidence at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5) and Southside Manor (Case Study #20).

With respect to features of the elevators' design, survey respondents had few complaints. Overall, 90% rated the elevator in their building as easy to get on and off, 89% thought they came fast enough, and 95% reported that the buttons were visible and easy to reach. Most (84%) thought there were enough elevators. There were two projects, however, where only about half of the respondents felt that there were enough elevators: L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6) and Harmer House (Case Study #16). Complaints with respect to elevator design were most noticeable at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5).

5.2.4 circulation areas

Satisfaction with circulation within multi-unit projects was assessed by asking survey respondents whether they found wayfinding in their building easy or difficult and asking them about hallway and walkway surfaces.

5.2.4.1 wayfinding

In response to the question "Is it easy or hard for you to find your way around this residence?" 92% replied "easy". Table 9 shows that the proportion replying "easy" was between 90% and 100% at 14 of the 20 multi-unit projects participating in the survey. The two projects with the lowest percentages rating wayfinding easy were Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9 - 53%) and Aven Court (Case Study #21 - 63%).

5.2.4.2. hallway and walkway surfaces

Overall, 69% of the multi-unit project residents were very satisfied with the hallway and walkway surfaces in and surrounding their building. There were four projects however, in which less than half of the respondents were "very satisfied": Harmer House (Case Study #16 - only 19%), Southside Manor (Case Study #20 - 27%), Aven Court (Case Study #21 - 38%) and Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17 - 49%).

5.2.5 project appearance and size

Respondents were asked "How attractive do you find the architectural design of this building?". Response categories provided were (1) very attractive (2) average and (3) unattractive. The survey also asked "How satisfied are you living in a housing project of this size?"

5.2.5.1 attractiveness of architectural design

Overall, 61% rated the architectural design of their project as "very attractive". Two of the three projects in Category A were so rated. Of the multi-unit projects, three received 100% ratings of "very attractive": Garden Suites (Case Study #11), The Wellington (Case Study #14) and Aven Court (Case Study #21). In contrast, none of the respondents from Southside Manor gave their project a "very attractive" rating, a majority selecting "average" as the descriptor of choice. Three other projects also showed low proportions assigning "very attractive" ratings: Woodside on the

Table 9: Satisfaction with Elevators, Circulation, Architectural Design, and Project Size, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, By Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% no problem elevators in their building	% rating elevators as easy to get on/off	% feeling there are enough elevators	% for whom elevators come fast enough	% finding elevator buttons visible/reachable	% rating way-finding in bldg easy	% very satisfied with hall/walkway surfaces	% rating arch. design "very attractive"	% "very satisfied" w/ project size
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	n/a
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	n/a
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	40	100	80	90	90	100	40	60	75
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	25	0	50	50	25	100	75	75	100
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	63	50	100	100	100	100	75	88	100
	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	75	n/a	36	81
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	50	80	70	90	100	79	69	86	69
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	53	n/a	26	32
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	72	94	94	100	94	100	89	72	67
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	88	63	100	100
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	83	67	58	83
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	87	91	96	96	96	100	100	100	87
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	63	93	100	83	100	97	70	63	80
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	65	100	55	80	100	90	19	35	60
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	76	84	95	95	92	92	49	65	68
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	88	88	88	100	100	100	100	75	100
	19	La Maison des Aînés 1, Montreal QC	75	92	96	88	92	100	79	79	79
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	27	96	88	88	92	96	27	0	73
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	63	38	100	75
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	55	94	82	91	98	98	87	63	85
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	70	80	80	90	100	90	70	40	50
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	76	93	90	90	100	100	93	79	93
		Total	61%	90%	84%	89%	95%	92%	69%	61%	77%

Green (Case Study #9 - 26%), Harmer House (Case Study #16 - 35%) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 - 40%).

5.2.5.2. project size

In total, 77% were “very satisfied” living in a housing project the size of the one they currently occupied. There were only two projects where 50% or fewer shared this sentiment: Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9 -32% “very satisfied” with their project’s size) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 - 50% “very satisfied”).

5.2.6 outdoor environment

Respondents were asked “How important are the outdoor areas of your housing to you?” and “Are you satisfied with the grounds (gardens, walkways)?”. Persons not satisfied with the grounds were asked to explain why.

5.2.6.1. importance to resident

The outdoor area was deemed “very important” by residents of all three projects in Category A and by the vast majority (100% and 88% respectively) of the residents of Aven Court (Case Study #21) and L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6). Projects with the smallest proportion rating the outdoor area as “very important” included: Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5 -25%), and La Maison des Ainés 1 (Case Study #19 - 31%) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 - 30%).

5.2.6.2. satisfaction with grounds

Overall, 63% of the respondents were “very satisfied” with the grounds of their project. Among multi-unit projects, the highest proportions “very satisfied” were at Garden Suites (Case Study #11 - 88% “very satisfied”), The Wellington (Case Study # 14 -83%), Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18 -- 88%), Aven Court (Case Study #21 - 84%) and The Elliot (Case Study #24 - 86%). The lowest proportions were at Southside Manor (Case Study #20 - 12%), Harmer House (Case Study #16 - 25%), Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9 -26%) and Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15- 27%).

Only 28 persons (5%) explicitly stated that they were “not satisfied” with the grounds of their project, a further 49 (9%) did not answer the question (see Table 10). Their dissatisfaction most commonly centred on a need for better maintenance. The second most common complaint was that there was not enough green space.

5. 2.7 parking

Respondents were asked two questions about parking: “If you own a car, how satisfied are you with the parking facilities for yourself?” and “How satisfied are you with the parking facilities for visitors?”

5.2.7.1 satisfaction with parking for self

Response to the first question and to a question asking what mode of transportation they used most often (see section 3.2.8) indicated that just under half of the respondents (46%) were car owners. Of those owning a car, the proportion “very satisfied” with the parking area available for themselves was highest (100%) at Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4), L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6), Heritage Village (Case Study #8), Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study # 17), La Maison des Ainés 1 (Case Study #19) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23). The lowest proportions were at Harmer House (Case Study #16 - only 9% of

Table 10: Importance of Outdoor Area and Satisfaction with Grounds and Parking, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, By Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% for whom outdoor areas are "very important"	% "very satisfied" with grounds	% car owners	% car owners "very satisfied" w/ parking for self	% "very satisfied" w/ parking for visitors
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	100	100	100	100	n/a
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	100	100	100	n/a
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	100	100	100	100	n/a
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	40	70	10	100	30
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	25	75	0	n/a	0
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	88	50	13	100	100
	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	61	36	83	87	39
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	71	69	100	100	57
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	42	26	79	93	38
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	67	67	33	50	40
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	50	88	63	100	100
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	75	67	92	64	45
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	59	83	39	78	74
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	47	27	47	64	32
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	75	25	55	9	5
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	38	35	3	100	n/a
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	63	88	25	100	67
	19	La Maison des Ainés I, Montreal QC	79	67	4	100	25
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	31	11	38	20	22
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	100	75	38	33	20
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	74	84	49	71	42
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	30	50	10	100	75
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	76	86	52	87	41
		Total	64%	63%	46%	72%	

car owners “very satisfied”), Southside Manor (Case Study #20 - 20%), and Aven Court (Case Study #21 - 33%).

5.2.7.2 satisfaction with parking for visitors

A substantial proportion of respondents (24%) said that they did not know about the parking for visitors; an additional 6% gave no answer to this question. Among those that did answer, only 43% overall indicated that they were “very satisfied”.

Projects having the highest proportions “very satisfied” with visitors parking included L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6 - 100%) and Garden Suites (Case Study #11 -100%), Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 -75%) and The Wellington (Case Study #14 -74%). Harmer House (Case Study #16) again had the smallest proportion “very satisfied” (5%), followed by Aven Court (Case Study #21 - 20%), Southside Manor (Case Study #20 - 22%) and La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19 - 25%).

5.2.8 location

The section concerned with location in the Resident Satisfaction Survey began with the question “In choosing a residence, what is important to you about its location? Respondents were provided with six alternatives plus an “other” category, and were asked to check all that applied. They were then asked “How satisfied are you with the location of your housing, in terms of convenience for you?” (1) Very satisfied, (2) Somewhat satisfied (3) Not at all satisfied and “How satisfied are you with this neighbourhood?” (1) Very satisfied, (2) Somewhat satisfied (3) Not at all satisfied.

5.2.8.1 key locational considerations

Table 11 shows the six alternatives presented to respondents and the proportions at each site who reported that the alternative was an important factor in their choice of residential location. As can be seen, overall “safety and security” was the most frequently chosen alternative (73% of respondents), followed respectively, by “accessibility to transportation” (64%), “quality of neighbourhood” (57%), “accessibility to outside services” (56%), “proximity to family or friends” (50%) and “the view” (47%). Very few respondents (13 or only 3%) mentioned any “other” factors the most commonly mentioned of which was “compatible neighbours”.

When the data were examined on a project-by-project basis, “safety and security” was clearly the top concern with respect to location for respondents from Heritage Village (Case Study #8), Garden Suites (Case Study #11), Sandalwood Adult Resort (Case Study #13), The Wellington (Case Study #14), Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17), Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18). It was tied with “accessibility to transportation” as the top concern of respondents from Harmer House (Case Study #16). Among respondents from other sites, different variables take precedence. For example, at Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4) “accessibility to transportation” and “accessibility to outside services” were most commonly chosen as the most important locational factors in choosing a residence. As will be seen below, dissatisfaction with their location in terms of its distance from facilities and services was reflected in Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses respondents’ answer to the specific question concerned with the convenience of their site’s location.

5.2.8.2 convenience of location

As shown in Table 11, all three projects in Category A were judged well located in terms of their convenience to facilities and services. Among multi-unit projects, those with the highest proportion (90% or more) “very satisfied” in terms of convenience to facilities and services included Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5), Sandalwood (Case Study #13), and The Elliot Group (Case Study #24). Projects with the smallest proportion “very satisfied” along this dimension included Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4 - 25%) and Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17 - 38%).

Table 11: Locational Factors Important in Choosing Residence, Satisfaction with Project Location, and Use and Perceived Accessibility of Public Transportation, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	Locational Factors Important in Choosing a Residence (%)					the view
			accessibility to transportation	accessibility to outside services	quality of neighbourhood	safety and security	proximity to family/friend	
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC		100	100	100	100	100
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB		100	100	100	100	100
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC			100		100	100
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	70	70	40	60	20	10
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	50	75	75	75	75	50
C	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	25	63	50	63	63	75
	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	31	67	67	64	36	38
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	50	71	79	100	69	43
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	42	42	74	47	47	47
D	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	72	78	72	67	39	44
	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	25	50	50	100	63	38
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	33	75	75	100	58	42
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	65	52	74	96	83	74
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	73	47	57	67	33	27
16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	90	65	70	90	70	30	
17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	41	41	22	73	24	16	
18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	38	50	25	63	25	13	
F	19	La Maison des Aïnés I, Montreal QC	67	42	42	71	13	42
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	88	69	65	73	54	38
	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	63	59	75	75	88	75
22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	73	51	53	72	55	58	
23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	40	59	50	60	80	20	
24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	90	72	69	83	48	55	
		Total	64%	56%	57%	73%	50%	47%

Table 11 (continued): Locational Factors Important in Choosing a Residence, Satisfaction with Project Location, and Use and Perceived Accessibility of Public Transportation, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% "very satisfied" with location in terms of convenience	% "very satisfied" with neighbourhood	% using public transport as most freq. mode of transport	% for whom public transport is easily accessible
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	100	0	0	100
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	100	0	n/a
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	100	100	0	100
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	25	63	30	75
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	100	100	25	50
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	63	25	13	13
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	64	64	0	0
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	57	79	0	7
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	63	79	0	47
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	72	72	50	61
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	88	50	13	0
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	92	92	0	92
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	83	91	17	57
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	87	53	70	93
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	50	40	25	90
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	38	32	32	27
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	88	50	0	25
	19	La Maison des Aïnés 1, Montreal QC	75	63	58	75
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	77	73	31	85
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	88	88	0	63
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	81	44	17	79
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	70	50	10	20
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	90	86	45	86
		Total	74%	57%	23%	63%

5.2.8.3 satisfaction with neighbourhood

Respondents from two of the three projects in Category A were “very satisfied” with their neighbourhood. Among multi-unit projects, proportions “very satisfied” with their neighbourhood were highest (90% or more) at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5), Sandalwood (Case Study # 13), and The Wellington (Case Study #14). Satisfaction with the neighbourhood was lowest at L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6 - only 25% “very satisfied”), Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17 - 32%) and Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22 - 44%).

It should be noted that overall, 74% of respondents were “very satisfied” with the location of their project in terms of its convenience but fewer (57%) were “very satisfied” with the surrounding neighbourhood. Differences in this direction were very noticeable at L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6), where 63% of respondents were satisfied with their site in terms of convenience but only 25% were very enthusiastic about the neighbourhood, at Garden Suites (Case Study #11), Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15), Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18) and Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22). The reverse pattern was apparent at Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4) where 63% were “very satisfied” with the neighbourhood but only 25% were very satisfied with their home’s distance from facilities and services. The reverse pattern was also seen at Heritage Village (Case Study #8).

5.2.9 transportation

In the Resident Satisfaction Survey, the questions about location were immediately followed by two concerned with transportation. One asked “What do you use most often for transportation?” Response categories provided were (a) public transit (2) own car (3) walk (4) special transportation provided by housing staff (5) rides provided by friends, family or volunteers (6) other. The second question asked: “Is public transit easily accessible to you?”

5.2.9.1 transportation most frequently used

Despite being asked to indicate the type of transportation used most often, some respondents checked more than one alternative. Overall, the type of transportation respondents most frequently reported using was “own car” (45%). Approximately one-third (31%) obtained rides from friends, family or volunteers, 25% said they walked and 23% reported using public transportation. Only 6% reported that they most often used transportation provided by the housing staff - most were from two sites: The Wellington (Case Study #14) and La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19). Under the heading of “other”, 3% mentioned Handi-transit and 2% mentioned taxi.

5.2.9.2 accessibility of public transportation

As can be seen in Table 11, 63% overall reported that public transportation was easily accessible for them. Proportions were high (over 90%) at Sandalwood (Case Study #13), Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15), and Harmer House (Case Study #16). Not surprisingly, they were lowest (0%) at Brinkworthy Place (Case Study #7 - note: Salt Spring Island has no public transportation) and also at Garden Suites (Case Study #11).

5.2.10 safety

Resident Satisfaction Survey respondents were asked how safe they felt inside their home, in common areas of the project, on the grounds of the project, in the parking area and on the streets of the neighbourhood.

5.2.10.1 inside the home

When asked how safe they felt inside their home, 82% overall replied “very safe”. As shown in Table 12, 100% at three sites (Jean Dudley House, L’Oasis des Batisseurs and The Wellington) gave this response. The lowest proportion feeling “very safe” inside their home was at Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 - 50%).

5.2.10.2 common areas of the project

The proportion feeling “very safe” in common areas was less than was the case for inside their dwelling unit (64%). The same three projects - Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5), L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6) and The Wellington (Case Study #14) again topped the high end of the distribution at 100%, 100% and 96% respectively. There were four projects clustered at the low end (only 40-46% feeling “very safe” in the common areas): Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23), South Side Manor (Case Study #20), Harmer House (Case Study #16) and Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9).

5.2.10.3 grounds of the project

There was a further decrease in the proportion feeling “very safe”, when a question was posed about feeling safe on the grounds of the project. In this case only 48% overall said they felt “very safe”. When the individual case studies were examined, perceived safety on the project grounds was found to be highest at Aven Court (Case Study #21 - 88% felt “very safe” outside). There were four projects clustered at the low end: Jean Dudley House (Case Study #4 - 25%); Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 - 30%), Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17 - 32%), and Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9 - 32%).

5.2.10.4 parking area

The proportion feeling “very safe” in their project’s parking area was 35% overall. Projects at the top of the distribution included Heritage Village (Case Study #8 - 86% of respondents feeling “very safe” in the parking area) and L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6 - 75%). Projects at the low end included: La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19 - only 8%), Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17 - 14%) and Cedar Hill Court (Case Study #10 - 17%).

5.2.10.5 neighbourhood

The lowest overall “very safe” response (28%) was in answer to the question “How safe do you feel in the streets in your neighbourhood ?” Projects with the highest proportion feeling “very safe” in the neighbourhood surrounding their site were: L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6 - 75%), Heritage Village (Case Study #8 - 69%) and Brinksworthy Place (Case Study #7 - 61%). Projects at the low end included: Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17 - 3%), Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18 - 13%), La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19 - 17%), and Holland Christian Home (Case Study # 22 - 17%). It is interesting to note that these same projects were at or near the bottom of the distribution when respondents were asked how satisfied, generally, they were with their neighbourhood. Safety concerns were obviously a major factor in their rating.

6. SATISFACTION WITH TENURE

Table 13 shows that a range of tenure arrangements were represented among the Resident Satisfaction Survey respondents. These included three types of owners: those who owned the dwelling and the land (n=24), those who owned the dwelling but leased the land (n=45) and condominium owners (n=11). While owners comprised 14% of the sample, by far the majority of respondents (396 or 73%) were renters. A further 65 (12%) held life-lease agreements and two live in accessory apartments in homes owned by their daughters where they pay no rent.

Table 12: Perceptions of Safety, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% rating their kitchen as very safe	% rating their bathroom as very safe	% feeling very safe inside their home	% feeling very safe in common areas	% feeling very safe on grounds of project	% feeling very safe in parking area	% feeling very safe in neighbourhood
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	0	100	100	n/a	100	100	100
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	100	0	100	n/a	100	100	100
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	n/a	20	88	60	50	20	50
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	n/a	100	100	100	25	n/a	0
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	n/a	88	100	100	75	75	75
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	64	39	83	69	61	47	61
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	57	43	93	86	79	86	69
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	58	58	74	42	32	11	47
D	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	56	33	78	61	44	17	22
	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	63	88	88	75	75	63	25
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	67	50	67	50	42	33	25
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	61	39	100	96	61	52	35
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	70	77	83	53	53	37	47
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	25	35	70	45	35	25	25
F	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	70	70	65	54	32	14	3
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	75	88	75	50	38	25	13
	19	La Maison des Aïnés 1, Montreal QC	83	96	88	79	29	8	17
F	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	58	23	77	46	38	31	23
	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	88	63	88	75	88	50	50
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	78	72	86	63	45	35	17
F	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	50	40	50	40	30	30	20
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	76	66	90	90	76	59	48
		Total	66%	61%	82%	64%	48%	35%	28%

In exploring respondents' satisfaction with their tenure arrangement, they were first asked what they liked and what they disliked about their tenure arrangement, and what arrangement they would prefer. Since life-lease (and co-op arrangements) are relatively sparse in seniors housing, the Resident Satisfaction Survey contained a set of questions targeted to these tenure forms. The first asked "If you are a shareholder in a group that owns the dwellings, or if you have a life-lease arrangement, did you contribute a capital amount or down payment?" If the respondent said "yes", the survey went on to ask the amount contributed, what the respondent thought would happen when he/she, or their estate, wished to end the tenure arrangement and, how satisfied the respondent was with the arrangement for the return of his/her capital.

The survey also asked: "How much is your monthly rent and utilities, or if you own, your mortgage payments, utilities, and maintenance fees?", "What services, in addition to the "rent" are covered by your monthly payments?", "Do you make regular use of the services covered by your monthly payments?" and, "Does the cost of your housing (including monthly fees and/or capital payment) leave you with adequate spending money?"

6.1 Liked and Disliked Aspects of Current Tenure Arrangement

When asked what they liked about their current tenure arrangement, the most common response of both standard homeowners and condominium owners was that they liked owning their own home. Freehold owners on leased land noted that by leasing the land, their home was more affordable. By far the most commonly mentioned positive feature for life-lease holders was that management handles resale. Renters described their tenure arrangement as simple and convenient, they noted that maintenance was taken care of, that they had flexibility and that it was affordable.

In response to a question asking what they disliked about their tenure arrangement, freehold owners did not list anything. Owners of homes on leased land mentioned increases in fees and not having freehold ownership. Condominium owners stated that they disliked condominium regulations. Renters most commonly mentioned increases in the rent and/or noted that the rent was too expensive.

When asked "What arrangement would you prefer?" only 139 of the 544 respondents (26%) answered the question. The most common response, given by 107 of the 139, was "no other arrangement". The next most common response, given by eight respondents, expressed a preference for standard freehold ownership of dwelling and land.

It should be noted that there was obvious confusion among life-lease holders (Case Studies # 10, #15, #16, #16) and owners of dwellings on leased land (Case Studies # 7 & #13) with respect to the nature of their tenure. This was reflected in their response to question 87 which asked "What type of tenure arrangement do you have at your current home" and offered 9 response alternatives. These included: own, rent, live with family members who own or rent, shareholder in an equity coop, corporation or society that owns the dwelling, life-lease agreement, freehold ownership on unit but on a land lease, condominium and other. Some individuals from each of the above mentioned sites chose more than one alternative, generally the combinations were "own" and "life-lease" or "freehold ownership on leased land" and "condominium". Others incorrectly chose "own"; "rent" or "co-op arrangement." Still others left the tenure question unanswered. Most telling, in response to the question which asked: "What do you dislike about your current tenure arrangement?" one life-lease holder, from Case Study #15, wrote:

Somewhat confusing arrangement. I don't really own the apartment, but I'm not a tenant either.

Table 13: Tenure Arrangements, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	own	freehold ownership on leased land	condo	rent	life-lease	other
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC						1
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB				1		
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC						1
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC				10		
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON				4		
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC				8		
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC		36				
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	2		11	1		
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	19					
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC					18	
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS				8		
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	3	9				
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB				23		
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON				10	20	
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON				15	5	
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC				37		
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON				8		
	19	La Maison des Aînés 1, Montreal QC				24		
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB				19	6	
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT				8		
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON				197		
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE				10		
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON				13	16	
		Total	24 4%	45 8%	11 2%	396 73%	65 12%	2 .4%

6.2 Understanding of and Satisfaction with Life-lease Arrangements

Overall, 54% of life-lease holders made a capital contribution or down payment of more than \$100,000, 11% contributed \$50,000-\$100,000, 8% contributed \$10,000-\$50,000, 12% contributed \$10,000 or less and 14% did not answer the question or stated that they didn't know how much they had contributed. As shown in Table 14, "More than \$100,000" was the most common contribution category at all five sites offering life-lease arrangements.

The survey offered five categories for respondents to use as a way of reflecting their understanding of what is returned when a life-lease is terminated. The first alternative was "The original amount will be refunded with no interest" which was chosen by 11% of life-lease holders. The second alternative was "The original amount will be refunded with a small increase for inflation" which was chosen by 41%. However, several crossed out the "inflation increase" portion of the second alternative or otherwise added "less a __% administration fee". A similar insertion (e.g. "less a 3% marketing fee") was made with the third alternative "I can sell my interest for whatever the market will bear" which was chosen by 20% of the respondents. As well, several noted that resale would be handled by their project's administration. One person (1.5%) chose the fourth alternative "Nothing is returned". Over one-quarter (28%) gave no answer, wrote in "don't know" or gave an irrelevant response such as "or my will".

Reflecting some uncertainty about this tenure arrangement, only 40% said they were "very satisfied" with the arrangement for the return of their capital payment, 21% said "somewhat satisfied", 1% said "not satisfied" and 26% wrote in "don't know" or did not answer the question.

6.3 Monthly Housing Costs, Use of Services and Residual Funds: Life-lease Holders

As shown in Table 14, 61% of the life-lease holders reported that they spend less than \$500 per month on housing related costs, 20% said \$500-\$999, 1% said \$1500-\$1999, 5% said \$2000+ and 12% gave no answer.

In addition to the "rent", the services most commonly seen as being covered by their monthly payments were upkeep of the building and grounds (81% of respondents) and recreation programs (25%). In total, 66% of the life-lease holders said that they make regular use of the services covered by their monthly payments, 17% said they did not and 17% gave no answer to the service use question.

In total, 85% of life-lease holders said that they had adequate spending money left after paying for the cost of their housing (including monthly fees and/or capital payment).

There were no major differences in the pattern of response to the above questions across the five sites offering life-lease arrangements.

7. SATISFACTION WITH SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT AND INTERACTION

The section dealing with satisfaction with social involvement and interaction began with a question asking respondents whether they considered themselves to be a social person. Respondents were then asked to estimate how many other residents they had talked with, either in person or on the telephone during the past three days, how many residents they knew well enough to visit in their units or invite to theirs, how often they socialized with other people in the project, and whether since moving to the project, their social life had increased, decreased or stayed the same. Other questions in this section were designed to ascertain respondents' satisfaction with the opportunities for socialization that their housing project afforded, where in the project socialization took place, the type of assistance that neighbours afforded one another, how often the respondent felt lonely, and whether he/she felt part of a community.

Table 14: Contribution, Understanding, Tenure Satisfaction, Housing Costs, and Use of Services, Life-lease Holders, By Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	Project type/name & location	Q92				Q93				Q94				(n)*							
			\$10,000 or less	\$10,000-\$50,000	\$50,000-\$100K	more than \$100K	na/dk	Origin. amt refunded no int	Origin amount refunded w/small increase	Can sell at market	Nothing is returned	n/a . dk or irrel. answer	Very satis. w/ Return arrang	Some what satis		Not satis	n/a or dk					
C	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich BC	5	2		9	2				3	8				4	5	6	1		6	(18)
E	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto ON	2	1	6	7	4				1	11				7	9	7			4	(20)
E	16	Harner House, Nepean ON			1	4					2							3			2	(5)
E	20	South Side Manor, Edmonton AB				5	1				1	5				1	1	3			2	(6)
F	24	The Elliot, Guelph ON		3		10	2					3				6	11	2			3	(16)
Total			8 (12%)	6 (8%)	7 (11%)	35 (54%)	9 (14%)	7 (11%)	1 (1%)	7 (11%)	27 (41%)	13 (18%)	1 (1%)	18 (28%)	26 (40%)	21 (32%)	1 (1%)	17 (26%)			65 (65)	

* (n) = full sample including respondents who did not answer this question

Table 14 (continued) : Contribution, Understanding, Tenure Satisfaction, Housing Costs, and Use of Services, Life-lease Holders, By Option Category and Case Number

cat.	Case #	Project type/name & location	Q95						Q96						Q97 Use Services	Q98 Has adeq.\$	(n)*		
			<\$500	\$500-\$999	\$1000-\$1499	\$1500-\$1999	\$2000+	n/a or dk	Meals	House keeping	Bldg & grounds maint.	Person care	Health Care	Rec Progs				None	
C	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich BC yes no n/a	14	1				3		2	15			5	7		9 (50%) 5 (28%) 4 (22%)	14 (78%) 2 (11%) 2 (11%)	(18)
E	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto ON yes no n/a	14	5				1	2	1	20			2	3	1	15 (75%) 1 (5%) 4 (20%)	17 (85%) 1 (5%) 2 (10%)	(20)
E	16	Harmer House, Nepean ON yes no n/a	1	2					2	2	5				2		5 (100%)	5 (100%)	(5)
E	20	South Side Manor, Edmonton AB yes no na	3	1				1			3				1		3 (50%) 2 (33%) 1 (17%)	4 (67%) 1 (17%) 1 (17%)	(6)
F	24	The Elliot, Guelph ON yes no n/a	8	4				3	2	2	10			2	3		11 (69%) 3 (19%) 2 (12%)	15 (94%) 1 (6%)	(16)
			40 (61%)	13 (20%)				8 (12%)	6 (9%)	7 (11%)	53 (81%)			9 (14%)	16 (25%)	1 (1%)			(65)

* (n) = full sample including respondents who did not answer this question

7.1 Sociability Self-ratings

Overall, 41% of respondents rated themselves as “a very sociable person”, 41% described themselves as “somewhat sociable”, 9% checked “I have just a few close friends”, 5% checked “I tend to keep to myself, mostly” and 4% did not answer the question. As shown in Table 15, among the 20 multi-unit projects, the proportion rating themselves as “very sociable” ranged from none at Jean Dudley House (Case Study # 5) to 74% at Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9), with most projects showing proportions of 25% to 50%.

7.2 Estimated Degree of Interaction with other Residents

Only 9 (2%) of respondents, one each from seven different multi-unit projects and two from Holland Christian Homes, said that they had not talked with another resident during the previous three days. Of those who had spoken with another resident, 16% estimated the number spoken to at 1-5, 40% estimated between 6 and 25+, and 17% said “several”, “many”, or “a lot”. Approximately one-quarter of the respondents (26%) gave no answer or said the question estimating the number of other residents spoken to in the past three days was non-applicable.

The non-response rate was much smaller (7%) to a subsequent question asking for an estimate of other residents known well enough to visit in their units. In total, 29% estimated knowing 1-4 persons well enough to visit in their unit, 56% estimated knowing 5-15+ and only 7% estimated knowing no one that well. Detailed examination of the data showed that 15 of the 39 respondents in the latter category were from one project: Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17).

When asked how frequently they socialized with others in their project, 40% overall said “every day”, 32% said “a few times a week”, 11% estimated once a week, 8% estimated less frequently and 4% said “rarely or never”. Projects with the highest proportion socializing daily included Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5 - 75%) and L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6 - 75%). Lowest rates of daily socialization were found at Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9 - 5%), Cedar Hill Court (Case Study #10 - 11%), Garden Suites (Case Study #11 - 13%), Aven Court (Case Study #21 - 13%) and Brinkworthy Place (Case Study #7 - 19%).

7.3 Change in Social Life Since Moving to Project

Overall, 42% of respondents reported that their social life had increased since moving to their current housing, 14% said it had decreased, and 40% said it had stayed the same. As shown in Table 15, the greatest proportion reporting an increase in social life was from Heritage Village (Case Study #8 - 93%). The greatest proportion reporting a decrease lived at Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 - 70%).

7.4 Locations Where Socializing Takes Place

As can be seen in Table 15, the projects with the highest rates of daily socializing tended to be those with the highest proportion of respondents who reported eating daily in a common dining area.

In total, 14 of the 20 multi-unit projects offered some meal service. The number and frequency of meals as well as the method of payment varies considerably across projects (see Section 9.1 below)

Table 15: Social Involvement and Interaction, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% rating self very sociable person	% w/ enough opp. to social.	Locations Where Socialization Takes Place			Neighbour Assistance								
					% in dwell. units	% in comm. space	% in public space	% get items from store	% lend or borrow things	% give advice	% look in on	% help when ill	% watch home when away			
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	30	50	30	80	20	50	40	10	10	40	30	0	0	0
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	0	100	25	100	0	50	0	50	75	50	50	0	0	0
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	38	75	50	63	0	25	38	38	50	63	0	0	0	0
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	33	72	33	19	50	33	42	25	53	36	56	56	56	56
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	50	93	79	69	93	57	50	50	71	43	57	57	57	57
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	74	63	74	37	26	21	32	16	42	26	58	58	58	58
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	28	89	33	83	33	61	27	33	44	50	33	33	33	33
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	25	88	75	63	13	75	38	0	75	63	0	0	0	0
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	33	92	75	58	67	25	50	83	42	8	67	67	67	67
	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	43	91	43	96	35	35	26	26	35	35	9	9	9	9
E	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	40	83	53	87	23	43	3	17	33	40	27	27	27	27
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	45	85	50	90	40	55	40	45	70	50	25	25	25	25
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	59	78	19	76	19	24	3	22	8	14	3	3	3	3
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	25	88	38	75	13	25	25	13	63	0	0	0	0	0
	19	La Maison des Ainés 1, Montreal QC	58	92	38	71	21	46	4	13	13	25	8	8	8	8
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	50	81	35	81	38	38	23	15	58	31	15	15	15	15
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	25	100	88	n/a	13	25	13	13	50	25	25	25	25	25
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	37	87	76	73	40	46	17	34	50	32	35	35	35	35
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	50	88	20	100	30	30	40	10	70	20	0	0	0	0
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	45	97	45	79	45	45	41	28	52	31	24	24	24	24
		Total	41%	84%	56%	71%	36%	42%	23%	28%	46%	33%	28%	28%	28%	28%

Table 15 (continued): Social Involvement and Interaction, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% very satis. w/ social life	% rarely or never lonely	% feel always part of comm unity	Frequency Eats in Common Dining Area			% socialize daily w/ others in proj	Status of Social Life Since Moving In		
						% daily	a few times a week	1-3 times a month		% w/ more social life	% w/ same amt. of social life	% w/ less social life
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	100	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	20	90	40	90		63	20	40	30	
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	25	25	75	100		75	50	50		
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	50	25	50	100		75	38	25	38	
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	61	53	44	n/a	n/a	19	17	53	19	
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	69	79	86	n/a	n/a	43	93	7		
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	61	53	47	n/a	n/a	5	47	32	16	
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	56	56	61	6	39	11	33	61		
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	75	63	75	n/a	n/a	13	63	25	13	
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	67	75	75	n/a	n/a	25	58	33		
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	83	61	61	83	9	61	28	35	35	
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	63	57	73	7	40	47	53	23	23	
	16	Harner House, Nepean, ON	60	55	50	n/a	20	35	40	35	20	
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	43	51	35	86	3	76	35	46	14	
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	63	50	88	38		50	25	75		
	19	La Maison des Aïnés 1, Montreal QC	58	46	75	88	8	42	42	42	8	
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	61	69	69	27	11	31	46	42		
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	88	100	50	n/a	n/a	13		100		
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	72	59	73	20	1	39	51	36	11	
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	40	30	40	100		60	10	20	70	
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	69	72	69	45		38	17	62	14	
		Total	64%	59%	64%			40%	42%	40%	14%	

When asked explicitly if they socialized in their homes, in shared areas of their housing project such as corridors, activity areas and laundry and/or in public places such as parking areas, garden or sidewalk, overall, 71% of respondents indicated that they socialize in shared areas, 56% reported socializing in their dwelling unit, and 36% in public places. As can be seen in Table 14, there was considerable variation across projects in the proportion who socialize in their unit. Aven Court (Case Study #21) stands at the high end of the distribution (88%). Virtually all socializing that occurs there appears to take place within the individual dwelling units. In contrast, at Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study # 17) socializing takes place mainly in shared areas.

7.5 Neighbour Assistance

Table 15 shows the six specific types of assistance that were enquired about in the Resident Satisfaction Survey. As can be seen, 46% of respondents reported that in the past three months they and their neighbours had looked in on one another, 42% reported assisting by picking things up at a store, 33% had given or received help when someone was sick, 28% had given or received advice from a neighbour, 28% looked after one another's home when someone was away and 23% had lent or borrowed things. When asked what other ways they and their neighbours had helped one another out, "driving" was most frequently mentioned (by 2% of respondents).

7.6 Satisfaction with Social Life and Opportunities to Socialize

The vast majority of respondents (84%) felt that they had enough opportunities to socialize with other residents in their project, 3% said they did not have enough opportunities, 1% said they had too many opportunities and 11% did not answer the question or said it was not applicable. Of those who did not feel they had enough opportunities to socialize, the greatest number came from Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17).

Overall, 64% of respondents reported being "very satisfied" with their social life, a further 29% were "somewhat satisfied". As shown in Table 15, the projects with the highest proportion "very satisfied" included Aven Court (Case Study-#21 - 88%) and The Wellington (Case Study-#14 - 83%). The projects with the lowest proportion "very satisfied" included two of the three in Category B: Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4 - 20%) and Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5 - 25%).

7.7 Perceived Connectedness

Respondents were asked how frequently they felt lonely and whether living in their present residence, they felt that they were part of a community.

7.7.1 Loneliness

Aven Court had the highest proportion (100%) reporting that they were "rarely or never lonely". Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4) ranked second (90% "rarely or never lonely"). Heritage Village was third (Case Study # - 79%). Projects at the low end of the distribution on this variable were Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5 - 25%), L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6 -25%) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 -30%).

7.7.2 sense of community

Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18) and Heritage Village (Case Study #8) were the projects that had the high proportion answering "always" to the question "Living here, do you feel you are part of a community?" (88% and 86% respectively). Lowest proportions were at Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17 - 35%) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 - 40%).

8. SATISFACTION WITH MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL APPROACH

Residents' satisfaction with the management and operation of their project was approached indirectly by asking survey respondents the following four questions: "How important is it to you to be involved in decisions that affect your housing?", "Are you involved in making decisions about your housing (e.g. do you participate in a housing or similar committee within the project?)", "Do you feel that your opinions are listened to?" and "How welcome do you feel going into the administrative area?".

8.1 Perceived Importance of Involvement in Decision Making and Actual Involvement

Overall, 34% of the respondents said that it was "very important" to them to be involved in decision-making. An additional 31% said such involvement was "somewhat important". However, only 7% of the respondents reported that they actually were "very involved" in decision making about their housing, while 25% said they were "somewhat involved".

As can be seen in Table 16, the two projects showing the largest discrepancy between the proportion of respondents who rated having input into housing-related decisions as "very important" and the proportion who reported being "very" or "somewhat involved" in the decision-making process were Aven Court (Case Study #21) and Southside Manor (Case Study #20). In these two projects and two others, Harmer House (Case Study #16) and Woodside on the Green (Case Study #9), only about one-third of residents felt that their opinions were listened or that they had some influence on housing-related decisions.

8.2 Feeling Welcome in the Administrative Area

With respect to feeling welcome in the administrative area, Southside Manor and Woodside on the Green again stand out -- only 4% and 16% respectively said that they felt "very welcome" in their project's administrative area. It should be noted, however, that at both these sites (and at Brinkworthy Place) approximately one-third of the respondents indicated that the question about administrative area was "not applicable".

9. RESIDENT SATISFACTION WITH SUPPORT SERVICES AND AMENITIES

Fifteen services and amenities were enquired about in the Resident Satisfaction Survey. For each, respondents were asked to indicate their frequency of use (daily, weekly, monthly, less often or never) and whether they were or were not satisfied with what was provided. Given that there was considerable variation in the availability of services across projects and in the proportion using them, **in this section, in contrast to other parts of this report, in calculating satisfaction ratings only those who used the service were included in the denominator.**

9.1 Meals

Fourteen of the 21 multi-unit projects provide some meal service. The number of meals available to residents varies widely as does the method of payment. For example, three meals per day are provided as part of the rent at Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4), Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5), and L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6). At Residence Wifred-LeCours (Case Study # 17) residents can receive two meals per day, one of which must be fixed at a certain time, the other is transferable to another time, either lunch or dinner. The Wellington (Case Study #14) includes one meal per day in the rent, served in a hotel-style, formal dining room. The rent at La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19) includes a mid-day hot meal on weekdays. At Cedar Hill Court (Case Study #10) meals are prepared on-site by contracted

Table 16: Participation in Management and Operation of the Project, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% rating involvement w/ housing decisions as "very" important	% "very" or "some what" involved in making housing decisions	% feeling their opinions listened to or that they have some influence	% feeling "very" welcome in admin. area
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	0	100	0	n/a
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	100	100	n/a
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	0	0	0	n/a
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	50	70	63	n/a
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	50	50	100	n/a
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	0	13	38	75
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	44	33	56	31
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	57	69	71	86
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	32	26	32	16
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	50	50	72	44
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	38	38	50	n/a
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	58	67	83	83
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	35	48	65	78
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	40	60	70	53
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	55	60	40	50
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	24	19	22	51
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	75	63	50	63
	19	La Maison des Aïnés I, Montreal QC	38	25	46	75
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	59	31	35	4
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	25	0	25	63
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	25	17	46	47
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	0	20	70	50
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	31	38	69	83
		Total	34%	32%	50%	49%

professions three times per week and are available at a neighbouring building on alternate nights. At Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15), a mid-day meal is served five days a week for about 30 people and may be purchased for a price of \$5. Harmer House (Case Study #16) provides four meals per week for subscribers. Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18) has optional mid-day meals. Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23) includes meals in the rent of Community Care residents and offers them as an option to residents of Whisperwood Court.

As can be seen in Table 17, the proportion of Resident Satisfaction Survey respondents who reported taking any meals at their site ranged from highs of 100% at Jean Dudley House and L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Studies #5 and #6) to a low of 10% at Harmer House. As expected, usage rates are higher, although surprisingly not 100%, at sites where meals are included as part of the rent. Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4) stand out in this regard. This site also stands out for the low satisfaction rate (only 20%) among those who do eat there. While the majority are satisfied at Residence Wilfred-LeCours and La Maison des Aïnés 1 (64% and 65% respectively), there is obviously some room for improvement at these sites as well.

9.2 Housekeeping Service

Daily housekeeping services, at least in common areas, is included as part of the rent at the three projects in Category B. Weekly in-unit housekeeping service is part of the rent at The Wellington (Case Study #14). At six other sites (Harmer House, Residence Wilfred-Lecours, Southside Manor, Holland Christian Homes, Whisperwood Villa and The Elliot), from 4%-60% of respondents reported receiving housekeeping services, most commonly on a weekly basis. In the case of Whisperwood Villa, this service is provided by Community Care. It is available on request at Southside Manor (Case Study #20) and may be as well at the other sites where it is received by a small minority of respondents. Satisfaction rates among those receiving this service were high, ranging from 75% to 100%.

9.3 Sports/Recreational Amenities

As shown in Table 17, at least some respondents from each of the 20 multi-unit projects reported using on-site sports and recreational amenities. Usage rates were highest at Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23 -80%), Heritage Village (Case Study #8 -79%), and Sandalwood (Case Study #13- 75%) and lowest at Cedar Hill Court (Case Study #10 - 6%), Brinkworthy Place (Case Study #11 -11%) and Southside Manor (Case Study #20 - 11%). Satisfaction rates ranged from 75% to 100% among users.

9.4 Transportation Service

Respondents from 12 of the 20 multi-unit sites reported using site-provided transportation. Usage rates ranged from a high of 65% at the Wellington (Case Study #14) to under 8% at, Southside Manor (Case Study #20), Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22) and The Elliot (Case Study #24). Satisfaction rates among users ranged from 82% to 100%.

9.5 Personal Care Services

Respondents from 10 of the 20 multi-unit projects reported that they received personal care services. Rates were 75% and 70% respectively at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23) but only 4%-13% at the other sites. Virtually all recipients were satisfied with the service they received.

Table 17: Use and Satisfaction with Services, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number*

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	meals		housekeeping		sports/rec amen.		transportation service		personal care	
			% using	% satis	% using	% satis	% using	% satis	% using	% satis	% using	% satis
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	70	20	30	100	40	100	n/a		10	100
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	100	100	100	75	50	100	30	100	75	100
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	100	88	88	75	50	100	25	100	n/a	
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	n/a		n/a		11	100	n/a		n/a	
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	n/a		n/a		79	82	n/a		n/a	
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	n/a		n/a		21	75	n/a		n/a	
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	89	88	n/a		6	100	n/a		n/a	
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	n/a		n/a		50	100	n/a		n/a	
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	n/a		n/a		75	100	n/a		n/a	
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	87	95	83	89	57	100	65	100	4	100
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	37	100	n/a		27	88	17	100	7	100
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	10	100	20	100	35	71	55	91	n/a	
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	89	64	16	100	49	78	30	82	16	100
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	75	100	n/a		25	100	38	100	n/a	
	19	La Maison des Aînés 1, Montreal QC	83	65	4	100	63	93	46	100	n/a	
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	42	91	15	100	11	100	4	100	4	100
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	n/a		n/a		25	100	n/a		13	100
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	33	98	7	100	28	98	4	100	12	100
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	90	78	60	83	80	88	20	100	70	86
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	41	100	31	100	41	75	7	100	7	100
		Total										

* Note: the denominator for percentage calculations in this table includes only those who reported using the service.

Table 17 (continued) : Use and Satisfaction with Services, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	laundry		fitness/exercise equipment		beaut/hair care salon		physiotherapy		counseling		religious services		organized outings/travel	
			% using	% satis	% using	% satis	% using	% satis.	% using	% satis.	% using	% satis.	% using	% satis	% using	% satis
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	50	100	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		10	100
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	50	100	n/a		25	100	n/a		50	100	n/a		75	100
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	38	100	63	100	38	100	n/a		n/a		63	80	n/a	
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	n/a		21	100	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		86	100
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		11	100
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	33	100	n/a		39	100	n/a		n/a		44	100	11	50
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	n/a		25	100	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		13	100
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	n/a		75	100	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		42	80
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	61	93	28	90	61	100	n/a		n/a		30	100	43	100
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	30	89	17	100	40	92	10	66	3	100	40	83	30	89
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	50	100	15	33	55	100	n/a		5	100	40	100	40	100
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	49	83	n/a		3	0	n/a		3	100	65	96	16	83
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	25	100	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		13	100	n/a	
	19	La Maison des Aînés 1, Montreal QC	8	100	29	100	33	88	n/a		21	80	33	100	29	100
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	54	79	4	100	n/a		n/a		4	100	42	100	11	66
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	53	99	13	92	54	98	18	92	4	100	65	98	26	94
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	70	100	50	80	60	100	n/a		10	100	50	60	60	100
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	28	100	7	100	21	100	n/a		3	100	41	100	17	80
		Total														

Table 17 (continued) : Use and Satisfaction with Services, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	cultural events/entertainment		workshop/activity area		convenience store		onsite staff assist	a&s support daily activity	a&s aid socializ	in hours w/ out a&s	servi qual	w/kinds of serv.
			% using	% satis	% using	% satis	% using	% satis						
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	10	100	10	100	n/a		n/a	20	20	30	10	10
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	25	100	25	100	25	100	100	100	100	50	100	100
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	38	100	50	100	n/a		100	63	100	75	50	50
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	3	100	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	11	3	0	n/a	n/a
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	57	88	7	100	n/a	100	n/a	36	43	21	50	50
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	5	100	n/a		5	100	n/a	16	11	5	n/a	n/a
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	22	50	6	100	17	100	n/a	56	67	17	50	44
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	25	100	13	100	n/a		n/a	38	38	13	63	63
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	33	100	n/a		n/a		n/a	75	83	33	92	75
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	65	93	n/a		65	100	n/a	87	83	26	83	74
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	43	92	17	100	35	100	67	63	87	17	67	60
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	40	75	15	66	5	100	55	60	50	25	40	25
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	46	82	14	83	3	100	70	38	59	14	35	31
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	13	100	n/a		n/a		50	50	38	0	63	75
	19	La Maison des Aînés 1, Montreal QC	42	100	38	100	4	100	92	71	67	25	67	54
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	23	100	4	100	n/a		42	42	35	11	15	11
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	n/a		n/a		n/a		50	50	38	13	25	25
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	41	99	8	94	56	95	80	56	55	20	69	64
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	70	100	40	80	40	75	80	80	80	40	60	50
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	24	86	21	83	7	100	52	79	72	10	69	66
		Total							53%	54%	19%			

9.6 Laundry Service

Respondents from 14 sites reported using on-site laundry service. Usage rates were highest at Whisperwood Villa (Case Study # 23 -70%) and The Wellington (Case Study # 14 - 61%). Satisfaction ratings ranged from 79% to 100%.

9.7 Fitness/Exercise Equipment

Respondents from 12 sites reported using site-provided fitness and exercise equipment. Usage rates were highest at Sandalwood (Case Study #13 -75%) and L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6 - 63%) and lowest at Southside Manor (Case Study #20 - 4%) and The Elliot (Case Study #24 - 7%). Satisfaction rates among users ranged from 79% to 100%.

9.8 Beauty/Hair Care Salon

On-site hair care was provided at 10 sites. Usage rates ranged from highs of 60% and 61% at The Wellington (Case Study #14) and Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23) to a low of 3% at Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17). Residence Wilfred-LeCours stands out because its one respondent indicating use of this service was not satisfied. At the other nine sites, satisfaction rates ranged from 92% to 100%.

9.9 Physiotherapy service

Respondents from only two sites, Suomi-Koti (Case Study #15) and Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22), reported using physiotherapy services. Usage rates at both sites were low (10% and 18% respectively). While satisfaction was high at Holland Christian Homes (92%), there appears to be room for improvement at Suomi-Koti (66% satisfied).

9.10 On-site Counselling

Respondents from nine sites reported receiving counselling. The usage rate was highest at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5) where half of the respondents reported receiving this service followed by La Maison des Aïnés 1 (Case Study #19 - 21%). At the other six sites it was 10% or less. Virtually all counselling recipients were satisfied with the service they received.

9.11 Religious Services

Respondents from 12 sites reported attending on-site religious services. Attendance rates ranged from about two-thirds of the respondents from L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6), Residence Wilfred-LeCours (Case Study #17) and Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #24) to 13% at Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18). Satisfaction ratings ranged from 8% to 100%.

9.12 Outings

Respondents from 16 sites reported going on outings organized by the site. Participation rates ranged from highs of 86% of respondents at Heritage Village (Case Study #8) and 75% at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5) to 10-13% at five of the other sites. Satisfaction ratings ranged from 50% at Cedar Hill Lodge (Case Study #10) and 66% at Southside Manor (Case Study #20) to 89% or over at the other 14 sites.

9.13 Cultural Events/Entertainment

Respondents from 19 of the 20 multi-unit sites reported attending cultural events or entertainment provided on-site. Participation rates ranged from highs of 70% and 65% at Whisperwood Villa

Study #23) and The Wellington (Case Study #14) to 3% and 5% at Brinkworthy Place and Woodside on the Green (Case Studies 7 and 9). Satisfaction ratings ranged from 50% at Cedar Hill Court (Case Study #10) to 75% or over at the other sites.

9.14 Workshop/Activity Area

While only two sites have woodworking workshops many have other activity areas. Respondents from 14 sites reported these spaces. Usage rates ranged from a high of 50% at L'Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6) to lows of 4% to 8% at four sites. User satisfaction was 66% at Harmer House and from 83% to 100% at the other sites.

9.15 Convenience Store

Respondents from 11 sites reported using a convenience store on their site. Usage rates ranged from 65% at The Wellington (Case Study #14) and 56% at Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22) to 4% to 7% at five sites. Satisfaction rates were 75% to 100%.

9.16 Satisfaction with On-site Staff

The Resident Satisfaction Survey asked a series of questions about the way in which service was provided by on-site staff. There was an extremely high degree of consensus among those answering the question. Therefore, only overall figures are presented.

9.16.1 information provision

Three questions were asked about information provision by on-site staff. One concerned the availability of information in the respondent's language of choice. The others asked, "Is information given by service providers?" and "Is the information easy to understand?" Overall, 71% of respondents answered the question about availability of service information in their language of choice; 99% of these indicated that it was. Just over half (51%) answered the question about information being provided by on-site service providers. Of these, 99% said that they did. In total, 54% answered the question about understandability of information provided. Of these, 99% said that it was easy to understand.

9.16.2 availability and attitude

Five questions addressed staff's availability and attitude. The first of these was "Is assistance from staff/volunteers available?" Overall, 62% of respondents answered this question; 99% said "yes" or "usually". The second question asked whether on-site staff were courteous and helpful. The response rate was 75%; 99% of respondents said "yes" or "usually". The third question in this set asked if on-site staff are knowledgeable and competent. The response rate was 68%; 97% answered in the affirmative. The fourth question asked if on-site staff kept well informed. The response rate was 69%; 93% said "yes" or "usually". The fifth question asked if staff spent enough time with the respondent. The response rate was 62%; 92% answered "yes" or "usually".

9. 17 Overall Satisfaction with Services & Amenities

Overall satisfaction with services and amenities was addressed by asking the respondents four "yes-no" questions, two satisfaction rating questions and several additional open-ended questions. Response to five of these questions is shown in Table 18.

As can be seen, overall 53% of respondents from the 20 multi-unit sites responded "yes" to the question: "Do the amenities and services you receive support your everyday activities?" The proportion of affirmative responses to this question was highest at Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5 - 100%) and The Wellington (Case Study # 14 - 87%).

A similar overall proportion (54%) said “yes” to the question “Do these amenities and services make it easier to socialize with other residents and/or visitors?” Again, when the individual project responses are examined Jean Dudley House is included among the top two in terms of proportion answering “yes” (100%). There was also a 100% affirmative response rate at L’Oasis des Batisseurs (Case Study #6).

L’Oasis des Batisseurs stands out also for having the highest proportion (75%) who indicated that they would not be comfortable living in their housing project if the amenities and services it offers were not available.

Not surprisingly given their target population and project type, affirmative responses to the first two of these questions were lowest at Brinkworthy Place (Case Study #7 - 11% and 3%) and at Woodside on the Green (Case Study #10 - 16% and 11%). Fewer than 5% at these two sites and at Fenelon Falls (Case Study #18) expressed concerns about the lack of amenities and services at their site.

The final two key questions in this section asked respondents how satisfied they were with the quality and with the kinds of services and amenities offered at their project. The highest proportions “very satisfied” with the quality of service they received were Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5 -100%), Sandalwood (Case Study #13 -92%) and The Wellington (Case Study # 14 - 83%). The same three projects plus Fenelon Falls (Case Study # 18) were at the top of the “very satisfied” distribution with respect to the kinds of services provided. Projects at the bottom of the “very satisfied” distribution for both quality and kinds of services included Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study # 4) and Southside Manor (Case Study #20).

Most respondents from Brinkworthy Place and Woodside on the Green chose not to answer these latter two questions.

10. OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH HOUSING PROJECT

Four questions were used to assess the respondents’ overall level of satisfaction with their housing project: “Have you ever thought seriously about moving out?”, “If you could do it over, would you still move here?”, “Are you proud to live here?” and “Are you happy living here?”

The vast majority of respondents were satisfied. Overall, 85% had never seriously considered moving out, 88% would repeat the move if doing things over, 78% said they were proud to live in their project and 70% rated themselves as “very happy” living there.

As shown in Table 18, enthusiasm was high for all three of the projects in Category A. Among the multi-unit projects, those rated highest when proportions from the four questions were averaged were: Jean Dudley House (Case Study #5), Garden Suites (Case Study #11), Fenelon Falls (Case Study # 18), and The Elliot Group (Case Study # 14). The next highest grouping included Sandalwood Adult Resort (Case Study #13), La Maison des Ainés 1 (Case Study #19) and Holland Christian Homes (Case Study #22). Satisfaction was clearly lowest at the Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses (Case Study #4) followed by Whisperwood Villa (Case Study #23) and Harmer House (Case Study #16). Heritage and Coach Abbeyfield Houses and Whisperwood Villa, it should be recalled, serve the oldest clients. Both of these projects are also distinguished by having the highest proportion of clients who use a mobility aid (80% and 90% respectively). In interpreting the data it will be important for the personnel from both of these sites to attempt to ascertain if there was good person-environment fit when clients initially moved to the project, as well as ways to improve the current fit.

Table 18: Overall Housing Satisfaction, Resident Satisfaction Survey Respondents, by Option Category and Case Number

cat.	case #	project type/name & location	% who have never thought about moving out	% who would repeat the move if doing things over	% proud to live in project	% "very" happy living in project
A	1	Accessory apt., New Westminster, BC	100	100	100	100
	2	Garden suite, Sackville, NB	100	100	100	100
	3	Maison Bi-Familiale Ste-Foy, QC	100	100	100	100
B	4	Heritage & Coach Abbeyfield, Vancouver, BC	60	70	20	40
	5	Jean Dudley House, Toronto, ON	100	100	75	100
	6	L'Oasis des Batisseurs, St-Nazaire, QC	88	88	88	50
C	7	Brinkworthy Place, Salt Spring Island, BC	83	92	69	64
	8	Heritage Village, Vineland, ON	71	93	86	71
	9	Woodside on Green, Airdrie, AB	95	95	58	58
	10	Cedar Hill Court, Saanich, BC	78	83	78	50
D	11	Garden Suites, New Glasgow, NS	75	100	100	100
	13	Sandalwood Adult Resort, Kelowna, BC	92	92	92	83
E	14	The Wellington, Winnipeg, MB	83	100	74	61
	15	Suomi-Koti, Toronto, ON	90	83	77	77
	16	Harmer House, Nepean, ON	80	70	40	50
	17	Residence Wilfred-LeCours, Quebec City, QC	78	78	76	49
	18	Fenelon Falls Indep. Living Ctr., Fenelon Falls, ON	100	100	88	88
	19	La Maison des Ainés 1, Montreal QC	75	91	96	88
	20	Southside Manor, Edmonton, AB	69	96	67	62
F	21	Aven Court, Yellowknife, YT	75	100	63	75
	22	Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, ON	90	88	86	78
	23	Whisperwood Villa, Sherwood, PE	70	88	50	30
	24	The Elliot Group, Guelph, ON	93	97	90	86
		Total	85%	88%	78%	70%