Aging in Community is a design competition with several unique differences:

- Eight different design teams will work on four different sites. These four sites reflect typical conditions in the city--strip commercial, urban infill, and adaptive reuse.

- The competition focuses on the social as well as the physical environment. We begin with the premise that successful housing for seniors needs to coordinate both shelter and services.

- Our goal is to rethink or reconceptualize senior housing. Rather than focusing on a single design solution, we will award ideas for innovation in senior housing and services.

Thus, the participating design firms will be responsible for producing not only the traditional design drawings (plan, section, elevation) but also for communicating innovative concepts that further aging in place/community, age integration, fostering of informal support, accessible and energy efficient design.

One goal of the competition is to foster interaction between the participating architects and community groups associated with the four selected sites. This collaboration was initiated in neighborhood focus groups and will continue during a design “charrette” being held over the weekend February 9-11th at the School of
Architecture and Urban Planning on the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee campus. While each of the four sites has specific needs, it is our hope that the ideas generated can be used as templates for similar developments in Milwaukee as well as other cities. We view this ideas competition as the first step in an ongoing process to nurture innovative senior housing in Milwaukee. Thus, all competition solutions will be published on our website as well as displayed at public venues within the city.

The Aging in Community Ideas competition also represents a unique public-private partnership with primary support coming from the Community Design Solutions Program of UW-Milwaukee as well four local foundations (Helen Bader Foundation; Faye McBeath Foundation; Greater Milwaukee Foundation; and United Way of Greater Milwaukee.) Additional community organizations have also lent their support (Milwaukee County Department on Aging, City of Milwaukee, Institute on Aging and Environment, UW-Milwaukee, Institute on Age and Community, UW-Milwaukee, Wisconsin EngAGEmnt Project of the Donors Forum of Wisconsin, Milwaukee Aging Consortium).
Problem Statement

It is now widely recognized that our society is aging at a rapid rate. It is estimated that one out of five people will be over the age of 65 by 2030. Within the city of Milwaukee, the Wisconsin Department of Administration estimates that by 2010 165,348 (16.9%) persons will be 60 years or older. Milwaukee must rise to the challenge of addressing this demographic wave within the context of our changing urban areas. Increasing societal attention is being directed to the concept of “aging in place” wherein elders remain in their own homes with necessary services brought to them. While this is clearly an attractive option, some have questioned its economic viability and ask if whether the effective end result is actually “aging in isolation”. The concept of aging in community, wherein one remains a part of a familiar and supportive organization or neighborhood, is perhaps a more workable alternative. As reflected in the title, this competition has adapted the perspective of aging in community with the goal of exploring its architectural and operational implications. Can aging in community be implemented through the creation of senior cohousing, co-ops and/or naturally occurring retirement communities?

Contextual / Community Issues

In considering innovation in senior housing there are a number of critical issues that must be kept in mind. Lawler (2001) has effectively summarized many of these concerns in her analysis of coordination of housing and health care for American elders.

Lawler identifies four key issues with respect to aging in place/community. As Americans are growing older, so are the dwellings and neighborhoods in which many of them live. Often these environments are ill suited to the needs, desires and competencies of older persons. What does this imply for environment modifications at the residential scale (accessible bathrooms) and at the neighborhood scale (sidewalks and traffic calming)? What does this imply for creating customized solutions to integrate housing and services (hospice or home health care)?

What are the benefits and costs of Aging in Place/Community? Clearly, aging in place has benefits with respect to maintenance of social networks and reduced
trauma of relocation. At the same time, it must be recognized that bringing services to all elders in their homes may result in exceeding high costs to society as a whole.

Based upon a survey of housing professional Lawler (2001) identified four key components for Aging in Place/Community. These are choice, flexibility, intergenerational contact and calibrated support. Increasingly, aging Americans will desire a greater voice in decision making with respect to their living accommodations and the services they receive.

Finally and most relevant to the goals of this competition, Lawler identifies five “opportunities” or strategies to support Aging in Place/Community:

- **Community Development Corporations / Community-Based Nonprofit organizations**

  Community Development Corporations and Community Based Nonprofits are often most connected to the needs of older residents and the local service network. Together they can play an effective role in coordinating health and housing services for the elders.

- **Community Revitalization**

  In an effort to revitalize existing urban communities, it is important to recognize the unique contributions as well as the needs of their older residents. They are often the repository of a community’s history and reflective of its identity. Moreover, many successful revitalization projects have utilized senior housing as a catalyst for future development. Increasingly, baby boomers want to live downtown where “the action” is occurring.

- **NORCs – Naturally Occurring Retirement Communities**

  Some communities are judged by elders to be well suited to their needs which in turn attracts additional older person and in some cases, such as the west side of Madison, they become a substantial part (25%) of the total population of what becomes known as NORCs.
• **Living in Healthy Communities**

There has been increased recognition over the past decade that low density, auto oriented and land use segregated communities inhibit everyday physical activities such as walking around the block (difficult if there are no sidewalks) or walking to a neighborhood convenience store. Research carried out as part of the Active Living Initiative of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (http://www.activelivingbydesign.org) is of direct relevance to issues of Aging in Place/Community.

• **New Urbanism**

Parallel to the Active Living movement, there has been renewed interest in the benefits of (Neo)-Traditional Neighborhood Design. Here as well there is a concern for walkable communities with particular attention to the needs of those user groups (the young and the elderly) without access to an automobile. Many of the principles articulated in the Charter of New Urbanism (http://www.cnu.org) are directly relevant to issues of Aging in Place/Community.

Competition Challenge Statement

The goal is to develop inventive, replicable design concepts for senior housing and services that will serve as a community focal point within the urban neighborhood. The Aging in Community Ideas Competition builds upon five core goals:

- **Create Opportunities to Age in Place/Community**

  How can the designed environment support the desires of people to age in the familiar neighborhoods in which they have spent their lives? How can we nurture people’s sense of being part of a larger “community” with a sense of shared identity and mutual support? Can we design dwelling units that flex between assisted living and independent living to avoid unnecessary relocation?

- **Maintain and Strengthen Links to the Larger Community**

  The creation of senior housing need not and likely should not imply age segregation or elderly enclaves. Even NORCs (with 20-25% elders) can still be and often are quite heterogeneous with respect to age. Can we create communities where people of all ages have a place—vest pocket park, café, or corner tap—where the young can learn from the experience and wisdom of elders, and elders can enjoy the vitality and exuberance of the young?

- **Nurture Informal Social Supports**

  It may increasingly be the case that social services for elders will not all come from formal service providers. In the spirit of “community” can people of diverse ages support one another both socially and pragmatically? Can house bound elders “trade” with single parents—exchanging child care for grocery shopping or tutoring? Can home cooked meals be traded for instructions on how to use E-mail?

- **Provide Barrier Free Settings.**

  The past two decades have seem gratifying progress in the creation of environments accessible to all users—including those who are challenged with respect to mobility, dexterity, or sensory/cognitive processing. Can “Universal Design” or “Visitability”
respond to these needs without creating institutional environments?


• Foster Energy Conscious and Sustainable Design

Like Universal Design energy conscious design and sustainable design (Green Architecture) have increasingly become the norm over the past two decades. To encourage adaptive reuse of buildings, one of the selected competition sites is occupied by an existing school building which could easily be converted into housing or a place for community services. In addition to conservation of non-renewable resources, can Green Architecture heighten our awareness of nature and enrich our experience of places?  http://www.stopwaste.org/docs/gettingstarted.pdf
Program Guidelines

In our search for innovative ideas rather than formulaic solutions, we have chosen to keep the “program” quite loose, providing general direction in place of room titles and square footages. In broad terms think of your design task as providing “housing +”. “Housing” need not be limited to what is typically thought of as housing for those who are able to live independently, or housing for those who would benefit from some degree of assistance (housekeeping, meals, medications). In the spirit of aging in place/community, housing can accommodate residents of varying levels of competence and flex in response to the changing needs of individuals over time? The “plus” half of “housing +” can take a variety of different forms. Feel free to consider a broad range of services that might serve your site and the surrounding community. These might include a daycare for children or adults, a wellness center, volunteer center, home repair or information center, etc. One particularly successful example is the Mather More than a Café to be found in several neighborhoods in Chicago http://www.matherlifeways.com/iyc_mathersmorethanacafe.asp. Another example is the “Apartment for Life” concept developed by Humanitas in the Netherlands which includes such “well-being” elements as restaurants, bars, music groups, and even hosting of wedding parties http://www.woonzinnig.nl/engels/index.php3.

In this same spirit of innovation, density guidelines for the competition well remain rather broad. For three of the four sites (See Table 1) densities between 30 and 45 units per acres are suggested. For the Three Holy Women Site, given the density and cost of the adjacent properties, we propose a doubling of the density to 60 to 90 units per acre.

- **Housing Options**
  Your design proposal may include any or all of the following:

  Independent Living*
  Assisted Living (CBRF, RCAC)
  Adaptable Housing (Accommodate Independent or Assisted Living Needs)

* Remember your proposal needn’t be exclusively for elders and may include age integrated housing for people of different ages.
• **Parking**
Parking needs will vary with tenant mix. We suggest an average of 1 car per Unit**. Active independent couples may require two cars while residents of a cohousing community may share one or two cars. Please include a brief explanation of your parking strategy.

• **Supportive Services for the Community and the Residents**
Fifteen to twenty-five percent of the area of the site must be allocated to functions which serve the surrounding community, as well as the residents on the site**. Such functions can include health or social service setting (walk-in clinic, child care center) as well as retail activity (café, store). A rationale and specific design solution for the service function must be demonstrated. We will anticipate that you will also have additional spaces to support the type of suggested housing designed for the site.

**Given the potential for the Layton and National Site to support commercial activity on the first floor, you are welcome to interpolate the guidelines to include higher amounts of retail and associated parking as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 – Site Density Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Holy Women Van Buren &amp; Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="#">60 to 90 Units per Acre</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Robinson School Fond du Lac &amp; 38th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="#">30 to 40 Units per Acre</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Strip 27th &amp; National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="#">30 to 40 Units per Acre</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Manor 8th &amp; Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="#">30 to 40 Units per Acre</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Presentation Requirements

Minimum PowerPoint Presentation for Sunday Review

Due: Sunday, February 11th, 12:30 pm

- Site Plan with Community Context
- 1st Floor / Main Floor Plan
- Typical Floor Plan(s)
- Typical Unit Floor Plan(s)
- Elevations for Main Facades and/or 3 Dimensional Renderings
- One or Two slides that Illustrate how the Proposed Solution Meets each of the Five Competition Goals listed in the Challenge Statement.

Follow-Up Post-Competition Dissemination

Due: Thursday, March 1st

- Written Statement Describing the Solution and Represented Ideas
- TIFF of the Each Images described Above at 300 dpi, 11”x17”
- Any Additional Images you Wish to Provide – Annotated plans which describe design intentions are particularly effective.

Release

All images produced at the charrette and submitted to the competition will become the property of the Aging in Community Competition. These images may be used for future exhibitions, publications, presentations, and for other educational materials and events. The design team will be credited in all publications. See attached release form for additional information and required signature.
Competition Sites and Assigned Teams

Three Holy Women - Van Buren & East Pleasant
Three Holy Women Parrish / Brady Street Neighborhood
Scott Gelzer, 414-272-2626

Firms and Contact Names:

- Quorum Architects, Inc.
  Alyson Nemec
  Phone: (414) 265-9265
  allyson@quorumarchitects.com

- Zimmerman Design Group Inc.
  Kurt Zimmerman
  Phone: (414) 476-9500
  kurt.zimmerman@zastudios.com

Jackie Robinson School – Fond Du Lac and 38th Street
Sherman Park Community Association
Steve O’Connell, 414.444.9803 ext 102

Firms and Contact Names:

- Eppstein Uhen Architects, Inc.
  Renee Kubesh
  Phone: (414) 271-5350
  reneek@eppsteinuhen.com

- Kubala Washatko Architects, Inc.
  Tom Kubala
  Phone: (262) 377-6039
  tkubala@tkwa.com

Retail Strip - 27th Street and National
Layton Blvd Neighborhood Association
Randy Kohl, 414-475-8811

Firms and Contact Names:

- AG Architecture
  Gene Guszkowski
  Phone: (414) 431-3131
  ergusz@agarch.com

- Continuum Architects + Planners, SC
  Ursula Twombly
  Phone: (414) 220-9640
  ursula.twombly@continuumarchitects.com

Plymouth Manor - 8th Street and Walnut Street
Masons and Community Groups
Jane Bastian, United Way of Greater Milwaukee, 414-263-8108

Firms and Contact Names Firms:

- Engberg Anderson Design Partnership
  Andrew Alden
  Phone: (414) 944-9000
  andrewa@eadp.com

- Plunkett Raysich Architects, LLP
  Kim Hassel
  Phone: (414) 359-3060
  khassell@prarch.com