**Client Brief Workshop 2 Task Summery: 6 April 2013**

This paper Summarises the Workshop Tasks held at the Meadows Community Centre on Saturday 6th April 2013. The minutes of the meeting are issued alongside for wider discussions; also see our decision tracker document. Please make us aware of any mistakes or omissions you think should be noted within 7 days. The tracker document records items raised in the meeting and if agreed in principle appear in Green if put out for discussion to group to report back in Orange and If parked in Red.

**Demographics:**

**Task 1: Bedrooms.**

**Aim:** Primer exercise to frame workshops discussion over a 25year+ time scale.

**Materials:** Handout – “How many bedrooms do we have now? How many would we like?”

**Process:** A straight forward questionnaire asking how many bedrooms each household would wish for.

**Outcome:** Primer exercise, no data was collected.

**Task 2: Demographics.**

**Aim:** To identify expectations for number of bedrooms

To analyse the age distribution of the group.

To agree in principle demographic of households, the group would like to attract to the co-housing group

**Materials**: Handout – Who is in our household now? Who will we be in 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 years? Stickers and graph printed on trace

**Process:** Each household were given a sheet of trace with an x-axis of time from the present to 25years hence and the y-axis showing ages of member’s of the house hold. Stickers representing each current member of the house hold were added to the graph, identifying the number and age distribution of the household.

 This process was then repeated imagining the household mix in 5 years, 10years etc up to 25years, the finished graph showing a projected make up of the household over time, number of bedrooms and any wish for a spare room was recorded for each of the 5 year steps.

**Response:** Typically for households with young families charts showed, children growing up and leaving home and in some cases elderly relatives moved in. For others having a lodger or sharing the house with someone else was not unusual. Expectations and requirements were adjusted in reference to what others were doing with their graph.

The completed trace sheets were then over lain and held up to the light and clear patens emerged showing an under representation of teenagers and those in their twenties and also those in their 50’s. A peak in space demand in ten years time was identified for the group present.

The exercise generated much discussion around the need for a broad age range not unsurprisingly some thought of individual or family morality was discussed on the tree tables and also the long term position of the kids at home or moving away. The long term impact of design decisions was widely commented on and two main strategies identified:

1. Designing flexible dwellings that could be adapted/extended to accommodate changes in family life.

2. Designing a social system were houses could be swapped between residents of differing needs. (This raised legal issues which were parked)

Following a discussion each house hold was then asked to complete a line for a next door neighbour representing a household that was yet to join the group. Here participants were les lightly to be definite; many opting for a generic don’t mind at all, ‘just fill the Demographic gaps’.

**Outcome:** The group present agreed that in principle:

* That it would like a broad age range across the site and that encouraging households from the missing demographic groups, (Older families with teenage children, possibility of lodgers, students, and older adults of retirement age) would be positive for the Cohousing group in the short and long term.

**Action:** The next steps, to be done before the next meeting:

* To decide if flexible dwellings that could be adapted/extended to accommodate changes in family life or designing a social system where houses could be swapped between residents of differing needs, is to be adopted to allow those with changing needs to remain as part of the co-housing community.
* To have the remaining members of the group complete the task; we can then collate all of the information and report back at the next meeting.

**Task 3:** Prioritising activities are they private or shared?

**Aim:** To provoke individual thought on the nature and importance of day-to-day activities.

To provide a broad brush visual representation of the group priorities

To identify which activities have a clear designation and can be assumed and which and which are more personal and needed more thought.

To inform and prepare for Task 4

**Materials**: Each participant including children, was given an envelope of 12 slips of paper 11 with an activity printed on it: Sleeping , Eating, Driving, Playing, Talking, Making, Gardening, Thinking, Waiting and TV/Film plus 1 Black for activities not covered.

**Process:** These were than arranged in order of preference individually and then each person added their activities on a chart; the higher the placement of the paper the more important the activity left or the right position indicates how private or shared the activity was to the individual.

**Response:** Exercise/sport was absent from the activities and was added in by many of the group other activities included, *‘Work’, ‘having a pint’* and *‘Cuddles’*

 Some comment on the accurate placing of information due to available space on the sheet was raised.

**Outcome:** The information will be mapped onto a graph and be circulated with Analysis for comment. It will help inform future discussion around how resources are allocated between individual and shared spaces.

**Task 4: Identifying and Prioritising Spaces.**

**Aim:** To identify and record the range and type of spaces anticipated for the co-housing scheme.

To prioritise the requirement of spaces both for Individual dwellings and for the Shared/Common house.

**Materials**: Grid and Post-It Notes

**Process:** In turn each member of the proposed a space to be included in the scheme, they ranged from Bedroom to Library to Rentable Workspace, these were then written on to Post-It notes.

 In turn each space was discussed and as a group it was allocated by priority, as either:

**Essential,** 100% of people in favour of its inclusion.

**Desirable,** 50-99% of those present in favour of its inclusion.

**Possible,** less than 50% of those present in favour of its inclusion.

**Rejected,** nobody thought these items necessary.

No attempt was made to define how large or the exact function of these spaces would be and there was an understanding that one space may share 2 or more roles if compatible. In some cases statutory requirements may raise the priority of some items.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Dwelling House** | **Common House** |
| **Essential,** 100% of people in favour of its inclusion. | BedroomCloakroomStorageBathroomKitchen/Dining/Living | Meeting RoomBike StoreWCCloak RoomKitchen/Dining Room (separable)Living Room WorkshopStoreGames Room (May include Bar)Play Room (Kids)Parking Spaces |
| **Desirable,** 50-99% of those present in favour of its inclusion. | Quiet SpaceRoof –GardenPlay Room (Kids?)Bike Store | Roof-GardenConservatory/ SitooterieQuiet Space(Bookable) Bedroom(guest room)BathroomRentable WorkspaceGymPantryLaundry Office Hot Desk |
| **Possible,** less than 50% of those present in favour of its inclusion. | Parking SpaceUtilityGames Room ConservatoryEn-suiteGarage/Car Store (other storage covered above)  | En-suiteUtility  |
| **Rejected,** nobody thought these items necessary. | TV RoomLaundry gym  | Garage/Car Store (other storage covered above) |

**Outcome:** This information will inform future workshops allowing us to focus on areas that are boarder line and there for interesting rather than items that can be assumed as required. **See, Table Above**

**Action:** To have the absent members of the group comment on the outcome via the groups consensus process.
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