

**National Survey
of Providers of Independent Living Units (ILUs)
for people with relatively low incomes and low assets
Final Report**

Prepared by
Swinburne Institute for Social Research

for
Social Housing Branch, Commonwealth Department of Families, Housing, Community
Services and Indigenous Affairs
jointly with
Aged and Community Services Australia
Council on the Ageing

March 2011

STEERING COMMITTEE

Leesa Croke	Branch Manager, Social Housing Branch, Commonwealth Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA)
Lara Purdy	Section Manager, Social Housing Branch, Commonwealth Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA)
Emma Knapp	Assistant Section Manager, Social Housing Branch, Commonwealth Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA)
Leslie Dredge	Policy Officer, Aged and Community Services Australia (ACSA)
Jo Root	National Policy Manager, Council on the Ageing, National (COTA)
Mike Furner	General Manager, Strategic Development and Sustainability, Baptist Community Services NSW & ACT
Marion Amies	Senior Policy Advisor, Office for an Ageing Australia, Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing (DoHA)

REPORT

The national survey of ILU organisations, the national ILU database and this final report were prepared by:

Sean McNelis	Swinburne Institute for Social Research
Andrea Sharam	Swinburne Institute for Social Research

Our thanks to the following for their assistance in distributing the national ILU survey:

Elizabeth Teece	Aged and Community Services of NSW & ACT
John Ham	Aged and Community Services of WA
Paul Zanatta	Aged and Community Care Victoria
Jeric Uy	Aged and Community Services SA & NT
Darren Mathewson	Aged and Community Services Tasmania
Paul Johnson	Aged Care Queensland

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

According to the National Housing Supply Council, the demand from older-person households for private rental housing and social housing is estimated to grow 120% between 2008 and 2028 (from 146,200 to 321,400 for private rental housing and from 86,500 to 189,800 for social housing).

A significant proportion of these households are living in housing that is not affordable. The 2011 Report of the Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision notes that, even when taking into account Commonwealth Rent Assistance, 27.8% of households with a reference person or their partner aged 75 years or more (25,364) paid more than 30% of their income in rent.

Under the *Aged Persons Homes Act* (APHA) 1954, between 1954 and 1986, the Commonwealth provided subsidies to not-for-profit organisations such as churches, service organisations, local organisations and local governments for the construction of dwellings for older people. It is estimated that around 32,500 independent living units (ILUs) for older persons were constructed. However, little is known about the current state of these ILUs.

Swinburne Institute for Social Research (SISR) conducted a national survey through which it developed, for the first time, a national ILU database. This database will contribute to future research by providing researchers with a consolidated list of ILU organisations.

For the purpose of the survey an ILU had to meet all three of the following criteria:

- (i) managed by a not-for-profit organisation that had received subsidies for some units under APHA
- (ii) capital funds have not come from State Housing Authorities
- (iii) accessible to older persons with relatively low incomes and low assets, thus where the ingoing contribution is less than \$131,500 as at September 2010.

The national survey was limited in scope, seeking to identify ILU organisations, their contact details, the number of ILUs by local government area, and the total dwellings managed. SISR also compared the results of this survey with those from their 2002 national survey.

The key results were:

- A database consisting of 300 ILU organisations – this includes data on 271 ILU organisations from 263 returns received from ILU organisations (8 organisations operated across state/territory borders) plus another 29 organisations known to manage ILUs from public sources
- These 263 organisations manage 35,443 dwellings of which 17,491 (49%) are ILUs
- The ILUs in the survey housed 73 per 1,000 recipients of the Age Pension and Commonwealth Rent Assistance – this ratio varied widely by state/territory
- Of the 171 organisations that participated in the 2002 survey, at least 41 of these no longer provide ILUs
- 84 organisations participated in both the 2002 and 2010 survey – they now manage 2,115 (27%) fewer ILUs than they did in 2002
- Among ILU organisations that participated in the 2002 survey, the overall loss of ILUs between 2002 and 2010 is at least 3,539 ILUs (26%)

The emerging issues are:

- The higher ingoing contributions required by some ILU organisations, as the contribution is linked with prevailing property prices, and the implications of this for their traditional target group
- The relatively high proportion (25%) of ILU organisations that ceased providing ILUs between 2002 and 2010
- The relatively high loss (26%) of ILUs between 2002 and 2010.

CONTENTS

1. Background	1
<i>Increasing demand from older renters</i>	1
<i>Meeting current demand</i>	1
<i>Independent living units</i>	2
<i>Will this valuable resource be lost?</i>	3
2. Defining ILUs: the three eligibility criteria	4
3. Steering committee.....	5
4. The national survey	5
5. Distribution and coverage of the national survey.....	6
6. Survey returns	7
7. Results of the national survey	7
7.1 ILU organisations by state/territory	8
7.2 Total dwellings managed and ILUs by state/territory	8
7.3 ILUs by local government area in each state/territory	9
7.4 ILUs and Age Pension recipients of rent assistance by state/territory	9
7.5 2002 responses compared with 2010 responses	10
8. Consent to use survey information.....	14
9. The ILU national database.....	15
10. Some lessons and some issues to follow up.....	16
10.1 Issues for researchers	16
10.2 Ingoing contributions based on prevailing property prices.....	17
10.3 ILU organisations no longer providing ILUs.....	17
10.4 Loss of ILUs between 2002 and 2010.....	17
APPENDIX 1: ILUs by state/territory and local government area	19
<i>New South Wales</i>	19
<i>Victoria</i>	22
<i>Queensland</i>	24
<i>South Australia</i>	25
<i>Western Australia</i>	27
<i>Tasmania</i>	28
<i>Australian Capital Territory</i>	29
<i>Northern Territory</i>	29
APPENDIX 2: National Survey of Providers of Independent Living Units for older people with relatively low incomes and low assets	30

1. Background

Increasing demand from older renters

The proportion of persons aged 65 years and over is increasing in Australia. The *2010 Intergenerational Report* indicates that, at June 2010, 13.5% of the population was aged 65 years and over. It projects that this proportion will increase to around 22.6% by June 2050.¹

This change in population demographics will have significant impacts on the housing sector, in particular, an increasing demand from older households for particular types of dwellings with particular types of facilities.

The National Housing Supply Council projects that demand from older-person households will increase by 100% between 2008 and 2028 (from 1.6 million to 3.2 million households).² While most of this demand will be met through owner-occupied housing, a significant proportion will be met through the private rental and social housing sectors. Indeed, the demand from older-person households for private rental and social housing is estimated to grow at an even more rapid rate of 120% between 2008 and 2028 (from 146,200 to 321,400 for private rental housing and from 86,500 to 189,800 for social housing).³

Meeting current demand

Currently, demand from older renters is met through the social housing sector, which includes public housing and community housing, and the private sector, which includes various forms of aged-specific housing such as some retirement villages, rental villages and non-private dwellings (rooming houses, boarding houses (known in some states as Supported Residential Services or SRSs) and caravan parks).

Older renters on low and fixed incomes seek long-term housing (indeed, permanent security of tenure) and housing that is appropriate, adequate and affordable. Retirement for older renters, particularly those with little superannuation, may bring with it a re-evaluation of their housing situation and sometimes a housing crisis as they seek to meet their housing costs on permanently lower incomes. At June 2010, 91,237 households in receipt of Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) had a reference person or their partner aged 75 years or more.⁴ Even when taking into account CRA, 27.8% of these households (25,364)

1 Treasury 2010 *The 2010 Intergenerational Report: Australia to 2050: Future Challenges*, <http://www.treasury.gov.au/igr/igr2010/> p. 9

2 National Housing Supply Council 2010 *2nd State of Supply Report*, Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Canberra
http://www.nhsc.org.au/state_of_supply/2009_ssr_rpt/stateofsupplyreport_2010.pdf pp. 136, 141f

3 Ibid., pp. 136, 142f

On the increasing demand for social housing from older people with low incomes and low assets, see also McNelis S 2007 *Older Persons in Public Housing: Present and Future Profile*, Research Paper, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne

http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/download/50318_rp and

McDonald P and Temple J 2010 *Projections of Housing Demand in Australia, 2008-2038: Housing Needs of Older Australians Narrative Report*, National Housing Supply Council

http://www.nhsc.org.au/housing_demand_08_38/olderhousing.pdf

McNelis 2007 estimated a 40% increase in demand for social housing by older person households between 2001 and 2011, and a 76% increase to 2016 (Table 32, p. 54). While the highest level of demand is from the 65-69 age group, the highest increase in demand comes from the 85+ age group, an increase of 118% to 2016 (p. 57).

4 Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision 2011 *Report on Government Services 2011*, Productivity Commission, Canberra

http://www.pc.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/105368/083-chapter16-attachment.pdf

Table 16A.58, 'Income units receiving CRA, by special needs and geographic location, 2010'

paid more than 30% of their income in rent.⁵ 'Much of Australia's private housing stock (both rental and owner-occupied) is not accessible by frail older people or capable of being adapted to enable them to 'age in place'.⁶ Whether the private sector can provide, appropriate, adequate and affordable housing is questionable and, at least, a matter of some debate.

While Commonwealth and state/territory governments are undertaking a range of initiatives to modify their stock⁷ and to increase the supply of social housing for older renters, 'it is unclear whether there will be sufficient supply of alternative options for older people to meet the projected demand'.⁸

Independent living units

Independent living units (ILUs) have been and continue to be a significant form of affordable rental housing for older people with relatively low incomes and low assets. These were built by not-for-profit organisations such as churches, service organisations, local organisations and local government between 1954 and 1986. They were funded through some mixture of donations from fund-raising activities, donations of land from local government, donations and loans from incoming residents, and subsidies from the Commonwealth government under the *Aged Persons' Homes Act* (APHA) 1954. Maintenance and management were the responsibility of ILU organisations. It is estimated that around 32,500 ILUs were constructed throughout Australia.⁹ From 1986, Commonwealth subsidies ceased.

ILUs provided residents with independent living arrangements and were well located. They were the first phase of retirement villages in Australia. Subsequently, many not-for-profit organisations built hostels and nursing homes to cater for older people as they became more frail and required ongoing support.

In 2002, it was estimated that ILUs made up around 27 per cent of social housing for older people with relatively low incomes and low assets. With the increasing demand for affordable housing for older people, they will increasingly become a significant resource for age pensioners, self-funded retirees with limited incomes and also for older people who would otherwise be homeless.¹⁰

In the last decade, two studies have specifically investigated ILUs in Australia. The major one was in 2002 and included an extensive national survey covering organisations, residents and dwellings, auspiced by the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI) and conducted by Swinburne Institute for Social Research (SISR). The results were published in two reports and a statistical appendix.¹¹ The second study, a 2009 online mini-

5 Ibid. Table 16A.82, 'Proportion of income units receiving CRA aged 75 years or over paying more than 30 per cent of income on rent, with and without CRA, 2005 to 2010'

6 National Housing Supply Council 2010, p. 146

7 McNelis S & Neske C 2008 *Older Persons in Public Housing: The Policy and Management Issues*, Final Report No. 121, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne
http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/download/50318_fr pp. 56-7

8 National Housing Supply Council 2010, p. 146

9 McNelis S & Herbert T 2004 *Independent Living Units: The Forgotten Social Housing Sector*, Final Report No. 53, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne
http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/download/50138_fr Table 2, p. 17

10 Ibid. p. 16

11 McNelis S & Herbert T 2003 *Independent Living Units: Clarifying Their Current and Future Role as an Affordable Housing Option for Older People with Low Assets and Low Incomes*, Positioning Paper No. 59, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne
http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/download/50138_pp
McNelis S & Herbert T 2004 *Independent Living Units: The Forgotten Social Housing Sector*, Final Report No. 53, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne
http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/download/50138_fr

survey conducted by Aged and Community Services Australia (ACSA), explored the future intentions that organisations had for their ILU stock.

In addition, recently, the Queensland AHURI Research Centre conducted a major study of service-integrated housing for older people in both Australia and overseas. One component of this study was ILUs. The results are published in two AHURI reports.¹²

Key findings from the 2002 national survey of ILU organisations included:

- Some ILU organisations provided only ILUs, whereas others provide the full range of services from independent living to residential aged care
- ILUs are now between 40 and 50 years old and among the problems that they face are ILUs which are rundown and neglected, below community standards and no longer able to meet older people's housing expectations¹³
- Some ILU organisations did not have the knowledge, capital, governance or capacity to manage and maintain current ILU stock, and many providers have had difficulty finding alternative funding for the upgrade, reconfiguration and redevelopment
- Some ILU providers were considering withdrawing from providing ILUs, were using their ILU stock to cross-subsidise their residential aged care and were moving up-market and selling ILUs to provide capital for their residential aged-care facilities.¹⁴

A recent ACSA submission noted that some ILU providers were increasing rents or ingoing fees to cover capital costs.¹⁵

Will this valuable resource be lost?

The research indicates that ILU organisations face great difficulties in continuing to provide ILUs to older people on relatively low incomes and low assets, due to ageing stock and the low income stream received as they house low income tenants. Over the past two decades, many ILUs have been lost to low income renters: some demolished and not replaced, some redeveloped and targeted at older people with higher incomes, some sold to the private sector, and some refurbished and targeted at older people with higher incomes.

With an ageing population, ILUs represent a valuable resource that is a key part of meeting the growing demand from older renters for secure, appropriate and affordable housing.

The Australian government is committed to increasing affordable housing stock and providing age-appropriate housing to older Australians. ILUs are a key source of housing for lower income older Australians. At present, little is known about the current state of the sector. The initial difficulty in developing a better understanding and in assessing the role and value of ILUs as a housing option for older people with relatively low incomes and low

McNelis S & Herbert T 2004 *Independent Living Units: The Forgotten Social Housing Sector: Appendix 4: National Survey of Independent Living Units*, Appendix to Final Report No. 53, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne
http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/download/50138_fr1

12 Jones A, Tilse C, Bartlett H & Stimson B 2010 *Integrated Housing, Support and Care for People in Later Life*, Positioning Paper No. 108, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/download/20287_pp
Jones A, Howe A, Tilse C, Bartlett H & Stimson B 2010 *Service Integrated Housing for Australians in Later Life*, Final Report No. 141, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne
http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/download/20287_fr

13 McNelis & Herbert 2004 pp. 29-34

14 Ibid. pp. vii, x, 27, 53

15 ACSA *Green Paper on Homelessness Submission*, June 2008.

assets is that existing databases do not distinguish between ILUs and other forms of housing for older persons.

Further research work still needs to be undertaken on ILUs. The national database seeks to contribute to this future research by providing, for the first time, a consolidated database which FaHCSIA and other research partners can use to contact and work with ILU organisations.

In addition the database will allow partner organisations to contact and work with ILU organisations in providing support, a mechanism for facilitating discussion and collaborative activities, development of the sector and, where needed, education and training.

For this reason, the Commonwealth Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA), jointly with Aged and Community Services Australia Inc (ACSA) and the Council on the Ageing (COTA), with input from the Department of Health and Ageing (DoHA), commissioned Swinburne Institute for Social Research (SISR) to undertake a national survey of ILU providers and develop a national ILU database.

2. Defining ILUs: the three eligibility criteria

'Independent living unit' (ILU) is a term that is widely used in the aged-care sector and can refer to any type of self-contained dwelling that is specifically constructed for an older person or couple. ILUs can be found on single sites, small multi-dwelling sites or large and very large sites. They can be single cottages, row houses, town-houses, semi-detached dwellings, or flats within small or large apartment blocks. Many but not all are in retirement villages.

For the purpose of the survey, however, a definition of ILUs was developed that reflected the original target group of APHA, viz. older people on relatively low income and low assets. The survey was limited to ILUs that met all the following three criteria:

- (i) Dwellings managed by a not-for-profit organisation that have received subsidies for some units under APHA
- (ii) Dwellings where capital funds have not come from State Housing Authorities but include a broad range of sources such as ingoing contributions from tenants, donations and internal sources
- (iii) Dwellings which are accessible to older persons with relatively low incomes and low assets, thus where the ingoing contribution is less than \$131,500.

Non-for-profit organisations that received subsidies under APHA included: community organisations that could just be providing housing or a range of aged care services or even a broad range of welfare services; service organisations such as RSL and Lions; and local government.

ILUs have been funded through a variety of sources: ingoing contributions from residents, donations from residents or from public fundraising campaigns, land donated by local government, internal organisation funds etc. Subsidies under APHA supplemented these funds. The survey excluded any dwelling where capital funding was provided by State Housing Authorities which sourced their funds through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement (CSHA).¹⁶ So, it sought to exclude all the dwellings specifically constructed for older persons that have been funded by State Housing Authorities since the early 1980s.

¹⁶ In 2009, the CSHA was replaced by the National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA). See <http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/housing/progserv/affordability/affordablehousing/Pages/default.aspx>. As nearly all housing funded by State Housing Authorities was done so under the CSHA, the survey referred to the CSHA rather than NAHA.

Residents who contribute less than \$131,500 toward an ingoing contribution (usually in the form of loan) are eligible for Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA). According to current Centrelink provisions, where a resident of a retirement village or a granny flat pays an ingoing contribution equal to or less than the 'extra allowance amount', they are assessed as a non-homeowner and may qualify for rent assistance. At September 2010, the extra allowable amount was \$131,500. The extra allowable amount is the difference between the Centrelink non-homeowner assets test and the homeowner assets tests.¹⁷

Any not-for-profit organisation that provides at least one ILU is referred to throughout this report as an ILU organisation. In addition to one or more ILUs, they may provide other dwellings for older people: dwellings funded through the CSHA, dwellings where the ingoing contribution is more than \$131,000, and dwellings managed on a commercial basis.

3. Steering committee

The national survey was conducted under the auspice of a steering committee comprising representatives from the Social Housing Branch (FaHCSIA), a representative from the Office for an Ageing Australia (Department of Health and Ageing), a representative from the National Council on the Ageing (COTA), a representative from Aged and Community Services Australia (ACSA) and a representative from an ILU organisation.

Through teleconferences, the steering committee assisted in the preparation of the brief for the national survey and database, monitored the progress of the survey and provided comments on this final report.

Steering committee members are listed at the beginning of this report.

4. The national survey

The national survey was conducted between mid-October and mid-December 2010. Respondents were asked to return the survey only if they could meet the three eligibility criteria outlined above – the survey began by asking respondents whether they managed ILUs that met all three criteria.

The national survey comprised two parts: Part One sought information for inclusion on the database; Part Two sought the consent of organisations for their inclusion on the database. The questions in each part covered the following:

PART 1: THE SURVEY

- Name of organisation that manages/owns ILUs
- Contact details of provider organisation: contact person, address, phone and email
- Whether organisation is affiliated with a larger organisation
- Total number of independent/self-contained dwellings for older people managed by the organisation
- Total number of ILUs managed by the organisation
- Number of ILUs by location (local government area)
- Decade in which the ILUs were initially constructed

PART 2: CONSENT TO USE SURVEY INFORMATION

- Consent from the organisation for its name and other details (contact details, number of ILUs managed and location of ILUs) to be included on the national

17 Centrelink 2010 *Seniors Payment Rates 20 September-31 December 2010*, p. 6
[http://www.centrelink.gov.au/internet/internet.nsf/filestores/co030_1009/\\$file/co030_1009en.pdf](http://www.centrelink.gov.au/internet/internet.nsf/filestores/co030_1009/$file/co030_1009en.pdf).

database of ILU organisations to be held by the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs

- Consent for other information in the survey to be made available for research and partner organisations
- Consent to be contacted within the next 12 months for further information regarding the survey.

A copy of the national survey is attached in Appendix 2.

Prior to its distribution the survey was piloted in each state to test the ease with which it could be completed and to ensure that the terms used were understood as the terminology varies between states. All respondents to the pilot had no difficulty in completing the survey but some minor changes were made as a result of the pilot.

5. Distribution and coverage of the national survey

The national survey sought to identify all ILU organisations in Australia so it was distributed as widely as possible with extensive follow-up by phone and email to ensure the highest rate of return.

It was promoted through industry magazines, email bulletins and the national ACSA conference. Some organisations received multiple surveys. Some received copies at individual ILU sites as well as to their central administration. Conversely, organisations that did not belong to an industry association (such as the aged care peak in their state) and had no web presence may have missed the survey.

Over 1,000 surveys were distributed directly to organisations identified through web searches and industry directories including but not exclusively COTA, DPS, Wisecare, villages.com.au, the Australian Aged Care Guide, state-based Seniors Information services and state-based Offices of Fair Trading (where states require registration of operators of retirement villages). As well as distributing the survey directly to organisations, it was distributed indirectly via email to members of the state peaks of Aged and Community Services Australia and Retirement Villages Australia.

In some states, the eligibility of organisations was publicly known as Seniors Information and COTAs have directories of not-for-profit housing organisations which includes information on ongoing contributions. There was, however, an issue of how up to date this information was.

A web page was developed: <http://www.sisr.net/Flagships/SC/Projects/ILU.htm>. This provided a quick reference to an overview of the project and a link to the online survey and to the electronic version of the survey for downloading.

The national survey was produced in three forms:

- a paper survey was mailed directly to possible ILU organisations. It could be returned in a pre-paid return envelope or by fax
- an online survey. The web address for the online survey was advertised in the paper survey, in email notices and on the project web page
- an electronic version using the form function of PDF reader. This version was attached to emails sent out by state peaks of the ACSA network to their members. It could also be downloaded from the project web page which was advertised in the paper survey. It could be completed electronically and emailed directly to the consultant by clicking on a link, or alternatively, it could be printed and returned via post (to a pre-paid address) or by fax.

To maximise responses, a large number of phone calls were made to organisations believed to manage ILUs that met the eligibility criteria.

Reminder cards were sent directly and through the ACSA state peaks. Where an email address was known, reminders were sent via email.

6. Survey returns

SISR received a total of 263 returns (after some deletions for double returns).¹⁸

Some were from organisations who reported on all their sites. Some were from individual sites of a larger organisation. We have sought to reduce any double counting as much as possible, but there may still be some.

For future research, it is interesting to note that survey returns were predominantly in paper form as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Number and percentage of survey returns by type

Type of survey return	Returns	
	#	%
Paper (by post)	195	74%
Electronic version (PDF)	11	4%
Online	53	20%
Paper (by fax)	4	2%
Total	263	100%

Some caution with these returns also needs to be taken as organisations struggled with criteria (ii) and (iii) outlined on page 4 of this report.

In regard to criteria (ii), an answer to this question often relied on the memory of individuals and could be confusing where there had been capital upgrades. Given that some of the stock is 50 years old, the funding sources are in some cases quite obscure. In regard to criteria (iii), rental units were not an issue but some organisations interpreted the ingoing contribution historically (what the resident paid some or many years ago) rather than the contribution an older person would pay if they entered the unit now.

Respondents were asked to nominate the decade in which their ILUs were built. This was intended to assist in identifying the funding source (to determine eligibility). Like criteria (iii), the data supplied relies heavily on memory, and the responses indicate a high degree of unreliability. This is a particularly difficult question to answer where mergers of organisations and transfers of stock or management have occurred.

7. Results of the national survey

This section includes the results of the national survey of ILU organisations. As outlined above in Section 5, every effort has been made to contact and include all ILU organisations. On this basis, we believe that most ILU organisations have completed the survey. However, as the total number of ILU organisations is unknown, we are unable to estimate the proportion of ILU organisations or ILUs covered by the national survey. As indicated below in Section 9, we do know from public sources that a further 29 ILU organisations did not respond to the survey despite numerous phone calls.

This section presents the results from the national survey and does not extrapolate from these results.

¹⁸ This compares very favourably to the previous Swinburne survey in 2002 with 172 returns (after some exclusions of ineligible organisations).

7.1 ILU organisations by state/territory

Table 2 indicates the number of ILU organisations in each state/territory that responded to the survey.

The highest number of responses was received from Victoria where COTA provide a good directory of ILU organisations. While Tasmania has the lowest number of responses, we believe that these are nearly all the ILU organisations in that state.

7 organisations based in one state operated across another state/territory, while 1 operated across another 2 states/territories.

Table 2: Number of ILU organisations by state/territory

State/territory	Number of ILU organisations
NSW	78
Victoria	81
Queensland	18
South Australia	52
Western Australia	20
Tasmania	15
Australian Capital Territory	6
Northern Territory	1
Total	263*

Note: * This figure is not the sum of the above state/territory figures because 5 of the 6 ILU organisations operating in the ACT are based in NSW, 1 ILU organisation operating in Tasmania is based in Victoria, the ILU organisation operating in Northern Territory is based in South Australia and 1 ILU organisation operates in NSW, ACT and Queensland.

7.2 Total dwellings managed and ILUs by state/territory

In addition to ILUs (as defined above), ILU organisations also manage other housing stock which is targeted at older people in higher income groups. Table 3 provides the total number of dwellings managed as well as the number of ILUs managed by ILU organisations in each state/territory. It also presents the ILUs as a proportion of total dwellings managed by ILU organisations.

From the survey results, NSW is the state with largest number of ILUs (4,831) but relative to population South Australia would appear to have the highest proportion of ILUs (4,497).

The table also shows that the proportion of dwellings managed by ILU organisations that are available to people with relatively low income and low assets varies considerably from state/territory to state/territory. The lower proportion indicates that ILU organisations have, in addition to their ILUs, expanded their housing operations to include higher income target groups. This could be achieved in a number of ways: by purchasing land and constructing new stock specifically for these groups, by redeveloping ILU sites, by adding stock to current ILU sites, by refurbishing or reconfiguring ILUs and targeting these units at higher income groups, by selling ILUs and retaining other stock, or by targeting some current ILUs to higher income groups.

Table 3: Dwellings and ILUs managed by ILU organisations by state/territory

State/territory	Total dwellings managed	ILUs managed	ILUs as a proportion of total dwellings managed
NSW	12,225	4,831	40%
Victoria	5,132	3,283	64%
Queensland	4,588	1,347	29%
South Australia	6,350	4,497	71%
Western Australia	5,357	2,403	45%
Tasmania	1,132	804	71%
Australian Capital Territory	647	314	49%
Northern Territory	12	12	100%
Total	35,443	17,491	49%

Queensland has the lowest proportion of ILUs with only 29%, indicating that ILU organisations largely manage housing stock targeted at higher income groups. Tasmania (71%) and South Australia (71%) followed by Victoria (64%) manage dwellings in which a high proportion are ILUs.

7.3 ILUs by local government area in each state/territory

Appendix 1 outlines the number of ILUs and ILU organisations in each local government area (LGA) by state/territory from the survey results.

In their responses, some ILU organisations provided data for each LGA on all their dwelling stock rather than just ILUs. So, some LGAs will include non-ILUs. The number of non-ILUs included in the data is noted at the end of the table for each state/territory.

7.4 ILUs and Age Pension recipients of rent assistance by state/territory

The target group for ILUs is those households on the Age Pension eligible for Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA). By calculating the ratio of ILUs to those receiving the Age Pension and CRA, we get a picture of the extent to which ILUs in the survey meet this target group. (Note: public housing tenants are not eligible for CRA.) Table 4 outlines, for each state/territory, the number of older people receiving both the Age Pension and Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) and the number of ILUs in the national survey. The final column indicates the relativity of ILUs in the survey to recipients of the Age Pension and CRA in each state/territory.

From ILUs included in the national survey, the nationwide average is 73 ILUs per 1,000 recipients of the Age Pension and CRA. However, there is considerable variation between the states. South Australia with 259 ILUs per 1,000 recipients has, by far, the highest relative proportion of ILUs of all the states/territories (apart from the small numbers in the ACT). In the Northern Territory and the ACT, where few, if any, ILUs were constructed with subsidies through APHA, there are 14 ILUs and 300 ILUs per 1,000 recipients respectively. In other states, they range from a low of 22 ILUs per 1,000 recipients in Queensland to a high of 141 in Tasmania.

Table 4: Recipients of Age Pension and CRA and ILUs in the national survey by state/territory

State/territory	Recipients of Age Pension and CRA	ILUs in the national survey	Number of ILUs in the national survey per 1,000 recipients of Age Pension and CRA
NSW	82,233	4,831	59
Victoria	49,711	3,283	66
Queensland	60,300	1,347	22
South Australia	17,373	4,497	259
Western Australia	21,132	2,403	114
Tasmania	5,698	804	141
ACT	1,048	314	300
Northern Territory	853	12	14
Unknown/not specified	33	-	-
Total	238,381	17,491	73

Source: Recipients of Age Pension who also received CRA at 4 June 2010, unpublished Centrelink data from Housing Payments Section, FaHCSIA

Note: The results of this table are based on the number of ILUs in the national survey. While every effort was made for the survey to be a census of all ILU organisations, the extent to which it covers all ILU organisations is unknown. While the table highlights the relativities between the states/territories, the results are indicative only as an unknown number of ILUs from each state/territory are not included.

7.5 2002 responses compared with 2010 responses

In 2002, Swinburne undertook an extensive national survey of ILU organisations. Table 5 compares the number of returns in 2002 and 2010 for each state/territory.

Table 5: Comparison of returns, 2002 and 2010 by state/territory

State/territory	2002 returns	2010 returns
New South Wales	34	78
Victoria	70	81
Queensland	23	18
South Australia	17	52
Western Australia	20	20
Tasmania	7	15
ACT	-	6
Northern Territory	-	1
Total	171	263*

Note: * This figure is not the sum of the above state/territory figures because 5 of the 6 ILU organisations operating in the ACT are based in NSW, 1 ILU organisation operating in Tasmania is based in Victoria, the ILU organisation operating in Northern Territory is based in South Australia and 1 ILU organisation operates in NSW, ACT and Queensland.

Table 5 indicates an increase in returns on the 2002 survey in all states except for Queensland and Western Australia. In South Australia returns tripled, while in New South Wales they more than doubled. One reason for the higher response rate to the 2010 survey relates to the nature and complexity of the two surveys. The 2002 survey required extensive work on the part of ILU organisations as it covered a broad range of topics: the ILU organisation and its range of services, its governance and its future directions and priorities, ILU stock and its characteristics, its legal status, its management and its financing, the occupants of ILUs and the provision of support services.¹⁹ The 2010 survey, however, was very brief, requiring less than 15 minutes to complete, and only sought basic information.

Table 6 compares the number of ILU organisations and ILUs in the 2002 survey and the 2010 survey. Despite a 53% increase in ILU organisations participating in the 2010 survey, the number of ILUs has only increased by 25%. Moreover, the average number of ILUs per organisation has decreased from 80 in 2002 to 66 in 2010. This decrease is more significant in some states. One reason may be that the 2010 survey picked up many smaller ILU organisations.

Table 6: Comparison of ILU organisations and ILUs, 2002 and 2010, by state

State	2002			2010		
	Orgs	ILUs	Ave.	Orgs	ILUs	Ave.
New South Wales	34	2,209	65	78	4,831	62
Victoria	70	3,393	48	81	3,283	41
Queensland	23	2,354	102	18	1,347	75
South Australia	17	2,429	143	52	4,497	86
Western Australia	20	3,017	151	20	2,403	120
Tasmania	7	284	41	15	804	54
Total	171	13,686	80	262	17,165	66

As an additional task, we compared returns from the 2002 survey with those from the 2010 survey to ascertain (i) whether the 2002 ILU organisations continued to provide ILUs and (ii) whether the number of ILUs managed by these organisations had changed.

Table 7 shows, for each state, the number of organisations in the 2002 survey (Column 2) and their status, as far as we could ascertain in 2010. Columns 3-7 show the number of ILU organisations: who continue to provide ILUs in 2010; which merged or transferred their stock to another ILU organisation; who did not respond to the 2010 survey; whose status is unknown, and who no longer provide ILUs. The last four columns outline the reason for the change in their status (where this could be identified). The reasons were identified through phone calls to organisations or through information provided on their website.

¹⁹ For more detail see McNelis & Herbert 2004.

Table 7: The 2010 status of ILU organisations who participated in the 2002 survey and reason for change in status[#]

State	2002	2010 status			No response	Unknown	Orgs no longer providing ILUs	Reason for change in status			
	ILU orgs	ILU orgs	ILU orgs merged /stock transfer	Ingoing contribution now over \$131,000				No ILUs	ILUs sold to private sector	Funded by SHA	
New South Wales	34	17		7	2	8	4	4			
Victoria	70	31	1	20	1	17	4	11	2		
Queensland	23	8		3	2	10	4	5		1	
South Australia	17	13		2	1	1	1				
Western Australia	20	9		6	1	4	2	1	1		
Tasmania	7	6				1		1			
Total	171	84	1	38	7	41	15	22	3	1	

Note:

[#] The results in this table are indicative only and should be used with some caution. Some of the results are based on data we gather informally through phone calls and websites. The data would be more reliable after further extensive rechecking and confirming/reconfirming with ILU providers to verify their status.

Table 8: Loss of ILUs between 2002 survey and 2010 survey from among ILU organisations

State	ILU orgs	ILU orgs included	ILUs in 2002	ILUs in 2010	Loss of ILUs	% loss of ILUs	Comment
New South Wales	17	12	1,091	827	-264	-24%	3 orgs lost over 50% ILUs; 2 orgs lost more than 50 ILUs; 1 lost more than 100 ILUs;
Victoria	31	25	1,029	876	-153	-15%	5 lost more than 50% ILUs; 2 more than 50 ILUs;
Queensland	8	5	1,881	958	-923	-49%	1 org lost more than 600 ILUs; 1 org lost more than 200 ILUs; 2 orgs lost over 50% ILUs
South Australia	13	13	1,894	1,920	26	1%	2 orgs increased by more than 20 ILUs; 3 orgs increased by more than 50% ILUs; 3 orgs decreased by more 20%
Western Australia	9	9	1,700	983	-717	-42%	1 org lost more than 500 ILUs; 2 orgs lost more than 100 ILUs; 1 org increased by more than 40 ILUs; 3 orgs lost more 50% ILUs
Tasmania	6	5	237	153	-84	-35%	2 orgs lost more than 25 ILUs; 3 orgs lost more than 50% ILUs
All states	84	69	7,832	5,717	-2,115	-27%	

Note:

* We were unable to include organisations where, in 2010, we could not identify their current number of ILUs – many of these were part of a return from a larger organisation.

In summary, 84 from the previous 171 organisations continue to provide ILUs in 2010. One ILU organisation in Victoria has merged with another ILU organisation.

38 organisations did not respond to the 2010 survey (20 of whom were from Victoria) and it can be assumed that, for at least some, their non-response is the result of no longer providing ILUs. Some now appear to only provide residential aged care only.

The status of 7 organisations is unknown – some because of the incomplete material available from the 2002 survey, some because they could not be traced.

41 organisations no longer provide ILUs according the three criteria outlined above: 15 of these no longer provided ILUs with an entry contribution of less than \$131,500, 22 no longer manage ILUs, 3 had sold their ILUs privately, and 1 was funded by a State Housing Authority.

In follow-up phone calls, some organisations indicated that the ingoing contribution was more than \$131,500 because they had linked it to the market price of property in the local area.

Table 8 outlines the loss of ILUs from ILU organisations between the 2002 survey and the 2010 survey (where they participated in both surveys). It shows a loss among current ILU organisations of 27% ranging from 49% in Queensland to 15% in Victoria. South Australia is the only state in which the number of ILUs increased (marginally) in this group of ILU organisations. The last column provides some comments on these losses.

Table 9 outlines the loss of ILUs from both current ILU organisations (who participated in the 2002 survey) and from ILU organisations in 2002 who no longer provide ILUs. The overall loss is 26%, ranging from 49% in Queensland to 23% in Victoria. Again, South Australia is the only state in which the number of ILUs increased (marginally).

Table 9: Loss of ILUs from ILU organisations in 2002 survey by state

State	ILU losses				
	ILUs in 2002	Current ILU orgs	Orgs ceased providing ILUs	Total losses	% losses
New South Wales	2,209	-264	-263	-527	-24%
Victoria	3,393	-153	-620	-773	-23%
Queensland	2,354	-923	-232	-1155	-49%
South Australia	2,429	26	-3	23	1%
Western Australia	3,017	-717	-296	-1013	-34%
Tasmania	284	-84	-10	-94	-33%
All states	13,686	-2,115	-1,424	-3,539	-26%

8. Consent to use survey information

The survey sought three consents from respondents:

- Consent to include organisation (and particular details) in the national ILU database
- Consent to provide other information in the survey for future research and to partner organisations
- Consent to being contacted over the next 12 months.

Nearly all respondents consented to these three requests. However, a proportion has refused consent to one or more request. These are outlined in Table 10.

Table 10: Consent

Type of consent	#	%
ILU national database		
Full	221	84%
Partial	27	10%
No	6	2%
No response	9	3%
Other information		
Yes	232	88%
No response	5	2%
No	26	10%
Follow-up within 12 months		
Yes	238	90%
No response	9	3%
No	16	6%

N=263

9. The ILU national database

The ILU national database is provided as separate EXCEL file. It contains 22 fields as follows:

- Column A: ID number with an initial character followed by a three digit number – the initial character indicates the state/territory in which the organisation is located; the three digit number is a unique number for each organisation (with the first number based on state postcodes)
- Column B: Organisation name
- Column C: Postal address
- Column D: Other address (street address where the postal address is a PO box)
- Column E: Suburb
- Column F: Postcode
- Column G: State/territory
- Column H: Email address
- Column I: Phone number
- Column J: Contact person
- Column K: Contact position
- Column L: Web address (Note: the web address was not requested in the survey and it may not be accurate; it is assumed from the email address with known ISP email addresses deleted)
- Column M: Whether the organisation is affiliated with another organisation
- Column N: Where the organisation is affiliated with another organisation, the name of this organisation
- Column O: The number of dwellings managed by the organisation
- Column P: The number of ILUs managed by the organisation

- Column Q: The number of ILUs managed by the organisation by LGA
- Column R: The date added to national database
- Column S: The date on which the ILU organisation's data was last updated
- Column T: The source of the information – whether from the survey or from public sources
- Column U: The person updating the ILU organisation's data
- Column V: Comments

Where organisations only gave partial consent, only those details for which consent was provided have been included.

The ILU national database consists of 300 organisations. It includes all data on organisations to the extent that they completed the survey and gave full or partial consent for data to be included on the database. The name of 21 organisations has not been included at their request. Some organisations provided consent for the inclusion of their contact details but not their organisation's name. Others only consented to the number of their ILUs being included. For 6 organisations which completed the survey and did not give consent for their inclusion on the national ILU database, no data has been included.

Also included on the database are 29 organisations (noted in Column T as 'Public') who did not respond to the survey but whom we believe, from publicly available information, provide ILUs. The data on these organisations is incomplete.

10. Some lessons and some issues to follow up

10.1 Issues for researchers

The national survey revealed some issues for researchers in the future. Four are of particular importance.

First, the best place to send a survey. Some organisations provide ILUs as one among a number of aged care or welfare services. Some manage ILUs over a number of sites. Their management structure can vary considerably. Some organisations manage their ILUs from a central location, while others manage them locally. In contacting ILU organisations it is important to keep this in mind. The database seeks to reflect these differences in management by providing the best place or places that will respond to requests for information etc.

Second, the preferred mode of communication. It was noticeable that most ILU organisations returned the national survey via mail even though the state peaks of the ACSA network regularly communicated with members via email and both online and an electronic version of the survey were readily available (see Table 1). As noted above, the pilot survey indicated that respondents had no problems with the construction of the survey. However, it seems that paper based communication is the preferred mode of communication.

Third, the survey sought information on the location (by LGA) of ILUs. Some organisations, however, provided data for all dwellings managed, rather than just ILUs. This has been noted in the 'Comments' field of the database.

Fourth, as noted previously, some organisations included ILUs where the historical ingoing contribution was less than \$131,000 rather than what a resident would contribute were the unit available at the time of the survey.

10.2 Ingoing contributions based on prevailing property prices

We noted above that some organisations participating in the 2002 survey had increased their ingoing contribution beyond \$131,500 and were no longer providing ILUs.²⁰ In follow-up telephone calls whereby we gained this information, we found that some had linked their ingoing contribution with prevailing property prices rather than with replacement costs. As a result, it would seem that general housing inflation has significantly affected the supply of ILUs.

The extent to which ingoing contributions are linked to market price calls for further inquiry.

The shift from replacement cost (depreciation) to market value could reflect a changed approach to accounting practices and the commercial reality inherent in a growth strategy based on leveraging assets: it may be that these ingoing contributions allow them to expand their overall stock; it could reflect a shift in their target group to those with a capacity to pay higher ingoing contributions; it could be that ILU organisations are making larger profits from developing and managing luxury 'retirement villages' to subsidise other activities. Whatever the cause, the change in practice necessitates a greater capital contribution from residents and/or a higher rental yield. This marks a significant change of approach in which financial management takes precedence over social objectives.

ILU organisations are independent organisations that make their own decisions as to their changing priorities, the use of their assets and their target groups. There is a need, however, to understand whether, the extent to which and the reasons why ILU organisations have increased ingoing contributions and, shifted away from ILUs towards aged housing for higher-income groups or towards residential aged care or towards other services.

10.3 ILU organisations no longer providing ILUs

Table 7 compared 2002 ILU organisations with their current status and found that nearly 25% of organisations from 2002 (41 of the 171 organisations) no longer provided ILUs. This is major cause for concern for the future of ILUs and a key issue for further investigation.

10.4 Loss of ILUs between 2002 and 2010

The loss of ILUs between 2002 and 2010, as indicated in Table 8 and Table 9, is a worrying sign. Overall, of ILUs counted in 2002, 26% have been lost. The losses have been particularly acute in Queensland (49%), Western Australia (34%) and Tasmania (33%). As mentioned above in Section 10.3, some organisations no longer provide ILUs. In addition to this, some have reduced their number of ILUs. The reasons for this are not known and require further investigation.

²⁰ In 2002, the 'extra allowable amount' was just over \$100,000 and these organisations met this criterion at that time.

APPENDIX 1: ILUs by state/territory and local government area

Notes:

(i) This data on ILUs by local government area (LGA) may include some dwellings that are not ILUs. The second last row of each table indicates the number of non-ILU dwellings included in the data.

(ii) Where an LGA is not listed, ILU organisations participating in the survey did not manage ILUs in this LGA.

New South Wales

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations
Albury	64	3
Armidale	34	1
Ashfield	1	1
Ballina	106	2
Balranald	3	1
Bankstown	57	2
Bathurst	21	1
Baulkham Hills	4	1
Bega Valley	90	1
Bellingen	20	2
Blacktown	51	2
Bland	12	1
Blue Mountains	1	1
Boorowa	8	1
Burwood	75	2
Camden	264	1
Campbelltown	262	1
Canada Bay	43	1
Canterbury	24	1
Clarence Valley	77	2
Coffs Harbour	167	6
Coolamon	16	1
Corowa	6	1
Cowra	21	2
Culcairn	29	1
Dubbo	191	3
Eurobodalla	85	1
Fairfield	21	1
Glen Innes Severn	6	1
Gosford	330	7
Goulburn	41	1
Grafton	4	1
Great Lakes	6	1

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations
Guyra	7	1
Hawkesbury	9	1
Hay	1	1
Holroyd	161	2
Hornsby	134	6
Hunters Hill	45	2
Hurstville	99	2
Inverell	9	1
Kempsey	3	1
Kiama	52	2
Ku-ring-gai	98	4
Lake Macquarie	272	4
Lane Cove	57	1
Leeton	14	2
Lismore	68	3
Liverpool	16	1
Maitland	60	1
Manly	1	1
Marrickville	62	2
Mid-Western	8	1
Molong	12	1
Mosman	2	1
Murrumbidgee	6	1
Nambucca	22	2
Narromine	27	1
Newcastle	60	4
Orange	24	1
Parkes	41	3
Parramatta	132	5
Penrith	10	2
Port Stephens	1	1
Randwick	40	2
Richmond Valley	32	4
Rockdale	49	3
Ryde	22	2
Shoalhaven	186	2
South Sydney	6	1
Sutherland	64	2
Sydney	48	2
Tamworth	46	3
Temora	16	1
Tenterfield	6	1
The Hills	184	6
Upper Hunter	84	2

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations
Wagga Wagga	76	2
Warringah	109	5
Warrumbungle	25	2
Waverley	2	1
West Wyalong	9	1
Willoughby	44	3
Wingecarribee	32	3
Wollondilly	56	1
Wollongong	763	4
Woollahra	1	1
Wyang	7	2
Unknown	653	2
Total Units	6,213	78
Non-ILUs included	1,382	6
Total ILUs	4,831	78

Victoria

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations
Ballarat	62	5
Banyule	247	4
Bass Coast	53	2
Bayside	87	3
Benalla	18	1
Boroondara	152	4
Brimbank	48	2
Buloke	14	1
Campaspe	18	1
Casey	34	1
Central Goldfields	54	4
Colac Otway	29	1
Darebin	52	3
East Gippsland	80	1
Frankston	3	1
Glen Eira	109	2
Glenelg	8	1
Greater Bendigo	144	5
Greater Dandenong	104	3
Greater Geelong	269	8
Greater Shepparton	10	1
Hindmarsh	12	1
Indigo	26	1
Kingston	22	2
Knox	20	2
Latrobe	77	2
Macedon Ranges	95	3
Manningham	18	2
Maroondah	34	1
Mildura	90	5
Mitchell	16	2
Moir	51	3
Monash	59	2
Moorabool	18	1
Moreland	56	1
Mornington Peninsula	6	1
Mount Alexander	20	2
Moyne	10	1
Murrindindi	3	1
Nillumbik	65	1
Northern Grampians	62	4
Port Phillip	48	3

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations
Queenscliffe	4	1
South Gippsland	33	2
Southern Grampians	50	1
Stonnington	168	3
Strathbogie	20	1
Surf Coast	6	1
Swan Hill	36	3
Wangaratta	33	1
Warrnambool	125	2
Wellington	90	3
West Wimmera	18	1
Whitehorse	98	4
Yarra	215	3
Yarra Ranges	77	5
Yarriambiack	10	1
Total Dwellings	3,386	81
Non-ILU dwellings	103	5
Total ILUs	3,283	81

Queensland

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations	Comments
Banana	21	2	
Brisbane	490	4	Includes 1 ILU organisation from NSW
Bundaberg	4	1	
Burdekin	18	1	
Cairns	1	1	
Fraser Coast	98	3	
Gold Coast	238	5	
Goondiwindi	8	1	
Gympie	9	1	
Ipswich	31	2	Includes 1 ILU organisation from NSW
Lockyer Valley	8	1	
Logan	60	2	
Mackay	21	1	
Moreton Bay	266	2	
Redland	57	3	
Rockhampton	98	2	
South Burnett	12	1	
Sunshine Coast	50	3	
Toowoomba	259	3	
Townsville	68	2	
Western Downs	30	2	
Whitsunday	7	1	
Total Dwellings	1,854	16	
Non-ILU dwellings	507	2	
Total ILUs	1,347	17	

South Australia

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations
Adelaide	33	1
Adelaide Hills	26	2
Barossa	10	1
Barunga West	14	1
Berri Barmera	90	2
Burnside	183	8
Campbelltown	201	4
Ceduna	10	1
Charles Sturt	205	5
Coorong	5	1
Copper Coast	29	1
Flinders Ranges	4	1
Franklin Harbour	14	1
Gawler	10	1
Holdfast Bay	472	6
Kingston	34	1
Lower Eyre Peninsula	24	1
Loxton Waikerie	123	3
Marion	194	5
Mid Murray	6	1
Mitcham	284	7
Mount Barker	68	2
Mount Gambier	10	1
Murray Bridge	47	3
Naracoorte Lucindale	53	1
Norwood Payneham and St Peters	237	5
Onkaparinga	78	5
Peterborough	8	1
Playford	79	4
Port Adelaide Enfield	238	7
Port Augusta	23	1
Port Pirie	16	1
Prospect	59	2
Renmark Paringa	94	1
Salisbury	35	2
Tatiara	5	1
Tea Tree Gully	178	3
Tumby Bay	6	1
Unley	271	3
Victor Harbor	104	3
Wakefield	17	2
Walkerville	62	2

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations
Wattle Range	55	2
West Torrens	214	1
Whyalla	11	1
Yorke Peninsula	50	2
Unknown	538	5
Total Dwellings	4,527	54
Non-ILU dwellings	30	3
Total ILUs	4,497	54

Western Australia

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations
Albany	71	4
Armadale	138	2
Bassendean	6	1
Bayswater	385	3
Bunbury	79	1
Busselton	4	1
Canning	42	1
Cockburn	29	1
Collie	20	1
East Fremantle	10	1
Fremantle	66	3
Gosnells	130	1
Harvey	8	1
Joondalup	20	1
Kalamunda	70	3
Kojonup	7	1
Mandurah	36	2
Melville	236	1
Narrogin	43	1
Nedlands	137	1
Northam	24	2
Perth	5	1
Plantagenet	10	1
Rockingham	50	1
Serpentine-Jarrahdale	12	1
South Perth	46	1
Stirling	732	6
Subiaco	49	1
Victoria Park	575	3
Vincent	68	1
Wanneroo	11	1
Unknown	1	1
Total Dwellings	3,120	20
Non-ILU dwellings	717	4
Total ILUs	2,403	20

Tasmania

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations	Comments
Break O'Day	12	1	
Brighton	2	1	
Burnie	40	1	
Central Coast	5	1	
Circular Head	77	1	
Clarence	14	2	Includes 1 ILU organisation from Vic
Devonport	19	1	
George Town	41	2	Includes 1 ILU organisation from Vic
Glenorchy	14	1	This ILU organisation from Vic
Hobart	117	2	Includes 1 ILU organisation from Vic
Huon Valley	12	1	
Kingborough	55	4	
Launceston	286	5	Includes 1 ILU organisation from Vic
Meander Valley	70	4	
Northern Midlands	23	1	This ILU organisation from Vic
Sorell	12	1	This ILU organisation from Vic
Waratah Wynyard	6	1	
Total Dwellings	805	15	
Non-ILU dwellings	1	1	
Total ILUs	804	15	

Australian Capital Territory

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations	Comments
ACT	314	6	5 ILU organisations based in NSW

Northern Territory

LGA	Dwellings	ILU organisations	Comments
Northern Territory	12	1	ILU organisation based in SA

APPENDIX 2:
National Survey of Providers of Independent Living Units for
older people with relatively low incomes and low assets

National Survey of Providers of Independent Living Units for older people with relatively low incomes and low assets

Swinburne Institute for Social Research is undertaking a brief national survey of providers of Independent Living Units (ILUs) for older people. (Note: in some states ILUs are known as self-care units or self-contained units.)

The survey is being undertaken on behalf of the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA) in order to establish a national database of ILU providers. It is being undertaken jointly with Aged and Community Services Australia Inc (ACSA) and the Council on the Ageing (COTA), with input from the Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing (DoHA).

ILUs comprise an essential segment of housing for older persons in Australia, particularly those with relatively low income and low assets. The Project Partners, FaHCSIA, ACSA, and COTA recognise that ILU providers have made a substantial contribution to the community. They wish to develop an up to date contact database of the sector to improve their knowledge of the sector and to contact organisations about future research on ILUs.

In this brief survey, we are interested in those **not-for-profit** organisations which are providing housing to older people with relatively low income and low assets and, managing at least one ILU that meets all the following criteria (please tick):

☐ ***The unit is occupied/available to an older person***

☐ ***The resident rents the unit or has made a capital contribution (donation or loan) of less than \$131,500***

☐ ***Capital funding has not come from a State Housing Authority, but from other sources such as internally-funded by your organisation, resident contribution, donations, local government and direct Commonwealth funding.***

If you ticked each of these boxes and are a not-for-profit organisation please proceed with the survey.

If you cannot tick all the boxes, your organisation is outside of the scope of this survey. We thank you for your time.

How to complete the survey

You can complete the survey in one of four ways:

- (1) Fill-in the questionnaire below and, either post it in the pre-paid envelope (no postage required) or fax it to 03 9819 5349
- (2) Complete the survey online. The survey is available at:
<http://opinio.online.swin.edu.au/s?s=9174>
- (3) Download an electronic version of the survey and, either email or, print and post, or print and fax it to us. An electronic version of the survey can be downloaded at:
<http://www.sisr.net/Flagships/SC/Projects/ILU.htm>
- (4) Email us at asharam@swin.edu.au and ask us to send you an electronic version

Further questions

If you any questions regarding this survey or the national database of ILU providers, please contact:

Andrea Sharam
Swinburne Institute for Social Research
Phone: 03 9214 5465
Email: asharam@swin.edu.au
<http://www.sisr.net/Flagships/SC/Projects/ILU.htm>

Approval that the research is ethical

This project has been approved by or on behalf of Swinburne's Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC) in line with the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research*.

If you have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of this project, you can contact:

Research Ethics Officer
Swinburne Research (H68),
Swinburne University of Technology, P O Box 218, HAWTHORN VIC 3122.
Phone (03) 9214 5218
Email: resethics@swin.edu.au

PART 1: THE SURVEY

Q1. Name of Organisation

Q2. Contact details

No. & Street

Town/suburb

State

Postcode

Email

Telephone

Q3. Contact person for research purposes

Name

Position

Q4: Is your organisation part of a larger organisation?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Name of organisation

Q5: How many independent/self-contained dwellings for older people does your organisation manage?

dwellings

Q6: How many of these dwellings are ILUs for older people with relative low income and low assets (see front page)?

ILUs

Q7: How many of these ILUs do you have in each local government area?

Local Government Area	No of ILUs
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**Q8: In which decades were your ILU dwellings initially constructed?
(you can tick more than one box)**

☐ Pre 1950s ☐ 1950s ☐ 1960s ☐ 1970s ☐ 1980s ☐ 1990s ☐ 2000s ☐ Not sure

PART 2: CONSENT TO USE SURVEY INFORMATION

I, [name]

(1) consent to the following information being included in a national database of ILU organisations to be held by the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs. FaHCSIA has agreed to make the database available to researchers contracted by FaHCSIA and to the partner organisations for further research into and development of ILUs and ILU providers.

The name of your organisation

☐ Yes

☐ No

Contact details

☐ Yes

☐ No

Contact person

☐ Yes

☐ No

Total number of ILUs managed

☐ Yes

☐ No

Number of ILUs by local government area

☐ Yes

☐ No

(2) consent for **the other** information provided in this survey to be made available for research and to allow partner organisations the opportunity to provide information and support to providers

☐ Yes

☐ No

(3) consent to being contacted in the next 12 months for further information/discussion regarding this survey.

☐ Yes

☐ No

Organisation

Position

Date

Thank you for completing the survey

Please post the completed survey in the pre-paid envelope

OR

Please fax to 03 9819 5349