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Agenda

• Context
• An ageing population - some trends
• Two axes of interest and four scenarios
• Scenario outcomes:
  – Social practice
  – Travel behaviours
• Policy implications and challenges
Trends: An ageing population

- Growing proportion of the population
- Rise of the older-old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Popln (m) 2007</th>
<th>Popln (m) 2025</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-64</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-84</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>+35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>+100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total adult</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>+14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The ‘Care Miles’ scenarios

• Two key ‘uncertainties’ to frame a scenario planning approach:
  – the extent to which assistive technologies will feature in and support living in later life
  – the extent to which the state would be able to provide care for older people

• Indicative 2030 time horizon

• An aim to expose uncertainty including around the interplay between the motor age and the information age
Assistive (living) technologies

- Continuous life style monitoring (instead of alarm-based telecare systems)
- Digital participation services for work and leisure (to connect, engage, stimulate and entertain older people at home)

The ‘Care Miles’ scenarios
**Scenario snapshots**

**Scenario A: ‘Communal call-out’**  
(high healthcare technologies engagement; **low** state provision of care)  
- People take responsibility for their own lives and care needs  
- Most people remain in their own homes in older age - some continue in employment to fund care  
- Wide array of (assistive) technologies available to support such individual responses – for those that can afford it

**Scenario B: ‘Home alone and wired’**  
(high healthcare technologies engagement; **high** state provision of care;)  
- Shortage of care workers makes residential, and ‘personal’ care at home unaffordable for most people  
- Older people are able to remain in their own home – although most live alone – as technology-enabled self-care is widespread (the state provides basic technology)  
- Extensive monitoring and self-care have led to a healthier population and a greater expectation of remaining active in later life
Scenario snapshots

Scenario C: ‘Gimme shelter’
(low healthcare technologies engagement; high state provision of care)
- State provision of care for some, but a scarcity of informal carers
- Older people unable to stay in their own homes, and with dispersed families they instead look to sheltered housing (this allows carers to service more clients)
- Less development and use of assistive technologies, and those available tend to be located communally to maximise use

Scenario D: ‘Home ties’
(low healthcare technologies engagement; low state provision of care)
- Minimal care is provided by the state; most older people rely on informal care through their social networks if they remain in their own homes
- Where necessary they move closer to family (or move in with them) to facilitate this
- For those without this option, co-housing has become popular
- There are low levels of assistive technologies available
Social Practice (I)

• **Living Choices**
  – Different possibilities for *how* older people will choose to, or have to live in the future
  – Living at home, communal living, shared living

• **Location Choices**
  – Access to services
  – Residential mobility, affordability
  – ‘Clustering’, retirement communities, social networks

  – What might this mean for services, community (age-mix)?
Social Practice (II)

- **Employment**
  - Working to fund care
  - Tele-working, home working
  - Technology an enabler, but is there a ‘digital divide’?
  - Possible support to employment for siblings

- **Interaction with ‘significant others’**
  - Virtual-connectivity, remote monitoring, tele-working
  - Localisation of non-work activity
  - Do communal housing forms create new ‘communities’?
Travel Behaviours (I)

• Individual versus collective transport
  – Importance of car for independence versus care costs
  – Shared journeys, shared ownership?
  – Diffusion or concentration? Benefits for community solutions?

• Active travel
  – Symbiosis between cycling and walking and active aging
  – Assistive technologies could be beneficial
  – But what about the older-old? What about obesity?
Travel Behaviours (II)

• Journey types
  – ‘*Necessary*’: Fewer health-related; more work related? Less demand on families?
  – ‘*Discretionary*’: ‘Rebound’ and replacement journeys – for leisure? To escape communal living?
  – ‘*Care miles*’: Home as trip attractor rather than generator

• Journey substitution
  – Virtual accessibility rather than physical mobility
  – ‘*Potential*’ and ‘imaginative’ travel
Policy implications and challenges

- **Outcomes** of an ageing society may affect DfT policy – but the **determinants** cover multiply policy areas

- How might an ageing society be accommodated?
  - Remaining wedded to forecasts and trends engenders a conservative approach **reinforcing the current regime** of thinking
  - There is a need to **confront uncertainty** and explore diversity
  - Scenario planning is not about answers but a means to prompt inter-departmental **policy debate**
Responding to indirect effects on travel

- **Policy framing**
  - **Inactive**: Little note of technology development, complexity of the future precludes trying to make too much sense of it, reinforces assumptions and forecasting
  - **Reactive**: Potential problem of different rhythms of change and policy response timescales
  - **Proactive**: Knowingly shaping society through (transport) policy rather than transport being subservient to it

- **The (collective) challenge of being visionary**
  - Older people and leading technologies and social practices of tomorrow different to those of today (though some glimpses today?)
Transport policy – serving or shaping?

• Dominant mentality is still ‘transport is here to serve society’ – epitomised by policies such as ‘predict and provide’
• But transport also shapes society – social engineering whether by accident or by design
• The question then becomes not ‘where are we heading?’ but ‘where would we like to head?’
  – Whilst seemingly more politically challenging, this may in fact offer better prospects for preparing for the uncertain future we now face