

Bond University
Research Repository



Stakeholder analysis of a retirement village development in Australia: Insights from an interdisciplinary workshop

Hu, Xin; Xia, Bo; Buys, Laurie; Skitmore, Martin; Kennedy, Rosemary; Drogemuller, Robin

Published in:
International Journal of Construction Management

DOI:
[10.1080/15623599.2015.1094848](https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2015.1094848)

Licence:
Other

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

Recommended citation(APA):
Hu, X., Xia, B., Buys, L., Skitmore, M., Kennedy, R., & Drogemuller, R. (2015). Stakeholder analysis of a retirement village development in Australia: Insights from an interdisciplinary workshop. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 15(4), 299-309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2015.1094848>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

Stakeholder Analysis of a Retirement Village Development in Australia: Insights from an Inter-Disciplinary Workshop

Xin Hu^{a*}, Bo Xia^a, Laurie Buys^b, Martin Skitmore^a, Rosemary Kennedy^b, Robin
Drogemuller^b

*^aSchool of Civil Engineering and Built Environment, Queensland University of Technology,
Garden Point Campus, 2 George Street, Brisbane QLD 4001, Australia; ^bSchool of Design,
Queensland University of Technology, Garden Point Campus, 2 George Street, Brisbane
QLD 4001, Australia.*

* Corresponding author. Email: huxincqu@gmail.com or x5.hu@hdr.qut.edu.au

Abstract: In Australia, the retirement village is regarded as a viable accommodation option for the fast-growing population of older people. Given that diverse stakeholders are involved in the village development process, a comprehensive stakeholder analysis, especially understanding stakeholders' concerns and expectations, is of critical importance to project success. This paper describes a stakeholder analysis based on a typical retirement village. The main methods utilized in this research were case study and an inter-disciplinary workshop comprising intensive work sessions and cross-functional review. The participants of this 2014 Brisbane workshop included four village managers from an Australian retirement village developer and eight academics from diverse disciplines from a large university. Through this workshop, 24 village stakeholders and their specific concerns and expectations are identified. Results suggest that both concerns and expectations of these stakeholders are multidimensional and vary considerably, and the concerns and expectations of different stakeholders have complex relationships. Implications of this workshop results for a retirement village development are also proposed. The findings of the study serve as a valuable reference for developers' understanding of stakeholder concerns and expectations, and taking corresponding actions in the remainder stages of the retirement village development.

Keywords: Stakeholder analysis, retirement village, concerns and expectations of stakeholders, inter-disciplinary workshop

Introduction

Primarily as a result of declining birth and death rates, the proportion of ageing population in Australia is steadily growing (Australian Productivity Commission, 2013). This is set to increase further as the 'baby boomers' enter retirement over the next 15 years. To facilitate older people's daily life, there is a need for special services to be provided including appropriate forms of housing accommodation (Tinker, 2002). Currently, the fast-growing retirement village sector offers older people an important accommodation option (Buys et al., 2006). The retirement villages, which stress the living philosophies of independence, security and privacy, provide an age-segregated living environment offering diverse services and support to satisfy residents' unique requirements (Gardner et al., 2005). Currently, over 177 000 people reside in 2160 retirement villages in Australia, accounting for more than five percent of people aged 65 years or older (Retirement Living Council, 2013a, b).

The development of retirement villages involves diverse stakeholders. These stakeholders have different demands that can affect village development both positively and negatively, and that need to be managed effectively to ensure project success (El-Gohary et al., 2006). Stakeholder analysis is indispensable for understanding stakeholders' diverse needs (Aaltonen, 2011), starting with identifying individuals and organisations associated with a development project. Analysing stakeholders' preferences and needs helps to identify and prioritise those needs, and guides subsequent stakeholder management decisions (Jepsen & Eskerod, 2009). If stakeholders' needs are not well analysed and managed, failures are very likely to occur (El-Gohary et al., 2006). For instance, if affordability concerns of potential residents are not well considered and addressed, a low occupancy rate may result. Another example is that if the site selected for the village does not take into account the site accessibility requirements of certain

service providers, such as emergency services, it will negatively impact the quality of services provision.

To date, although research associated with retirement villages involves a wide range of topics such as the residents' relocation, living experience and village living environment (Bernard et al., 2007; Buys, 2000; Xia et al., 2014), little attention has been paid to stakeholder analysis in early stages of planning a retirement village development. Moreover, the large number of stakeholders involved and difficulties in gathering their opinions worsen the situation (Yang et al., 2009a). Furthermore, the retirement village is unique type of development project as it is senior-oriented and should support the independent living of its residents (Gardner et al., 2005). This has further hindered understanding village stakeholders' attitudes. To address these problems, a workshop using a typical retirement village development at its early concept stage as a case study was conducted in Brisbane, Australia. This process was an effective way of uncovering a broad range of stakeholders and identifying their particular concerns, the nature of the problems involved, and their potential solutions.

Stakeholder Analysis and its Importance in the Development of Retirement Village Projects

Project stakeholders are “individuals and organizations that are actively involved in a project, or whose interests may be positively or negatively affected as a result of project execution or project completion; they may also exert influence over the project and its results” (Project Management Institute, 2000) (p.16). Thus both individuals and organizations who affect, or are affected by, the objectives and performances of a project are considered as project stakeholders (Bryson, 2004; Newcombe, 2003). There is a long list of stakeholders during a

typical building project life cycle, such as owners, contractors and the public. This is also true for a retirement village project, in which numerous stakeholders (e.g., potential residents, their family members and friends, services and facilities providers, and neighbours) should be taken into consideration due their influences on the project development process. For instance, older adults have special housing requirements due to their changing physical abilities, and therefore the village environment should be developed to provide a supportive environment (Gardner et al., 2005). Their family members and friends have an impact on the village development through their engagement and support given to potential residents, such as in relocation decisions (Buys, 2000). Services and facilities providers are important in the village development given the important role of services and facilities play in the shaping village social-spatial environment (Xia et al., 2014). The influence of neighbouring homeowners on the village development may be negative, and hinder development processes (Pacione, 2012; Rosenberg & Everitt, 2001).

Project stakeholders need to be managed carefully to ensure a positive outcome for all stakeholders (Aaltonen, 2011; Yang et al., 2009b). Project stakeholder management aims at exploring the importance and priority of stakeholders' needs and expectations, minimising negative impacts and ensuring the achievement of the project organisations' goals (Chinyio & Olomolaiye, 2009; Olander, 2007). Its importance can be seen from the two-way relationship between projects and their stakeholders (Preble, 2005). To be more specific, for one thing, a retirement village project can have both positive and negative effects on its stakeholders. For instance, it may offer its residents opportunities to have increased access to social and health programs and services, but also has the potential to put pressure on those services (Bernard et al., 2007; Pacione, 2012). For another, village stakeholders can also impact the development

process of a retirement village project, which is especially true for those opposing stakeholders given their negative perceptions towards the development process.

In the stakeholder management process, stakeholder analysis is considered to be a central component (Aaltonen, 2011; Olander & Landin, 2008). Stakeholder analysis is an approach or tool for generating knowledge closely associated with stakeholders, such as their features and influences (Varvasovszky & Brugha, 2000). Its objective is to “evaluate and understand stakeholders from the perspective of an organisation, or to determine their relevance to a project or policy” (Brugha & Varvasovszky, 2000) (p.239). The basic process comprises identification of project stakeholders and analysing their characteristics (Jepsen & Eskerod, 2009). First, stakeholder identification seeks to uncover all the relevant stakeholders for the ensuing analysis (Bryson, 2004). Then, the primary task of stakeholder characteristic analysis is to determine each stakeholder’s expectations, benefits and powers relating to the proposed project (Jepsen & Eskerod, 2009). Owing to the vital position of identifying stakeholders’ concerns and expectations in the stakeholder management process, “assessing the stakeholders’ needs and constraints to the project” is of the utmost importance (Yang et al., 2009a).

Stakeholder analysis in the early stage of a project development is very important (Jepsen & Eskerod, 2009; Olander & Landin, 2005), as the decisions made based on the results of stakeholder analysis profoundly affect the following stages (Kolltveit & Grønhaug, 2004). For a retirement village project, first, stakeholder analysis helps the village developer understand their stakeholders’ requirements at the initial stage, and to determine which stakeholders’ requirements are more important and influential, and therefore which concerns ought to be given priority to satisfy. Second, stakeholder analysis can reveal ways to minimise the

negative impacts of stakeholders who have concerns regarding the village development. These concerns as well as their negative impacts are systemically identified through stakeholder analysis, giving the village developer the opportunity to adopt interventions to mitigate these negative impacts and potentially increase positive impacts. Third, stakeholder analysis identifies and manages potential controversies between different village stakeholders. Perceptions of village stakeholders toward the retirement village development vary considerably and some of these views are likely to be conflicting. It becomes possible for the village developer to propose strategies to manage conflicts to reduce their negative influences. Moreover, stakeholder analysis is a way of compensating for the limited information acquisition at the early stage of a village development. Stakeholder analysis can be used as a tool for the village developer to expand the information sources to support their initial decision-making.

Research Method

This paper focuses on the identification of potential stakeholders and the analysis of their needs and constraints in the early stage of an actual retirement village development project in Australia. In previous research, various methods such as face-to-face interviews, questionnaire surveys and dialogues with project members are utilized for stakeholder analysis (Jepsen & Eskerod, 2009; Yang et al., 2011b). However, some of these proposed methods can be considered as too time-consuming and ineffective (Yang et al., 2011a). In addition, as the successful development of a retirement village heavily depends on multi-disciplinary expertise such as urban development, social science, architectural design, and project management, these methods may not serve to facilitate the effective integration of diverse expertise.

Workshopping, which combines the advantages of many methods, is an effective method of investigating stakeholders' preferences and aspirations (Yang et al., 2009b). A well-organised workshop can gather participants' opinions concerning the proposed topic within a designated period of time, suggesting that acquiring information in this way is more efficient than by other methods. Additionally, workshop participants with diverse professional experience and knowledge supply decision-makers with intellectual support from different discipline perspectives, improving the likelihood of a successful stakeholder analysis.

One inter-disciplinary workshop, named *Exploring A Future Retirement Village Site*, was held in April 2014. The workshop was organised by a senior researcher to explore the effectiveness and efficiency of using a workshop approach to address stakeholder preferences. The participants were identified by the researcher based on their multi-disciplinary background and their knowledge and expertise. Participants included an executive and three senior staff from one retirement village developer/operator and eight academics from a large university. The participants from the retirement village were experts in retirement village development and operation and had substantial managerial experience and knowledge of their residents. The academic participants were experts in the disciplines of sociology, social gerontology, urban environment, regional and urban planning, architectural design, property economics, building information modelling, and construction and project management.

In order to contextualise the research problem and focus participants' attention on a tangible set of issues surrounding a retirement village development and its stakeholders, a case study of a proposed retirement village was chosen as the focus for an intensive inter-disciplinary workshop. The project information was provided by the retirement village developer, whose

philosophy is to deliver accommodation that provides residents with a quality lifestyle and a 'village' that reaches into the local community. The proposed village is planned for a suburb of Brisbane, Queensland, approximately eight kilometres south of the Brisbane central business district (CBD). A concept map of the proposed site is shown in Figure 1. The site is close to the Brisbane River and various recreational amenities including a major sporting venue, and is surrounded by existing local communities. In addition, there is a convenient train station in the east of the site within a few minutes' walk from the main residential area. There is also a heritage-listed facility within the site.

Insert Figure 1 here

The workshop was facilitated by two senior researchers who introduced the topics and guided the discussion. The facilitators created the environment so that participants felt comfortable to engage in robust and challenging discussions. The strength of this approach was that participants were given the opportunity to introduce ideas, challenge concepts and as a collective, develop a range of new options and ideas. The facilitators recorded the discussion outcomes on large sheets of paper that were posted around the room – giving participants the opportunity to revisit and revise the data during the workshop.

The stakeholder analysis followed the following steps. Step 1: Familiarization with the proposed retirement village. Managers from the village presented detailed information of the project and provided answers to any associated questions from other participants. Step 2: Identification of a comprehensive list of stakeholders involved in the project. A variety of methods can be employed in the project stakeholder identification process, such as brainstorming, asking organization members, and using generic stakeholder lists (Jepsen &

Eskerod, 2009; Moodley et al., 2008). Given the collaborative and interactive attributes of this inter-disciplinary workshop, brainstorming was employed. Step 3: Identification of potential issues and outcome expectations. Participants identified potential issues, concerns and examined likely outcome expectations for each stakeholder. Step 4: Development of a stakeholder concerns and expectations matrix detailing stakeholder information and illustrating complex interactions and potential conflicts.

The Inter-disciplinary Workshop Results

Stakeholder Identification

A comprehensive list of 24 local, state and national stakeholder individuals and organizations was identified by participants. To facilitate the management of stakeholders, researchers propose diverse categories of stakeholders in different research scenarios (Rowlinson & Cheung, 2008), with “internal and external” being the most widely utilized in stakeholder classification (Atkin & Skitmore, 2008; Project Management Institute, 2000). Internal stakeholders are those that can directly participate in the decision-making process of a development project, while those that whose interests may be affected by the project organisations’ activities are regarded as external stakeholders (Atkin & Skitmore, 2008). The identified 24 stakeholders were grouped as shown in Table 1. This classification process assisted in solving issues of overlapping problems, facilitating stakeholder analysis and elaborating the influences of different stakeholder groups directly and clearly.

For this project, the ‘internal village stakeholders’ were defined as those directly participating in the decision-making process of a retirement village development, including those involved

in the supply chain. Specifically, they are the stakeholders directly involved in the development of a retirement village. Therefore, those internal stakeholders are mainly the developer, regulatory bodies, and service and facilities providers. Conversely other stakeholders with no decision-making control, but who have varying degrees of effect on the retirement village project development were defined as external stakeholders. Both internal and external village stakeholders should be considered carefully during the process of village development (Atkin & Skitmore, 2008).

Insert Table 1 here

Stakeholder Analysis

The analyses of stakeholders' concerns and expectations are shown in Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

Insert Table 2 here

Insert Table 3 here

Based on the results shown in Table 2 and 3, two significant features of these concerns and expectations can be found. First, both concerns and expectations of the stakeholders are multidimensional and vary considerably between different groups. For instance, potential residents are concerned about the village affordability issue and expect the village social-spatial environment will be in balance with their competencies, while some stakeholders just focus on the commercial benefits they may obtain. Second, the concerns and expectations of

different stakeholders have complex inter relationships. Understanding and managing stakeholder relationships is one of the important topics in current stakeholder management process (Yang et al., 2011b). These identified stakeholder perceptions provide project managers effective support in understanding and managing these relationships. For instance, prospective residents expect services that best match their capabilities. To address their needs, third party services providers, healthcare providers and emergency services providers ought to tailor their services based on residents' requirements, rather than simply offer a homogeneous approach.

Results Implications for Village Development Practice

The results of this workshop shown in Table 2 and 3 suggest some implications for retirement village development practice. In this section, the results implications for shaping a village environment, the negative attitudes of stakeholders and some potential conflicts between stakeholders that should be mitigated, resolved, or leveraged to create positive outcomes are discussed.

The retirement village development refers to the conceptualisation, design and construction of both the physical and social environment, if a retirement village aims to provide its residents a positive lifestyle rather than basic accommodation alone (Grant, 2003). The results of this inter-disciplinary workshop shown in Table 2 and 3 give some implications for the shaping of a village environment.

- 1) **Affordability.** Results of this workshop indicate potential residents will be concerned about the high cost of entry and expect affordable housing. Previous researchers have

pointed out that low living cost is one of the contributors to residents' decisions to relocate to a retirement village (Buys, 2000; Stimson & McCrea, 2004), whereas affordability is still an important issue as Walker & McNamara (2013) expressed that "moving to a retirement village often includes a noteworthy financial investment" (p.446). Although most potential residents are baby boomers who are reported to be wealthier than their parents and are likely to offset the cost of entry to a retirement village by the sale of the family home, this noteworthy financial investment of living in a retirement village may nevertheless place financial pressure on them regarding ongoing living costs (Quine & Carter, 2006). Therefore, retirement villages ought to take into account the village affordability issue and residents' desire to maintain economic independence.

- 2) Equipping the village with attractive characteristics may encourage relocation. The workshop participants argued that potential residents experience hard decisions when relocating. This is consistent with previous researchers' statement that "whether or not to relocate to a new community in later life can be a difficult decision" (Grant, 2003) (p.136). Typically, some Australian consumers postpone a decision to relocate to retirement villages until they are compelled by a health-related incident (GrantThornton, 2011). Previous researchers have also indicated that older people's relocation behaviours can be prompted when a retirement village possesses certain characteristics, such as health and maintenance services, supportive living environment, and convenient location (Crisp et al., 2013; Stimson & McCrea, 2004). Therefore, the village developer should take these factors into consideration in order to make the developed retirement village more attractive. The attraction of the village living will bring benefits to governments, such as releasing the pressure of insufficient

or inappropriate housing for elderly people (the state government), and supporting ageing-related budget reforms (the federal government).

- 3) Services availability, suitability, and easy access. First, the retirement village should provide diverse services to its residents. Workshop results indicate that service availability is a major expectation of potential residents. The demand for daily services generally increases with age because of the deteriorating health and physical competencies of most older people (Logan & Spitze, 1994). Services availability both in and outside the village is recommended by previous researchers given its positive roles in facilitating active living (Nathan et al., 2013). Second, the provided services inside a retirement village ought to be suitable. Analysing the unique service needs of prospective residents at the pre-design stage gives the developer the opportunity to 'design in' solutions as part of the development process. The workshop results indicate that accommodating suitable services is valued by stakeholders such as service providers, community and potential residents' relatives. Although diverse services may be available, not all these services are preferred and frequently utilized by older people (Valdemarsson et al., 2005). These provided services in a retirement village should be tailored carefully based on residents' needs, such as their preferences and utilization frequencies. Third, the provided services should be easily accessible. The workshop results indicate service accessibility issue is a concern of potential residents, and the provided services should be within walkable distance given potential positive effects on residents' walking behaviour (Nathan et al., 2013).

The case study site is co-located with various suitable and accessible commercial services such as casual dining, gym and therapists in walkable destinations and a high quality public open space environment compliant with the Disability Discrimination

Act. This will facilitate the daily life of the retirement village residents and their visitors. Providing services to village residents will also offer local businesses the potential to grow their business and increase profitability. Reciprocally, services located within the retirement village may be accessible to the wider community, bringing benefits to a spectrum of stakeholders.

- 4) Supportive, secure, and social connection and participation should be ‘designed in’ to the retirement village environment. Workshop results suggest that potential residents and their relatives and friends expect that the village is secure and supports social connections and participation. The importance of security, social connection and participation of retirement villages has been emphasized in previous research (Buys, 2001; Graham & Tuffin, 2004; McDonald, 1996). The village developer should shape a social environment which is secure, offers opportunities for maintaining established social interactions and develop new social networks, and offers prospective residents an active lifestyle which can alleviate negative emotions and enrich their retirement life.

With its high quality public open space, active and passive recreation opportunities available in an attractive river-side setting to residents, visitors and the wider community, and a variety of nearby uses, the case study site offers the social and physical environment to support healthy active living practices.

- 5) Appropriate village location and design. Location selection and design are important aspects of a village development (Goldenberg, 1986; Welch et al., 1986). Results of this workshop show that the influences of stakeholders on village location selection and design mainly reflect on the distance from the home of residents’ family and

friends, car-parking space, transportation and service accessibility. First, the village location should be not far away from the living place of resident's family and friends. Previous research has given the similar implication that proximity to family is an important feature of a developed retirement village from the perspective of potential residents (Buys, 2000; Stimson & McCrea, 2004). In present research, the same aspiration is obtained from the perspective of their family members and friends. Second, the village location should be convenient for car-parking or its design should plan sufficient car-parking space for its visitors, especially its residents' friends. Third, the village should be close to transportation. This has been stressed in previous research as a factor that should be considered carefully in village location selection owing to its effects on residents' social participation (Goldenberg, 1986; Nathan et al., 2014). Last, the village location and its design should convenient services delivery. This is extremely important for some emergency services providers due to their worries about site accessibility problems.

The case study site is located in proximity to suburbs characterised by the full socio-economic demographic spectrum, which means that middle income to low income residents provide a pool of potential residents for the village developer. Additionally, this case study site is also considered as a convenient location for prospective residents, their families and social networks, as the high-frequency public transport choices are proximate and accessible and a choice of local shopping, services and community facilities are nearby.

The implications obtained for shaping a village environment as derived from the concerns and expectations of these identified stakeholders, to some extent reflect the similar requirements of delivering a sustainable retirement village (affordable, social and environmental friendly) suggested by researchers such as Barker et al. (2013), Zuo et al. (2014) and Xia et al. (2015).

The urgency of providing age-friendly housing and communities to a growing population of older people is an important task of the federal government, which is reflected in the multiplicity of government policies or strategies, such as the *Caring for Older Australians* (Australian Productivity Commission, 2011). Shaping a retirement village with age-friendly features is an on-going trend in Australia.

The workshop results indicate that the negative attitudes toward a retirement village project development mainly come from its surrounding stakeholders. These surrounding stakeholders are components of what Welch et al. (1986) called ‘*visual environment*’ in a retirement village site analysis. Table 2 and 3 indicate that, in this case, the stakeholders with negative perceptions mainly include neighbouring property owners and the adjacent facility operators. To be more specific, neighbouring property owners are concerned about the potential for their property values to depreciate and fear this kind of institutional environment. Although prior research pointed out that certain types of residential construction can be perceived to have a negative effect on the value of adjacent properties (Lee et al., 1999), there is little evidence to support village neighbours’ concern for the depreciation of their property values. In addition, as a retirement village tends to be age-segregated, the village development may meet with disapproval by neighbours (Gardner et al., 2005). This may reflect insufficient understanding or stereotypes of this kind of facility, although the previous investigation has indicated that the village living is positive for majority of residents in later life (Kennedy & Coates, 2008).

Moreover, the case study site is adjacent to a sporting facility which operates day and night throughout the year, and periodically hosts some major events which attract a large number of the general public. The adjacent land user may be worried about the potential negative effects of the developed retirement village on its operations for various reasons. For instance, the

developed village may increase population density in the location, and therefore cause additional social problems such as traffic jams, potential conflicts and complaints over environmental problems regarding noise, access and lighting, and potential conflicts over resource sharing. Prior research has suggested that the stakeholders' negative attitudes should be fully considered by project developers (Olander & Landin, 2005). Therefore, it is essential to propose some strategies to manage the negative effects derived from its surrounding stakeholders, such as keeping communication with these stakeholders, better understanding and considering their concerns and expectations, and providing more knowledge to the public to better let them know the nature of the village life, and managing relationships with neighbours. A positive effect for adjacent facilities such as a sporting venue may be a boost to the potential pool of willing volunteers to assist at organised events, and enhanced security.

The potential conflicts between different village stakeholders are also a concern for the retirement village developer. As stakeholders' preferences are expressed from the perspectives of their own standpoints (Rowlinson & Cheung, 2008), village stakeholders' concerns and expectations are likely to be conflicting. A typical example found in this workshop is that the high cost of entry is one of the prime concerns of prospective residents. This has further troubled a retirement village proponent who highlighted the complex issue of the scarcity of affordable sites for village development within the metropolitan area, due to competition with other developments and land use opportunities. Another example is that although accessibility to rail transportation can facilitate residents' daily life, the rail agency is worried about the possibility of some negative impacts from the rail line on residents. In order to meet community expectations and enhance mobility for residents, the developer may contribute to the costs of upgrading the rail station. However, the expenditure may be passed on to the residents further increasing the price of accommodation. These controversies require

a crucial consideration by the village developer to guarantee the success of the subsequent project work (Yang & Shen, 2014). For instance, one of the approaches toward mitigating the potential effects of development in a transit corridor is shaping a well-planned surrounding environment with co-ordinated input from local and state authorities.

Results and implications of this case study can also be leveraged in the stakeholder analysis of other retirement village projects. First, the stakeholder identification of other retirement village projects can follow the identified retirement village stakeholder list, with adjustments appropriate to the different project context. Some stakeholders may be deleted or added based on relevance to the specific situation. Second, the identified stakeholders' concerns and expectations provide insights for other village developers on how to address them properly. Similarly, these identified concerns and expectations may be not re-used directly, and need to be adjusted based on the real situation.

Conclusions

The retirement village industry in Australia has experienced a rapid growth in recent years due to the fast-growing ageing population as well as an increasing acceptance of village life by older adults. As retirement village development involves a variety of stakeholders, it is vitally important to thoroughly understand their concerns and expectations. This paper presents the results of a well-organised inter-disciplinary workshop that utilised a case study of a proposed retirement village development in a suburb of Brisbane, Australia, to identify and analyse the issues and expectations of future retirement village stakeholders. Through this workshop, 24 village stakeholders are identified. Both concerns and expectations of these stakeholders are multidimensional, interactive and even conflicting between different groups,

and these dimensions and interactions should be carefully considered. In particular, the concerns of stakeholders need to be fully addressed to neutralise or minimise their negative influences on the village development and enhance positive outcomes for all stakeholders. The implications of the workshop results for the retirement village development are also suggested. Although this research investigates village stakeholders' concerns and expectations based on the work-shoppers' analysis instead of actual investigation on these identified stakeholders, it serves as an effective and sufficient way of stakeholder analysis at the early stage of a village project development.

Despite of the logistical benefits of this type of study for stakeholder analysis in terms of time, cost, scope and outcomes for a retirement village proponent, it still has limitations. First, the research method of the inter-disciplinary workshop relies heavily on domain experts' judgements, and these intuition-based results may not fully reflect the whole picture of retirement village stakeholders' concerns and expectations. In addition, this study was conducted based on a specific retirement village project proposal. Certain attributes of this project may be not directly transferrable to other retirement village projects. In spite of these limitations, the research helps village developers better understand stakeholder needs and concerns through the full use of expert knowledge and experience. Based on stakeholder analysis, strategies and actions for stakeholder management can be proposed to contribute to the success of future retirement village projects. As this research acquired stakeholder concerns and expectations based on experts' judgements, a follow-on investigation on these identified stakeholders will be conducted to validate the research findings.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank our academic and industry colleagues who engaged in the workshop, in particular we would like to recognise our colleagues from Aveo.

References

- Aaltonen K. 2011. Project stakeholder analysis as an environmental interpretation process. *International Journal of Project Management*, 29(2): 165-183.
- Atkin B, Skitmore M. 2008. Editorial: stakeholder management in construction. *Construction Management and Economics*, 26(6): 549-552.
- Australian Productivity Commission. 2013. *An Ageing Australia: Preparing for the future*, Canberra.
- Australian Productivity Commission. 2011. *Caring for Older Australians*, Productivity Commission Inquiry Report, Age-friendly housing and retirement villages, Canberra.
- Barker J, Xia B, Zillante G. 2013. Sustainable retirement living: what matters?, *Australasian Journal of Construction Economics and Building-Conference Series*, 1(1): 56-61.
- Bernard M, Bartlam B, Sim J, Biggs S. 2007. Housing and care for older people: life in an English purpose-built retirement village. *Ageing & Society*, 27(4): 555-578.
- Brugha R, Varvasovszky Z. 2000. Stakeholder analysis: a review. *Health Policy and Planning*, 15(3): 239-246.
- Bryson JM. 2004. What to do when Stakeholders matter. *Public Management Review*, 6(1): 21-53.
- Buyts L, Miller E, Barnett K. 2006. The Personal, Practical and Policy Implications of Older Australians' Residential Choice. *Journal of Housing For the Elderly*, 20(1-2): 31-46.
- Buyts LR. 2001. Life in a Retirement Village: Implications for Contact with Community and Village Friends. *Gerontology*, 47(1): 55-59.

- Buyss LR. 2000. Care and Support Assistance Provided in Retirement Villages: Expectations vs Reality. *Australasian Journal on Ageing*, 19(3): 149-151.
- Chinyio E, Olomolaiye P. 2009. *Construction stakeholder management*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Crisp DA, Windsor TD, Butterworth P, Anstey KJ. 2013. What are older adults seeking? Factors encouraging or discouraging retirement village living. *Australasian Journal on Ageing*, 32(3): 163-170.
- El-Gohary NM, Osman H, El-Diraby TE. 2006. Stakeholder management for public private partnerships. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24(7): 595-604.
- Gardner IL, Browning C, Kendig H. 2005. Accommodation options in later life: retirement village or community living? *Australasian Journal on Ageing*, 24(4): 188-195.
- Goldenberg L. 1986. Design Consideration, in: Sarkissian, W., Parker, V. (Eds.), *Retirement housing in Australia: guidelines for planning and design*. Impacts Press, NSW, Australia.
- Graham V, Tuffin K. 2004. Retirement villages: companionship, privacy and security. *Australasian Journal on Ageing*, 23(4): 184-188.
- Grant SC. 2003. Retirement villages: an alternative place to live. *Australasian Journal on Ageing*, 22(3): 136-140.
- GrantThornton, 2011. Retirement living: Industry trends & prospects. Available from: http://www.grantthornton.com.au/files/retirement_living_report_1012.pdf
- Jepsen AL, Eskerod P. 2009. Stakeholder analysis in projects: Challenges in using current guidelines in the real world. *International Journal of Project Management*, 27(4): 335-343.
- Kennedy DJ, Coates D. 2008. Retirement Village Resident Satisfaction in Australia: A Qualitative Enquiry. *Journal of Housing For the Elderly*, 22(4): 311-334.

- Kolltveit BJ, Grønhaug K. 2004. The importance of the early phase: the case of construction and building projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22(7): 545-551.
- Lee CM, Culhane DP, Wachter SM. 1999. The differential impacts of federally assisted housing programs on nearby property values: A philadelphia case study. *Housing Policy Debate*, 10(1): 75-93.
- Logan JR, Spitze G. 1994. Informal Support and the Use of Formal Services by Older Americans. *Journal of Gerontology*, 49(1): S25-S34.
- McDonald J. 1996. Community Participation in an Australian Retirement Village. *Australian Journal on Ageing*, 15(4): 167-171.
- Moodley K, Smith N, Preece CN. 2008. Stakeholder matrix for ethical relationships in the construction industry. *Construction Management and Economics*, 26(6): 625-632.
- Nathan A, Wood L, Giles-Corti B. 2013. Environmental Factors Associated With Active Living in Retirement Village Residents: Findings From an Exploratory Qualitative Enquiry. *Research on Aging*, 35(4): 459-480.
- Nathan A, Wood L, Giles-Corti B. 2014. Perceptions of the Built Environment and Associations With Walking Among Retirement Village Residents. *Environment and Behavior*, 46(1): 46-69.
- Newcombe R. 2003. From client to project stakeholders: a stakeholder mapping approach. *Construction Management and Economics*, 21(8): 841-848.
- Olander S. 2007. Stakeholder impact analysis in construction project management. *Construction Management and Economics*, 25(3): 277-287.
- Olander S, Landin A. 2005. Evaluation of stakeholder influence in the implementation of construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 23(4): 321-328.
- Olander S, Landin A. 2008. A comparative study of factors affecting the external stakeholder management process. *Construction Management and Economics*, 26(6): 553-561.

- Pacione M. 2012. The Retirement Village as a Residential Environment for the Third Age – The Example of Firhall, Scotland. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 128(2): 148-168.
- Preble JF. 2005. Toward a Comprehensive Model of Stakeholder Management. *Business and Society Review*, 110(4): 407-431.
- Project Management Institute, 2000. A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK), USA.
- Quine S, Carter S. 2006. Australian baby boomers' expectations and plans for their old age. *Australasian Journal on Ageing*, 25(1): 3-8.
- Retirement Living Council. 2013a. Profile: Retirement Village Operators. Available from: <http://www.retirementliving.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Retirement-Village-Operators-Profile.pdf>
- Retirement Living Council. 2013b. Profile: Retirement Village Residents. Available from: <http://www.retirementliving.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Retirement-Village-Residents-Profile.pdf>
- Rosenberg M, Everitt J. 2001. Planning for aging populations: inside or outside the walls. *Progress in Planning*, 56(3): 119-168.
- Rowlinson S, Cheung YKF. 2008. Stakeholder management through empowerment: modelling project success. *Construction Management and Economics*, 26(6): 611-623.
- Stimson RJ, McCrea R. 2004. A push-pull framework for modelling the relocation of retirees to a retirement village: The Australian experience. *Environment and Planning A*, 36(8): 1451-1470.
- Tinker A. 2002. The social implications of an ageing population. *Mechanisms of Ageing and Development*, 123(7): 729-735.

- Valdemarsson M, Jernryd E, Iwarsson S. 2005. Preferences and frequencies of visits to public facilities in old age—a pilot study in a Swedish town center. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 40(1): 15-28.
- Varvasovszky Z, Brugha R. 2000. A stakeholder analysis. *Health Policy and Planning*, 15(3): 338-345.
- Walker E, McNamara B. 2013. Relocating to retirement living: An occupational perspective on successful transitions. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 60(6): 445-453.
- Welch P, Parker V, Zeisel J. 1986. Design and constructing the facility, in: Sarkissian, W., Perlgut, D. (Eds.), *Retirement housing in Australia: guidelines for planning and design*. Impacts Press, NSW, Australia, pp. 31-43.
- Xia B, Skitmore M, Zuo J, Buys L. 2014. Review of community facilities in Australian retirement villages: A content analysis. *Australasian Journal on Ageing*, (in press).
- Xia B, Zuo J, Skitmore M, Chen Q, Rarasati AD. 2015. Sustainable retirement village for older people: a case study in Brisbane, Australia. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 19(2): 149-158.
- Yang J, Shen GQ, Bourne L, Ho CMF, Xue X. 2011a. A typology of operational approaches for stakeholder analysis and engagement. *Construction Management and Economics*, 29(2): 145-162.
- Yang J, Shen GQ, Ho M, Drew DS, Chan APC. 2009a. Exploring critical success factors for stakeholder management in construction projects. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*, 15(4): 337-348.
- Yang J, Shen GQ, Ho M, Drew DS, Xue X. 2011b. Stakeholder management in construction: An empirical study to address research gaps in previous studies. *International Journal of Project Management*, 29(7): 900-910.

Yang J, Shen Q, Ho M. 2009b. An overview of previous studies in stakeholder management and its implications for the construction industry. *Journal of facilities management*, 7(2): 159-175.

Yang JR, Shen GQ. 2014. Framework for Stakeholder Management in Construction Projects. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, (in press).

Zuo J, Xia B, Barker J, Skitmore M. 2014. Green buildings for greying people: a case study of a retirement village in Australia. *Facilities*, 32(7/8): 365-381.

Table 1 Village stakeholders and their categories

Stakeholder	Members
Categories	
Internal Stakeholders	Retirement Village Developer; State Government (including Ministers); Local Government and other Regulatory Authorities; Technology and Infrastructure Providers; Energy and Water Infrastructure Providers; Third Party Service Providers (including leisure, health, beauty, etc.); Healthcare Providers; Emergency Services Providers; Heritage Protection; Development Financiers.
External Stakeholders	Prospective Residents; Family of Prospective Residents; Competitors; Financial Advisors / Lawyers; Community; Neighbouring Property Owners; Rail Authority; Local Community Clubs, Societies, Religious Groups, and Chamber of Commerce; Neighbouring Land User (Major sporting venue operator); Friends of Prospective Residents; Federal Government; Health Department; Local Politicians; Education Providers.

Table 2 Stakeholders' concerns regarding a proposed retirement village development

	Stakeholder	Concerns (Issues of importance to each stakeholder)
Internal Stakeholders	Retirement Village Developer	Scarcity of appropriate sites; Fierce competition with other developers for land/sites;
	State Government (including Ministers);	The lack of housing for the older adults and the young disabled; Un-received financial benefits; The problem of diverse use under one or more portfolios
	Local Government and other Regulatory Authority	The lack of appropriate housing for the older community; Land-use planning and the difficulty of making best use of (potential) sites; Do not receive financial benefits; Mitigation of site constraints e.g., susceptibility to flooding;
	Technology and Infrastructure Providers	Capacity and design constraints of the proposed village;
	Energy and Water Infrastructure Providers	Infrastructure sustainability issues; Potential easements problems on the site; The rationality problem of planning for this site as well as suitable for future projects; Emerging impacts of climate change;
	Third Party Service Providers (including leisure, health, beauty, etc.)	Lack of potential for business growth and profitability;
	Healthcare Providers	Tailoring appropriate services to new customers; Limited capacity;

	Emergency Services Providers	Site accessibility;
	Heritage Protection	Maximising heritage values of existing buildings and site;
	Development Financiers	Ongoing viability of the proposed village project; Traditional process governed by prescriptive Act of Parliament;
	Prospective Residents	Desire to age in place; The hard decision on 'why relocate to retirement village instead of other living arrangements during their life span transitions; Care of other family members e.g., disabled partner or adult child; Fear of losing their social connections; Loss of independence; Loneliness and boredom; High cost of retirement village entry; Perceived lack of transparency when choosing village developers' products; Affordability of living; The problem of accessibility to offered services; Perceptions of site problems (e.g., Flood risk);
External Stakeholders	Neighbouring Property Owners	Property value depreciation; Fear of nursing homes; Image problem;
	Family of Prospective Residents	Inconvenient to see and visit family; Un-qualified care services provided to their parents; Family far away from the proposed village; What kinds of welfare the family can obtain;
	Competitors	Un-maximized benefits;

Financial Advisors/ Lawyers	Un-maximized benefits; Lack of information available for providing advice to clients about the viability of the retirement village product;
Community	Access to community-based services;
Rail Authority	Residents may seek to mitigate potential negative impacts of rail line (noise, odours, light at night); Avoid high cost and time-consuming upgrade of rail station;
Local Community Clubs, Societies, Religious Groups, and Chamber of Commerce	Losing membership and the difficulty of attracting new membership;
Neighbouring Land user (Major sporting venue operator)	Potential conflicts and complaints regarding noise, access and lighting during major events and throughout the year;
Friends of Prospective Residents	Convenience of access to site; Parking problems; Via public and private transport;
Federal Government	The urgency of providing age-friendly accommodation to a growing population of older people; The difficulty of providing community based services; The difficulty of effectively implementing Living longer/ Living Better reform (Australian Government, 2013);
Health Department	Health-related demands of aging population; Utilization of hospital beds for aged

		care rather than acute care;
	Local Politicians	Potential benefit conflicts;
	Education Providers	Location of local providers; The difficulty of providing university for the 3 rd age;

Table 3 Stakeholders' outcome expectations of a proposed retirement village

	Stakeholders	Expectations (Issues that constitute a 'win' for each stakeholder)
Internal Stakeholders	Retirement Village Developer	Obtaining the development rights to good urban sites, with attributes such appropriate scale, strong surrounding suburbs, and qualified local infrastructure;
	State Government (including Ministers)	Maximizing financial returns; Providing housing for a broad area of the community;
	Local Government and other Regulatory Authority	Promoting social inclusion and integration; Ensuring an appropriate demographic distribution; Maximizing financial returns;
	Technology and Infrastructure Providers	Getting the service without restrictions and meeting the clients requirements;
	Energy and Water Infrastructure Providers	Efficiency and infrastructure capacity; Meeting the requirements of sustainability;
	Third Party Service Providers (including leisure, health, beauty, etc.)	Acquiring additional customers;
	Healthcare Providers	Expanding offerings to new customers; Economies of scale;
	Emergency Services Providers	Design that enables ease of access to site;
	Heritage Protection	Active use of heritage buildings;

	Development Financiers	Ensuring the viability of the village and acquiring a good ROI;
External Stakeholders	Prospective Residents	Affordable housing; Retaining social connection; Housing meets their unique physical and social needs; Active village lifestyle; Ease of understanding the housing market choices available to older adults; No 'hidden' extras; Environmentally sustainable living; Accessibility to diverse services;
	Neighbouring Property Owners	Community outreach; Improving services through intensity of the infrastructure; Minimisation of negative effects of this proposed village;
	Family of Prospective Residents	Ease of access; Certainty of care, peace of mind and security offered to their parents; Minimizing isolation; Greater connection;
	Competitors	Winning the bid;
	Financial Advisors/ Lawyers	Clear and easy to understand proposition and superior to other offerings, and financial certainty;
	Community	Access to services;
	Rail Authority	No residential in proximity to rail line; Cost saving as the developer pays for upgrade of rail station;
	Local Community Clubs, Societies,	Augmenting their membership;

Religious Groups, and Chamber of Commerce	
Neighbouring Land user (Major sporting venue operator)	Catchment for volunteers; More security; Managing relationships with neighbours;
Friends of Prospective Residents	Maintaining social connections with their friends; Convenient public and private transport;
Federal Government	Demonstrating to the electorate they can address this issue of ageing; Complementing the Living longer/ Living Better reform effectively (Australian Government, 2013);
Health Department	Additional capacity; Preventative management of health care;
Local Politicians	Supporting a desirable outcome that demonstrates proactivity to the community;
Education Providers	Proximity to the proposed village;




Figure 1 A concept mapping of the location of some important infrastructures in the proposed site