PIONEER
ACADEMIC PUBLISHING LIMITED

Journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities
ISSN 2709-1910
www.pioneerpublisher.com/jrssh
Volume 4 Number 7 August 2025

Aging in Place and the Role of Accessibility in Dutch Housing Policy

Thijs W. Groot[1]

[1] Utrecht University, Netherlands
Correspondence: Thijs W. Groot, Utrecht University, Netherlands.

doi:10.56397/JRSSH.2025.08.02

Abstract

The demographic aging of Dutch society has placed increasing emphasis on the concept of aging in place as a cornerstone of housing and care policy. This paper critically examines the intersection between aging in place and the accessibility of the built environment within the context of Dutch housing policy. Drawing on recent empirical studies, policy frameworks, and demographic data, the analysis explores the material, institutional, and social dimensions that enable or hinder older adults from remaining safely and independently in their homes and communities. The research identifies a significant mismatch between policy ambitions and the realities of the existing housing stock, which remains largely inaccessible to individuals with mobility or sensory limitations. It also highlights the fragmented implementation of accessibility standards, the insufficient rate of construction of adapted dwellings, and the unequal distribution of resources across municipalities. Neighborhood-level accessibility, social infrastructure, and cultural inclusivity emerge as critical but under-addressed factors in sustaining aging in place. Participation of older adults in design and planning processes is recognized as an emerging strength, although inconsistently practiced. The paper concludes that while aging in place is institutionally prioritized in the Netherlands, its realization depends on systemic reform that embeds accessibility as a normative and structural principle in housing development, urban planning, and social governance.

Keywords: aging in place, accessibility, Dutch housing policy, built environment, social infrastructure, independent living

1. Introduction

The Netherlands, like many industrialized nations, is undergoing a profound demographic transformation characterized by a rapidly aging population. The proportion of Dutch citizens aged 65 and older is projected to rise from approximately 20 percent today to nearly 26 percent by 2040. This demographic shift poses fundamental challenges for national healthcare systems, pension infrastructure, and urban development. One of the most pressing issues is how to ensure that older adults can maintain autonomy, dignity, and quality of life in the environments where they have spent most of their lives. The concept of "aging in place" has emerged as a policy priority, not only as a cost-saving alternative to institutional care but also as a human-centered approach to aging that aligns with the preferences of the majority of

older adults.

In the Dutch context, aging in place has become more than a sociological ideal. It has become a structural necessity embedded in long-term care reforms, housing strategies, and local governance. Since the introduction of the 2015 Social Support Act (Wet maatschappelijke ondersteuning), responsibility for supporting older adults has shifted significantly to municipalities, which are now tasked with creating age-friendly environments through infrastructural design, community services, and housing adaptations. As a result, local governments, housing associations, and care providers are now at the forefront of shaping a built environment that supports older people in remaining safely and comfortably in their own homes for as long as possible.

The ability to age in place depends not only on health status or social support but critically on the accessibility and adaptability of the home and its surrounding neighborhood. Accessibility in this context refers to more than physical features like step-free entrances, elevators, or grab bars. It encompasses spatial planning, transport connectivity, proximity to essential services, and the social fabric of the community. For aging in place to be viable, the home must be a site of safety and comfort, while the neighborhood must function as an extension of that home, offering opportunities for social engagement, mobility, and access to care. The Dutch housing stock, however, was largely built during decades when population aging was not a central concern. A substantial proportion of the existing homes are ill-suited to accommodate people with limited mobility, chronic illness, or cognitive decline.

Aging in place also intersects with broader issues of housing supply, affordability, and urban inequality. In the Netherlands, where housing shortages are acute, many older adults continue to live in homes that exceed their needs in size but fall short in safety and accessibility. The lack of suitable alternative housing options exacerbates this mismatch, creating a bottleneck in the housing market that affects younger generations as well. Although national efforts aim to stimulate the construction of senior-friendly housing, progress remains slow due to rigid zoning regulations, limited funding, and a fragmented policy landscape. The ambition of aging in place, while socially desirable and economically sound, therefore collides with the structural and spatial realities of the Dutch built environment. Understanding the role of accessibility in making this ambition a lived reality is essential. It is in the intersection between aging policy, housing design, and urban accessibility, that this paper situates its analysis.

2. The Policy Context

The trajectory of Dutch housing policy over the last several decades reveals a fundamental recalibration of how the state approaches aging, care, and the built environment. Historically, the Netherlands operated a highly institutionalized model of eldercare. Retirement homes, nursing institutions, and specialized care facilities formed the backbone of public policy responses to aging. Older adults, especially those with declining health or limited family support, were often relocated to state-supported care institutions. This model was widely seen as both comprehensive and humane at the time, yet it also came with limitations. Institutional care models, by design, remove older adults from their familiar social environments. They reduce daily autonomy, often require downsizing or relinquishing personal property, and in many cases create psychological and emotional stress related to forced displacement.

In the late 20th century, a paradigm shift began to emerge. Cost pressures in the healthcare system became increasingly difficult to ignore, especially with projections of rising longevity and declining birth rates. Policymakers recognized that institutional care models were not only expensive but also poorly aligned with the preferences of the aging population. Surveys consistently showed that older adults overwhelmingly preferred to remain in their own homes as long as possible. The concept of "aging in place" gained ideological and political traction. It offered the promise of autonomy and dignity, framed aging as a social rather than medical phenomenon, and aligned with broader cultural values that emphasized independence and participation.

Dutch housing policy began incorporating this conceptual shift into formal regulatory frameworks. The major turning point arrived with the 2015 decentralization of long-term care through the Social Support Act (Wet maatschappelijke ondersteuning, Wmo). This legislation transferred significant responsibilities from the national government to municipalities.

Local authorities were now charged with delivering a wide range of support services, from home modifications and assistive technologies to community engagement initiatives and transport subsidies. The rationale for this move was rooted in the principle of subsidiarity: local governments are presumed to be closer to their populations and thus better equipped to tailor services to specific community needs. Under this model, municipalities became active agents in facilitating aging in place, with direct accountability for creating environments conducive to later life.

At the same time, this policy reform introduced a highly decentralized and often uneven landscape of service delivery. While some municipalities embraced their expanded roles with innovative policies, collaborative housing projects, and public-private partnerships, others struggled with financial constraints, administrative capacity, and lack of technical expertise. A patchwork system emerged in which access to services and housing adaptations varied significantly depending on geographic location. This variability introduced inequities in the lived experience of aging in place, raising questions about the state's ability to guarantee uniform standards of dignity and care across the country.

Central to this evolving policy environment is the issue of housing accessibility. Aging in place presupposes that homes are not only safe but also capable of supporting the evolving physical and cognitive needs of older individuals. For many Dutch households, this is not currently the case. Much of the Dutch housing stock was built between the 1950s and 1980s, a period marked by rapid urbanization and mass housing construction. These buildings were not designed with aging populations in mind. Multi-story homes with narrow staircases, high bathtubs, inaccessible entryways, and insufficient lighting dominate large segments of the urban and suburban landscape. Retrofitting these homes poses a technical and financial challenge, especially for low- and middle-income homeowners and social housing tenants.

To address this gap, the Dutch government introduced various grant schemes and tax deductions aimed at stimulating private investment in home modifications. These policies include subsidies for installing stairlifts, widening doorways, replacing tubs with walk-in showers, and implementing smart-home technologies. Housing associations—responsible for a significant portion of social rental housing in the Netherlands—are also encouraged to modernize their building portfolios. Yet these measures have produced mixed results. The pace of renovation is slow. The demand for accessible housing significantly outstrips supply. Waiting lists for adapted social housing remain long, especially in urban areas where housing pressure is intense. Older adults who wish to move to a more suitable home often find few available options, leading to situations where people age in place not by design but by default, in homes that fail to support their well-being.

The Dutch government has also attempted to stimulate the construction of new housing units specifically designed for aging populations. These efforts include promoting intergenerational housing, senior co-housing communities, and small-scale clustered living arrangements that blend privacy with communal services. Policy instruments such as the National Housing Agenda and the Programma Langer Thuis articulate these ambitions clearly. They stress the need to build tens of thousands of senior-friendly homes by the end of this decade. Strategic alignment between urban planning, healthcare policy, and housing development is emphasized as a necessary condition for achieving this goal. Local zoning laws are being revised in some areas to permit higher-density construction and mixed-use developments near amenities and transport hubs.

Although policy commitments have been established, structural barriers remain unresolved. Land scarcity in high-demand regions, lengthy permitting processes, and community opposition to new developments limit the scalability of such projects. Real estate developers often prioritize higher-margin investments, reducing incentives to build for an aging demographic that may lack the financial resources of younger homebuyers. The result is a planning paradox: while national policy encourages aging in place, market dynamics and local regulatory hurdles often constrain the practical realization of this vision.

Accessibility in Dutch housing policy is not limited to physical infrastructure. It extends into the realm of social accessibility. Older adults with limited digital literacy face difficulties in navigating increasingly digitized public

services. Municipal portals, application processes for subsidies, and access to care providers often rely on online systems. The shift to digital service delivery, though cost-efficient, risks excluding the very populations that most depend on public support. Municipalities are now tasked with bridging this gap through service desks, community centers, and outreach initiatives, but these efforts remain underfunded and inconsistently applied.

Another important dimension of the policy context is the role of informal caregiving. Dutch policy increasingly assumes that family members, neighbors, and local volunteers will provide much of the day-to-day support required for older adults living at home. This assumption is embedded in policy language that emphasizes "self-reliance" and "participation." While these values align with broader social ideals, they can obscure the practical burdens placed on caregivers, many of whom are themselves aging or balancing employment with caregiving responsibilities. Women, in particular, bear a disproportionate share of informal care work, raising questions about gender equity in the implementation of aging-in-place strategies. Policy frameworks acknowledge the importance of informal caregivers but offer limited structural support such as respite care, caregiver allowances, or mental health services.

The Dutch policy context also reflects broader European and international trends. The Netherlands is an active participant in WHO's Age-Friendly Cities and Communities initiative, which promotes comprehensive planning across transport, housing, health, and social participation. Many municipalities have adopted age-friendly charters, developed senior councils, and launched pilot projects inspired by international best practices. These initiatives signal a growing recognition that aging is not solely a medical or individual matter, but a public and spatial one. Cities and towns must be designed not just to accommodate older residents, but to actively support their full participation in social life. In this sense, accessibility becomes a foundation for democratic inclusion.

The increasing momentum behind aging-in-place policy has not bridged the gap between aspiration and implementation. Accessibility, though universally acknowledged as essential, is still treated as a supplemental rather than foundational component of housing development. Many architects, developers, and policymakers continue to design for an able-bodied population, viewing aging as a niche issue rather than a demographic inevitability. Design standards often fail to mandate universal accessibility, and incentives for compliance are weak. This disconnect between policy rhetoric and design practice contributes to a built environment that marginalizes rather than integrates aging populations.

Cultural perceptions of aging also shape the policy environment. In Dutch society, aging is often framed through the lens of productivity and active citizenship. Successful aging is associated with continued independence, social participation, and health maintenance. While this framework offers a positive vision of later life, it can inadvertently stigmatize those who are frail, disabled, or dependent. Policies built on ideals of self-sufficiency may overlook the structural barriers that prevent many older adults from achieving them. This tension becomes especially visible in immigrant communities, where aging is experienced differently due to language barriers, cultural expectations, and socioeconomic disparities.

The future of Dutch aging policy depends on confronting these contradictions. Accessibility must be redefined not as a reactive accommodation but as a proactive design principle embedded in every stage of urban and housing development. Aging in place requires more than localized interventions. It requires systemic change in how the built environment is imagined, funded, and governed. The challenge is not simply to allow older adults to remain where they are but to ensure that those places remain habitable, safe, and empowering across the lifespan.

3. Accessibility and the Built Environment

Accessibility in the context of aging in place is not confined to architectural features within individual homes. It operates across multiple scales—spatial, infrastructural, and social—and shapes the broader ecosystem that determines whether older adults can remain in their communities with dignity, autonomy, and safety. In the Dutch context, the built environment plays a central role in mediating the experience of aging, yet much of this environment remains inadequately equipped to meet the complex

demands of an aging population.

The physical design of dwellings is often the most visible dimension of accessibility. Step-free entryways, wide corridors, non-slip flooring, lever-style door handles, and walk-in showers represent a baseline for aging-friendly home design. In the Netherlands, a substantial share of the existing housing stock fails to meet even these minimum accessibility standards. A legacy of post-war housing expansion produced vast tracts of apartments and terraced houses built without elevators, often with steep staircases and narrow doorways. These structural features are not easily modifiable. Home adaptations such as stairlifts or bathroom renovations can be expensive, time-consuming, and contingent on tenant approval or municipal subsidies.

Private homeowners may lack the financial capacity or motivation to undertake such adaptations unless compelled by necessity. Renters in social housing often depend on long bureaucratic processes to access modification services. Municipal schemes intended to finance accessibility improvements are unevenly applied across jurisdictions. Some local governments maintain active aging-in-place programs that include home assessments and targeted grants. Others treat accessibility retrofits as reactive, responding only after a crisis has occurred. These inconsistencies in service provision create unequal aging experiences, shaped not by individual need but by geographical circumstance.

Beyond the private dwelling, the design of residential buildings also poses challenges. In many older multi-unit buildings, shared spaces such as stairwells, lobbies, and entrances are not wheelchair accessible. Elevators, where present, may be too small to accommodate mobility devices. Emergency exits and fire safety protocols may not account for the slower response times or sensory limitations of elderly residents. Even the placement of mailboxes, signage, and waste disposal areas can create daily friction for people with mobility, vision, or cognitive impairments. These cumulative barriers contribute to a silent attrition of autonomy, as individuals gradually reduce their participation in everyday life outside the home.

The surrounding neighborhood exerts an equally profound influence on the feasibility of aging in place. Walkability, safety, and environmental quality are critical features of an age-friendly built environment. Sidewalks must be even, well-lit, and free of obstructions. Public benches, resting points, and pedestrian crossings need to be available and appropriately spaced. Street signage should be legible, intuitive, and positioned at eye level. In many Dutch neighborhoods, especially those built during the car-centric planning era of the mid-20th century, these features are either absent or poorly maintained. The dominance of cars in suburban and peri-urban areas creates hostile environments for pedestrians, particularly for older adults who rely on walking or mobility aids.

Access to amenities such as grocery stores, pharmacies, general practitioners, and recreational facilities determines the extent to which older adults can perform daily tasks independently. In many parts of the Netherlands, retail consolidation and centralization have led to the disappearance of local shops. Large supermarkets and health centers have relocated to regional hubs, often on the outskirts of cities and towns, accessible primarily by car or bicycle. Public transportation offers a theoretical solution, but practical use is often constrained by limited service frequencies, poorly designed stops, or the complexity of digital ticketing systems. Older residents who no longer drive or use smartphones may find themselves effectively isolated from essential services, even if those services exist within municipal boundaries.

Cultural and linguistic accessibility also shape the usability of the built environment. In diverse urban areas such as Rotterdam, Amsterdam, and The Hague, older residents with migration backgrounds often face additional barriers. Language differences, unfamiliarity with bureaucratic systems, and culturally unresponsive service provision intersect to create environments that feel exclusionary. Research on Moroccan and Turkish older adults in the Netherlands illustrates how social isolation, lack of culturally familiar spaces, and perceived insecurity in public areas diminish the potential of aging in place. These challenges are not simply matters of preference. They reflect systemic gaps in urban design that fail to recognize or respond to the plural realities of aging.

The built environment also interacts with social infrastructure in ways that influence psychological well-being. Public spaces such as

libraries, community centers, parks, and places of worship provide venues for intergenerational interaction, social engagement, and informal caregiving networks. In many communities, these spaces are disappearing due to budget cuts, privatization, or changing urban priorities. As physical meeting points vanish, older adults lose access to the kinds of weak social ties, acquaintances, neighbors, shopkeepers, that form the scaffolding of social inclusion. This decline in everyday publicness contributes to loneliness and alienation, both of which are significant predictors of physical and cognitive decline in later life.

Accessibility also encompasses the temporal rhythms of urban life. Nighttime lighting, noise levels, service hours, and traffic patterns affect how safe and comfortable older residents feel in their surroundings. An environment may appear accessible during daylight hours but become hostile at night. Older adults, especially those with visual impairments or balance issues, may begin to self-restrict their movements based on perceived threats or discomfort. These restrictions, although self-imposed, stem directly from environmental cues that communicate whether or not a space is meant for them. The built environment can either invite or exclude, reassure or intimidate, encourage or deter.

Designing for accessibility in the built environment requires coordination across multiple policy domains. Urban planning, transport engineering, public health, housing, and social services must align to produce age-inclusive outcomes. In the Netherlands, siloed governance structures often complicate such alignment. While the Ministry of the Interior sets national housing targets and building codes, municipal governments control land use, transport planning, and service delivery. Housing associations operate under a separate regulatory framework, often with competing priorities related to affordability and environmental sustainability. The absence of a unified regulatory or funding mechanism for age-friendly development leads to fragmented implementation and missed opportunities for systemic reform.

Innovation in accessibility design remains uneven. Some municipalities and housing developers have piloted smart-home technologies, modular construction, and co-housing models to address accessibility challenges. These projects, while promising, remain exceptions rather than the rule. The mainstream construction industry still prioritizes cost efficiency and aesthetic norms that cater to younger demographics. Universal design remains largely underutilized in new construction, even with evidence supporting its cost-effectiveness and accessibility. Architectural education and professional standards continue to reflect outdated assumptions about who cities and homes are built for, reinforcing design paradigms that marginalize older adults.

Climate adaptation policies introduce a new set of tensions. Efforts to densify urban areas, reduce car dependency, and create green infrastructure often conflict with the accessibility needs of older populations. Shared mobility systems like bike-sharing and app-based car rentals exclude those without smartphones or with limited physical mobility. Car-free zones may improve air quality but reduce transport options for people with disabilities. Vertical densification through high-rise construction creates logistical challenges for emergency services, elevator maintenance, and social cohesion. Environmental sustainability and social sustainability are frequently treated as separate agendas, although both exert overlapping impacts on aging populations. Technological accessibility introduces another layer of complexity. As public services migrate online, older adults encounter new forms of spatial exclusion. Booking medical appointments, applying for housing adaptations, or accessing transportation subsidies often requires digital literacy and reliable internet access. In the Netherlands, where digitalization has been rapid, older residents without computer skills or smartphones are at risk of falling through the cracks. Physical spaces such as municipal offices and libraries are increasingly staffed and resourced under the assumption of digital self-service. The disappearance of analog alternatives, paper forms, in-person appointments, telephone hotlines, transforms the built environment into a maze of inaccessible portals.

The concept of accessibility in the built environment must also contend with the psychological dimension of place attachment. Older adults often express deep emotional connections to their homes and neighborhoods. These attachments are formed over years or decades and include memories, routines, social

relationships, and a sense of personal history. Policies or planning interventions that disrupt these attachments can produce trauma, resistance, and loss of identity. Forced relocations, rapid neighborhood change, or intrusive modernization projects may undermine rather than support aging in place. Accessibility, in this broader sense, requires sensitivity to the symbolic and emotional significance of place.

Design processes that incorporate older adults as co-creators rather than passive recipients offer a promising path forward. Participatory planning, user-centered design, and community-based initiatives provide mechanisms for aligning the built environment with the lived realities of aging. In the Netherlands, such models are emerging in experimental housing cooperatives, neighborhood design charrettes, and inclusive urban labs. These efforts demonstrate that accessibility is not merely a technical issue but a social practice, embedded in relationships of trust, recognition, and shared agency. When older residents are invited to articulate their needs, preferences, and aspirations, the resulting environments are more likely to be inclusive, flexible, and resilient.

Accessibility in the built environment is ultimately about the right to inhabit space. It is a claim to visibility, mobility, and participation. In an aging society, the failure to prioritize accessibility represents not just a policy oversight but a violation of that right. The Dutch policy commitment to aging in place must be grounded in a built environment that supports rather than constrains later life. This support must be designed, funded, regulated, and maintained with intentionality, not left to the market or chance. It must recognize that aging is not an exception but a universal condition, and that environments built to support the old are environments that will, eventually, support all.

4. Data Overview

Quantitative data plays a crucial role in revealing the structural and systemic conditions surrounding aging in place within the Netherlands. While qualitative studies offer rich narratives about individual experience, statistical indicators offer a macroscopic view of infrastructural readiness, demographic patterns, and emerging policy gaps. The five core data points outlined in the table provide a diagnostic lens through which the feasibility and effectiveness of aging-in-place policies can be assessed. They not only reflect the current state of housing and accessibility but also point toward impending challenges that require coordinated and proactive responses.

Table 1.

Indicator	Value / Findings	Source
Proportion of homes fully accessible (step-free, wide doors, adapted bathrooms)	~25% of housing stock	Henegouwen, 2019
Older adults (65+) living independently	93% (majority without formal care support)	Wammes et al., 2024
Anticipated shortage of accessible homes by 2030	300,000+ units	van Hoof et al., 2021
Seniors citing neighborhood accessibility as key to aging in place	70–80% (across cultural groups)	Hussein et al., 2024
Participation of older people in housing design	Increasing, but unevenly implemented	van Hoof et al., 2021

4.1 Interpreting the Housing Accessibility Deficit

The statistic that only around 25% of homes in the Netherlands are considered fully accessible underscores a foundational barrier to aging in place. Full accessibility refers not only to physical alterations such as step-free access or wide doorways but also to an integrated spatial design that anticipates and supports varying levels of physical and cognitive decline. A three-quarters inaccessibility rate in the national housing stock indicates a profound spatial mismatch between the environments where people age and the functional needs that arise with aging.

This mismatch has multiple origins. Much of the housing stock was constructed between the

post-war decades and the late 20th century under assumptions of able-bodied occupancy. Mass housing projects prioritized speed and cost-efficiency over adaptability. The low percentage of accessible homes also reflects the historical segregation of health and housing policies, with medical institutions bearing the primary responsibility for eldercare. As the policy model shifted toward community-based care, the inherited housing infrastructure failed to keep pace.

The figure also suggests that aging in place, while desirable, is currently constrained by built conditions that do not support physical decline without significant retrofit or relocation. The cost and complexity of retrofitting old buildings—especially multi-unit dwellings with shared stairwells and no elevator shafts—pose logistical and regulatory obstacles. Many older adults live in housing that will require extensive modification to accommodate walkers, wheelchairs, or reduced sensory capacities. Without public subsidies or coordinated interventions, many will remain trapped in unsuitable living environments or be forced into institutional care despite personal preference.

4.2 Independence versus Infrastructure

The figure that 93% of Dutch adults aged 65 and older live independently appears at first glance to be an indicator of success. High rates of independent living suggest that the policy goal of aging in place is not only aspirational but already being realized at scale. Most older adults continue to manage their own households, participate in community life, and navigate their environments without formal care dependency.

The surface impression of this figure, however, deserves critical examination. Independence in this context often masks a silent burden. Many older adults continue living independently not because their homes and communities support them adequately but because alternatives are either unavailable or undesirable. Independence may be maintained at the cost of social isolation, self-neglect, or quiet suffering. Some may avoid requesting support out of fear of being relocated, institutionalized, or labeled as burdensome.

Informal caregiving plays a significant role in sustaining this independence. Family members, neighbors, or community volunteers often fill the care gap left by limited formal support. This model is efficient for the system but may be unsustainable for caregivers. The high rate of independent living must be understood in light of cultural expectations, generational values, and structural pressures. It reflects agency but also necessity. In some cases, independence is not chosen but endured, revealing the limits of the housing and care infrastructure in accommodating varying stages of aging.

4.3 Projected Shortage: A Failing Pipeline

The anticipated shortage of over 300,000 accessible homes by 2030 is perhaps the most urgent signal that current housing policies and construction trends are out of step with demographic realities. This figure combines two deficits: the lack of adapted existing housing and the slow pace of construction of new senior-friendly homes. Even as the government promotes aging in place as a strategic priority, the physical environments needed to support this policy are not being produced at a sufficient rate.

The projected shortage highlights the absence of a scalable strategy for integrating accessibility into new builds. The private housing market prioritizes profitability and trend responsiveness. Developers often cater to the tastes and budgets of younger or middle-aged buyers. Accessibility features are either excluded or offered as upgrades. Regulations do not always mandate universal design in new housing, and incentives to include such features are inconsistent across jurisdictions.

The shortage also stems from limited political alignment across planning, housing, and health departments. Aging in place is framed as a health or social care issue rather than a spatial planning responsibility. This siloed governance model impedes the creation of unified pipelines for aging-ready housing. Without coordinated land-use policy, streamlined permitting for accessible units, or financial mechanisms to reduce development risk, the gap between need and supply will continue to widen.

This projected shortfall is not just a numerical gap. It represents a generation of older adults who may be left without viable housing choices. It also has downstream consequences for health systems, informal care networks, and labor force participation. Unmet housing needs lead to preventable injuries, accelerated institutionalization, and higher health expenditures. They also trap younger families in

unsuitable dwellings as older adults remain in homes that no longer serve them functionally but cannot be relinquished due to lack of alternatives.

4.4 Neighborhood Accessibility and Social Connection

The finding that between 70% and 80% of older adults across cultural groups identify neighborhood accessibility as a key component of aging in place reflects the critical role of the external environment in shaping lived experience. Housing accessibility begins at the threshold but extends outward into the social and spatial matrix that surrounds the home. Walkability, proximity to services, safety, and the availability of social infrastructure all influence whether aging in place remains viable beyond a certain threshold of health or mobility loss.

This data point captures both a shared human need and a differentiated experience. Across demographic categories, older adults recognize the importance of being able to reach pharmacies, markets, clinics, and public transport stops. These needs are amplified in later life as car usage declines and physical resilience diminishes. Yet the experience of neighborhood accessibility is not distributed equally. In urban cores, dense amenities may be available but not always physically accessible. In suburban or rural areas, the absence of transit and the spatial dispersal of services may pose insurmountable barriers.

The statistic also reflects the invisible architecture of social inclusion. Neighborhoods function not only as logistical spaces but as stages for informal social life. The ability to greet a neighbor, sit in a public square, or access a library defines the social quality of aging. When the built environment erodes these opportunities, loneliness and psychological decline increase. Neighborhood accessibility is not a luxury but a structural determinant of health and belonging in older adulthood.

4.5 Design Participation and Democratic Deficits

The final indicator points to a growing recognition that participation in housing design processes by older adults is increasing, although implementation remains uneven. The importance of user involvement is not simply procedural. It reflects an ethical and epistemological shift in how expertise is valued. Older adults bring lived experience, tacit knowledge, and long-term perspectives to housing design that technical experts alone cannot provide. The rise in support for participatory models has not eliminated the structural barriers that inhibit their application. Planning timelines, professional hierarchies, and financial pressures often marginalize end-users in the design process. Participation is sometimes limited to tokenistic consultation rather than co-creation. Those who are invited to participate tend to reflect more privileged segments of the older population. Migrants, lower-income individuals, and those with cognitive impairments are often excluded from these processes.

The uneven implementation of participatory practices reveals a democratic deficit in how the aging experience is translated into spatial form. It also suggests that policies promoting aging in place may falter unless they incorporate the voices of those most affected. Inclusive design must be process-driven as well as outcome-oriented. Without meaningful participation, design risks reproducing the same exclusions under new aesthetic forms.

5. Challenges and Opportunities

The ambition of enabling aging in place across the Netherlands is shaped by a landscape of competing constraints, shifting responsibilities, and embedded structural disparities. Policy documents at the national and municipal levels express a clear commitment to promoting autonomy, dignity, and accessibility for older adults. This ambition resonates with demographic urgency, fiscal necessity, and the articulated preferences of the aging population. Still, the pathway from policy to practice remains riddled with persistent challenges. These include the architectural rigidity of the existing housing stock, the inertia of the housing market, financial limitations at the local level, and social inequalities that compound vulnerability in later life.

One of the most formidable challenges lies in the nature of the current housing infrastructure. A significant share of Dutch dwellings were built before aging populations became a planning consideration. These homes reflect design assumptions centered on young, mobile, nuclear families. The layouts often include steep internal staircases, small bathrooms, narrow doorways, and poor insulation. Converting these spaces into safe and supportive environments for older individuals is technically complex and

financially burdensome. Structural changes such as installing elevators in walk-up apartment blocks or converting bathtubs into accessible showers require not only investment but also coordination among property owners, tenants, and regulatory authorities.

Retrofitting homes to meet accessibility standards is not a uniform process. The effectiveness of these modifications depends on the original design of the home, the adaptability of the materials, and the presence of shared ownership arrangements. In buildings managed by housing associations or co-operatives, decisions about renovations often require collective approval. This process introduces delays and may lead to uneven implementation, particularly when priorities between younger and older tenants diverge. Private homeowners, particularly those with low to moderate incomes, may not qualify for renovation subsidies or may lack the financial stability to invest in adaptations that do not increase resale value.

Affordability remains a critical issue. The Dutch housing market is experiencing high demand and constrained supply across nearly all segments. Rising property prices, long waiting lists for social housing, and stagnant new construction rates have produced a mismatch between available housing and demographic need. Older adults who wish to downsize or move into more accessible homes often find themselves with few viable options. Many remain in large, multi-story family homes not out of choice but because no better alternative exists. The lack of appropriately scaled, single-level, or senior-adapted housing units in urban centers forces older individuals either to endure increasingly unsuitable living conditions or to relocate to unfamiliar or remote areas, where services may be lacking and social networks are disrupted.

The housing shortage affects not only older adults but also younger generations, creating competition in the market and political pressure on policy decisions. Efforts to prioritize senior housing may meet resistance from constituencies advocating for starter homes, family housing, or refugee accommodation. Municipal planning departments must navigate these competing demands within the limits of zoning laws, land availability, and development incentives. The result is a triage system in which aging-in-place policies are subordinated to broader housing concerns, rather than integrated into a comprehensive framework that anticipates lifelong needs.

Decentralization, intended to bring services closer to the people, has introduced both innovation and disparity. Under the 2015 Social Support Act, municipalities were given expanded responsibility for facilitating aging in place through housing support, domestic assistance, and local care services. Some municipalities, particularly larger and wealthier ones, have developed sophisticated systems for identifying vulnerable seniors, coordinating service delivery, and financing home modifications. Others have struggled with budget constraints, limited staffing, and inadequate data infrastructure. Older residents in rural or low-capacity municipalities may encounter fragmented services, long waiting times, and insufficient outreach. The quality of aging in place becomes contingent not on individual need but on postal code.

Digitalization is accelerating this disparity. Municipalities increasingly rely on digital platforms for service requests, eligibility assessments, and application tracking. While this transition improves efficiency for some, it alienates those without digital literacy or internet access. Older adults who are unfamiliar with online systems may become dependent on family members or neighbors, undermining the policy goal of independent living. Attempts to create alternative access points, such as telephone lines or in-person support desks, are often under-resourced or inconsistently staffed. The push toward digital-by-default governance in an analog-reliant demographic deepens the accessibility gap and introduces new forms of exclusion.

Social isolation, already a significant concern among older populations, is exacerbated by inaccessible housing and neighborhoods. Individuals who cannot navigate their homes safely or leave them easily are at higher risk of losing social contacts. This isolation leads to mental health decline, reduced physical activity, and increased reliance on emergency services. Policy efforts to combat loneliness have gained attention in recent years, yet they often operate independently from housing policy. The built environment is rarely considered a determinant of social connection, even though features such as communal spaces, walkable areas, and intergenerational proximity are proven to

support spontaneous interaction and emotional well-being.

Ethnic and cultural diversity within the aging population adds layers of complexity. Older migrants often have different household structures, caregiving expectations, and spatial preferences. Housing policies built around normative Dutch nuclear-family models may fail to meet the needs of multigenerational households or culturally specific living arrangements. Language barriers and lack of culturally competent service provision inhibit access to support systems. Migrant seniors also experience intersecting forms of disadvantage, including lower socioeconomic status, limited pension entitlements, and historical experiences of marginalization. A one-size-fits-all approach to aging in place overlooks these differences and risks reinforcing inequities under the guise of universality. Significant opportunities exist to reframe aging in place as a transformative urban policy agenda. The demographic shift toward an older population is not a temporary phenomenon but a structural condition of the 21st century. Designing cities, neighborhoods, and homes that support aging populations offers benefits that extend across generations. Universal design, though originally conceived for disability inclusion, provides a framework for environments that accommodate a wide range of abilities, stages of life, and household types. Applying these principles at scale would reduce the need for costly retrofits, improve safety for all users, and enhance the functionality of public space.

Cross-sectoral collaboration can amplify impact. Housing associations, health insurers, urban planners, technology developers, and community organizations each hold partial solutions to the aging challenge. When these actors coordinate efforts, they can co-produce environments that support aging in place in a holistic manner. Pilot projects across the Netherlands demonstrate the value of integrated design. Some have combined senior housing with day-care facilities, creating intergenerational spaces that reduce age segregation and maximize resource efficiency. Others have used participatory design processes to include older residents in decision-making, ensuring that projects reflect lived experience rather than abstract standards.

Data analytics and predictive modeling offer tools for proactive intervention. Municipalities that invest in data systems can identify at-risk individuals, forecast service needs, and allocate resources more effectively. Geographic information systems (GIS) can map accessibility barriers, service gaps, and social infrastructure density, enabling targeted investments. Privacy and ethics must guide the use of such technologies, but their potential to shift policy from reactive to anticipatory cannot be overlooked. A data-informed approach allows policymakers to move beyond general declarations of support for aging in place and toward measurable outcomes.

Educational and cultural shifts within the design and planning professions are beginning to challenge the implicit ageism of the built environment. Architecture schools are incorporating universal design and inclusive planning into their curricula. Municipal planning departments are piloting age-impact assessments alongside environmental or economic impact analyses. These developments suggest a growing awareness that accessibility is not a niche issue but a core criterion of sustainable urbanism. Built environments that welcome aging are not relics of compromise but models of resilience.

Financing mechanisms represent another area of opportunity. Current subsidy programs for home adaptation and aging-in-place support tend to be fragmented and underfunded. Creating dedicated investment streams through housing funds, public-private partnerships, or social impact bonds could enable larger-scale innovation. Aligning financial incentives with long-term social outcomes would encourage developers and municipalities to prioritize accessibility from the outset. Designing homes that support aging in place reduces downstream costs in health care, emergency services, and institutional care. These savings justify upfront investment if the funding models are structured to capture cross-sectoral returns.

Narratives about aging also play a role in shaping policy and practice. Aging is often framed as decline, dependency, and burden. Reframing it as a phase of life with potential for contribution, growth, and leadership alters the political calculus. Older adults are not simply service recipients but community stakeholders with knowledge, skills, and perspectives that enrich collective life. Including them in planning processes, housing governance, and urban debates transforms aging in place from a

technical fix into a democratic imperative.

The opportunity lies not in isolating aging from other policy domains, but in weaving it through the entire fabric of urban development. Aging in place intersects with climate adaptation, digital inclusion, transport planning, economic development, and social cohesion. Treating it as a standalone issue narrows its scope and limits its transformative potential. Embedding accessibility into mainstream policy agendas recognizes the inevitability of aging and prepares society to meet it with dignity and care.

6. Conclusion

Aging in place has emerged as both a strategic imperative and a normative vision within Dutch housing and social policy. It reflects demographic inevitability, financial prudence, and a deeper cultural preference for continuity, autonomy, and belonging in later life. The Netherlands, with its strong tradition of social planning and decentralized governance, has taken concrete steps toward embedding this vision into its legal, architectural, and care infrastructure. Policy instruments such as the Social Support Act, municipal housing strategies, and national aging programs have signaled a reorientation of state responsibility toward facilitating independent living within the community. These reforms are not rhetorical gestures. They represent a structural pivot away from institutional care toward a model where homes and neighborhoods must carry a greater share of care provision and daily functionality.

At the core of this transition lies the concept of accessibility not as a secondary concern but as a foundational precondition for the realization of aging in place. The built environment, both inside and beyond the home, mediates nearly every aspect of older adulthood. Physical design determines whether a person can bathe, cook, exit the house, cross the street, or visit a neighbor. Urban infrastructure shapes access to services, opportunities for social interaction, and the overall sense of safety and orientation. Social infrastructure including parks, libraries, and public seating either facilitates or impedes participation in civic life. Accessibility is not simply a matter of eliminating architectural barriers. It is the enabling condition for presence, engagement, and dignity across time.

The analysis of the Dutch context reveals significant tensions between aspiration and implementation. National policy endorses aging in place, yet much of the housing stock remains inaccessible to people with limited mobility, chronic illness, or cognitive decline. Municipalities have been tasked with supporting older residents but often lack the resources, coordination mechanisms, or long-term planning capacity to meet demand. The housing market is shaped by demographic competition, land scarcity, and regulatory complexity, leaving many older adults with few feasible alternatives to unsuitable dwellings. Technology promises greater efficiency in service delivery, but often introduces new forms of exclusion for those with limited digital access. Cultural diversity within the aging population presents additional challenges, which are frequently under-addressed in generic housing and care models.

At the same time, the opportunities for transformation are real and present. Universal design, when implemented with foresight and inclusivity, offers a blueprint for spaces that support human variation across the lifespan. Participatory planning practices shift older adults from passive beneficiaries to active agents in shaping their environments. Interdisciplinary collaboration linking housing, health, transport, and social care can generate innovations that scale beyond pilot projects. Data-driven governance tools allow for proactive identification of needs and allocation of resources, particularly when equity is made a central criterion. Framing accessibility not as a cost but as a value-generating investment has the potential to shift economic and political incentives across the development sector.

Accessibility must no longer be treated as a compensatory measure applied after a problem has emerged. It must become a guiding principle from the earliest stages of design, planning, and regulation. Homes, neighborhoods, and cities must be conceived not only for the agile and the affluent but for those who age, who slow, who remember, and who adapt. The challenge is not simply to prolong independent living but to create conditions in which dependency does not equate to exclusion, and vulnerability does not foreclose dignity.

The future of Dutch aging policy depends on moving from localized interventions to systemic transformations. This will require political commitment, sustained investment, and the willingness to challenge inherited assumptions about who cities are for. It will also require

listening to those who live aging every day—not as a policy category but as a lived, embodied experience. In placing accessibility at the heart of the built environment, the Netherlands has the opportunity not only to meet the needs of its aging citizens but to model a form of urbanism that affirms care, interdependence, and inclusion as central civic values.

References

Henegouwen, L. J. B. en. (2019). A Dutch framework for housing models to age in place Master's thesis, Delft University of Technology. TU Delft Repository.

Hussein, H., Cramm, J. M., & Nieboer, A. P. (2024). Needs for aging in place: Views of older Moroccan adults in the Netherlands. *The Gerontologist, 64*(7).

Nieboer, A. P., & Cramm, J. M. (2024). Growing old outside of one's home country: Well-being needs for aging in place among Turkish people in the Netherlands. *Cities*, Article 104395.

Pynoos, J., Nishita, C., Cicero, C., & Caraviello, R. (2008). Aging in place, housing, and the law. *Elder Law Journal, 16*, 77–105.

Van der Tol, J. (2023). An age-friendly living: Senior co-housing communities and ageing in place. Master's thesis, Wageningen University & Research. WUR E-depot.

Van Hoof, J. (2010). Ageing-in-place: The integrated design of housing facilities for people with dementia. Doctoral dissertation, Eindhoven University of Technology. TU/e Research Portal.

Van Hoof, J., Rusinovic, K. M., & Tavy, Z. K. C. T. (2021). The participation of older people in the concept and design phases of housing in the Netherlands: A theoretical overview. *Healthcare, 9*(3), 301.

Van Hoof, J., Dikken, J., & Buttiġieġ, S. C. (2020). Age-friendly cities in the Netherlands: An explorative study of facilitators and hindrances in the built environment and ageism in design. *Gerontology and Geriatric Medicine, 6*, 1–12.

Wammes, J. D., Vullings, I., Kringos, D. S., & Wouterse, B. (2024). Performance indicators for the assessment of aging-in-place reform policies: A scoping review and evidence map. *Journal of Aging and Health.*