NHS

London Healthy Urban Development Unit

HUDU Planning for Health

Rapid Health Impact Assessment Tool

January 2013

Contents

NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit

www.healthyurbandevelopment.nhs.uk

HUDU Planning for Health
Rapid Health Impact Assessment Tool

Background

The Watch Out for Health guide and checklist was first published in 2008 to help ensure that health is properly considered when evaluating and determining planning proposals, and that where possible development plans and proposals have a positive rather than a negative influence on health.

The assessment tool has now been revised to take into account new legislation and policy changes both nationally and in London that relate to health and spatial planning.

- *The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).* The NPPF came into effect in March 2012 and has replaced existing planning guidance notes and statements. The NPPF supports the role of planning to create healthy, inclusive communities by supporting local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all and by working with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population.

- *The London Plan and other Mayoral strategies in London*. In 2011, the Mayor of London published his London Plan and health is treated as a cross-cutting issue linking planning and health throughout the plan. The plan contains a policy on improving health and addressing health inequalities which requires that the impacts of major development proposals on the health and wellbeing of communities should be considered through the use of health impact assessments. It notes that areas of areas of deprivation align with designated growth areas and the development and regeneration of these areas provides a significant opportunity to improve health and reduce health inequalities in London.

- *Fair Society, Healthy Lives (the Marmot Review).* Published in 2010 the review found that individual health is influenced by wider determinants such as income, education, local environmental quality and employment – what Marmot calls the 'social determinants of health'. The review set out six policy objectives for reducing health inequalities including 'to create and develop healthy and sustainable places and communities'.

- *Healthy Lives, Healthy People: our strategy for public health in England.* The White Paper sets out the Government's long-term vision for the future of public health in England. It aims is to create a 'wellness' service (Public Health England) and to strengthen both national and local leadership. It adopts the Marmot Review's life course framework for tackling the social determinants, and aims to support healthy communities.

- *The Localism Act 2011*. The Act enshrines a new layer of development plan called the neighbourhood plan. These are initiated by communities, although they are

subject to a formal approval process and a referendum. The Act also paves the way for neighbourhoods to initiate a neighbourhood development order, which allows local people to designate for particular development without it requiring planning permission.

- *The Health and Social Care Act 2012.* The Act brings about the transfer of responsibility for commissioning most healthcare services to consortia of GPs, known as clinical commissioning groups, and establishes an NHS Commissioning Board for commissioning primary care services and specialist acute services. The Act gives boroughs the responsibility of promoting joined up commissioning of local NHS services, social care and health improvement. The PCT and strategic health authority estate will be transferred to either NHS providers or a NHS Property Services Ltd by April 2013.

- *A Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and joint health and wellbeing strategy*. Prepared by local health and wellbeing boards they will inform GP commissioning plans and support the integration of services. A new Public Health Outcomes Framework summarises the new public health responsibilities of boroughs and includes outcomes closely linked to planning, including air quality, the use of green space, road casualties and fuel poverty.

Taken together, this legislative and policy context sends a strong signal that local authorities, health and wellbeing boards and NHS commissioners and providers should engage in the planning system to address the health impacts of development and regeneration proposals and improve health outcomes in new and existing communities.

Using the assessment tool

The tool is designed to assess the likely health impacts of development plans and proposals, including planning frameworks and masterplans for large areas, regeneration and estate renewal programmes and outline and detailed planning applications. It is partly based on the World Health Organization publication Healthy Urban Planning by Hugh Barton and Catherine Tsourou (2000).

It helps identify those determinants of health which are likely to be influenced by a specific development proposal. It does not identify all issues related to health and wellbeing, but focuses on the built environment and issues directly or indirectly influenced by planning decisions. Not all the issues or assessment criteria may be relevant and the user is encouraged to prioritise specific actions which focus on key impacts.

It is commonly recognised that there are three types of health impact assessment:

- A checklist which provides a broad overview of potential health impacts

- A rapid assessment, which provides more detailed information on potential health impacts and recommends mitigation and enhancement measures

- A comprehensive assessment which provides an in-depth assessment of potential health impacts which may include quantitative and qualitative information, data from health needs assessments, reviews of the evidence base and community engagement.

An assessment can be prospective (done before a proposal is implemented), concurrent (done while the proposal is being implemented) or retrospective (done after a proposal has been implemented). A prospective assessment provides the opportunity to influence development proposals and decision-making.

It is intended that this tool is used to rapidly assess plans and proposals. It should be used prospectively at the earliest possible stage during plan preparation or prior to the submission of a planning application to inform the design, layout and composition of a development proposal. The assessment should also include arrangements for monitoring and evaluating the impacts and mitigation and enhancement measures.

Potential users of the tool could include:

- *developers and consultants* formulating a development proposal and assessing the health impacts of a subsequent planning application.

- *local authorities and NHS organisations* assessing the health impacts of regeneration or development proposals, who may want to scrutinise planning applications to ensure that health impacts are addressed and health benefits maximised. Use of the tool could be coordinated by health and wellbeing boards and be supported by the joint strategic needs assessment.

- *community, voluntary groups and organisations* such as neighbourhood forums who may want to identify the health impacts of a proposed development or of a proposed neighbourhood plan or development order.

The assessment tool is generic and should be localised for specific use. It is designed to highlight issues and to facilitate discussion. As a rapid assessment tool, its purpose is to quickly ensure that the health impacts of a development proposal are identified and appropriate action is taken to address negative impacts and maximise benefits. It may be supplemented by further information, such as a policy and literature review, a needs assessment and community engagement.

The tool overlaps with other assessments, in particular environmental impact assessment and sustainability appraisal (see summary of assessments in Table 1). In London, the Mayor of London has used Integrated Impact Assessment to assess the Mayoral strategies, including the London Plan, which includes an assessment of health impacts.

This tool could be used as a 'stand-alone' assessment to assess the impact of large-scale development plans or projects, such as area action plans or masterplans, or strategic planning applications. Alternatively, it could form part of an integrated impact assessment process. In the case of major planning applications subject to environmental impact assessment (EIA), the environmental statement could include a separate chapter on health impacts using this tool. Cross-references should be made to other relevant chapters in the environmental statement, such as socio-economic

impacts, transport, noise and air quality. Incorporating health impacts into EIA also allows the cumulative impacts of other neighbouring developments to be addressed. For example, the cumulative impact of a number of developments might necessitate the need for new health or social infrastructure.

Table 1 Summary of relevant assessments

Assessment	Process
Code for Sustainable Homes/ BREEAM	A Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM assessment should be undertaken for all major development proposals. The Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) is a national standard to guide the design and construction of sustainable homes. The Code gives a rating from 1 to 6. The higher the rating, the more sustainable the design of the home. Level 4 is roughly the equivalent of a BREEAM excellent score (see below). The assessment includes health and wellbeing criteria with credits available for Lifetime Homes, sound insulation, daylight and private outdoor space. http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/sustainability/codesustainablehomes/ Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) assesses the environmental performance of new and refurbished buildings. Bespoke assessments can be carried out for unusual or mixed-use buildings. The assessment gives buildings a score of pass, good, very good or excellent. http://www.breeam.org/
Sustainability appraisal (SA)	An SA is mandatory under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The process seeks to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations in the preparation of development plan documents and supplementary planning documents. SA provides a critical evaluation of the performance of policy against predetermined social, economic and environmental criteria so that the plan's performance can be improved. It usually involves: • reviewing current best practice with regard to the subject of the plan • scoping national, regional and local policy guidance • reviewing the plan's assumptions, objectives and forecasts • identifying criteria for appraising the plan's sustainability performance • appraising policies against the criteria (usually in a matrix) • modifying policies in the light of the appraisal • identifying sustainable development indicators (SDI) so the plan's long term delivery of sustainability can be monitored. http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/sustainabilityappraisal

Assessment	Process
Health Impact Assessment (HIA)	Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a means of assessing the health impacts of policies, plans and projects using quantitative, qualitative and participatory techniques. It aims to produce a set of evidence-based recommendations to inform decision-making to maximise the positive health impacts and minimise the negative health impacts of proposed policies, plans or projects.

It assumes that policies, programs and projects have the potential to change the determinants of health. Changes to health determinants then leads to changes in health outcomes or the health status of individuals and communities.

World Health Organization Health Impact Assessment

http://www.who.int/hia/en/

Mayor of London Best Practice Guide: Health Issues in Planning

http://www.london.gov.uk/thelondonplan/guides/bpg/bpg_02.jsp

The HIA Gateway

http://www.apho.org.uk/default.aspx?QN=P_HIA |
| Mental Well-being Impact Assessment (MWIA) Toolkit | The toolkit helps support national, regional and local services and systems across health, local government, the voluntary, community and private sector to embed mental well-being into their work. It includes an updated evidence base on population characteristics, determinants and protective factors for mental wellbeing. It focuses on the social determinants of mental well-being, such as socio-economic position, environment, transport, education, food, and the understanding of resilience, core economy, social justice and equity

National MWIA Collaborative (England) (2011) Mental Health Wellbeing Impact Assessment: A Toolkit for Well-being (3rd edition)

http://www.apho.org.uk/resource/item.aspx?RID=95836 |
| Integrated Impact Assessment | The Mayor of London has adopted an integrated approach to assessing the impacts of his strategies, which incorporates the following legal requirements: Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Sustainability Appraisal, a Health Impact Assessment (related to the duty to reduce health inequalities as set out in the GLA Act 1999 as amended), an Equalities Impact Assessment, and a Community Safety Impact Assessment.

Carrying out an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) enables any synergies and cross-cutting impacts of the assessments to be identified.

To meet the requirement of the SEA Directive the significant effects of implementing the London Plan are monitored through a set of key performance indicators which are reported in the London Plan Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). |

Assessment	Process
Environmental impact assessment (EIA)	An EIA may be required to identify the environmental effects of a proposed development and ensure that these are thoroughly understood EIAs are compulsory for certain types of development which include urban development projects where the size of the site is above 0.5ha and where the proposal is likely to have significant environmental impacts. http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/environmentalimpactassessment
Design and access statement (DAS)	A DAS is required for both outline and full planning applications. Statements are documents that explain the design thinking behind the application. This includes how everyone, including disabled people, older people and very young children will be able to use the development. http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/validationguidance
Lifetime Homes and Lifetime Neighbourhoods	Lifetime Homes is a set of 16 design criteria that can be incorporated into the construction of new homes at minimal cost. The London Plan requires the Lifetime Homes standard in new developments. http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/ Lifetime Neighbourhoods places the design criteria of Lifetime Homes into a wider context. It encourages planners to help create environments that people of all ages and abilities can access and enjoy, and to facilitate communities that people can participate in, interact and feel safe. http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/pages/lifetime-neighbourhoods.html http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/housing/lifetimeneighbourhoods
Building for Life	Building for Life, updated in 2012, is the industry standard, endorsed by Government, for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods. BfL12 is a tool that local communities, local authorities and developers are invited to use to stimulate conversations about creating good places to live. It sets out 12 questions to be addressed when designing new developments, grouped under three broad headings:-: • Integrating into the neighbourhood • Creating a place • Street and home http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/CABE/Our-big-projects/Building-for-Life/

Assessing the plan or proposal

The assessment matrix in Section 1 identifies eleven topics or broad determinants:

1. Housing quality and design
2. Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure
3. Access to open space and nature
4. Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity
5. Accessibility and active travel
6. Crime reduction and community safety
7. Access to healthy food
8. Access to work and training
9. Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods
10. Minimising the use of resources
11. Climate change

Scoping and assessment

Under each topic Section 2 identifies examples of planning issues which are likely to influence health and wellbeing and provides supporting information and references.

Assessment criteria are suggested derived from the planning issues, but the user is encouraged to add other criteria where necessary. Information and evidence to assess and evaluate the proposal will come from a wide range of sources, including information submitted with a planning application. This could include a planning statement, design and access statement or an environmental statement for applications subject to environmental impact assessment. In some cases there may be a lack of information and/or data about certain aspects of the proposal. In this case, the impact is likely to be uncertain and more information should be requested.

The planning issues and topics may be assessed according to local priorities and needs, derived from community engagement and a profile of community health and wellbeing needs and assets. In addition, impacts may be short-term or temporary, related to construction or longer-term, related to the operation and maintenance of a development and may particularly affect vulnerable or priority groups of the population, such as older people or black and ethnic minority groups. Some issues may have a local impact, whilst other issues may have a wider or neighbourhood impact.

Where an impact is identified, actions should be recommended to mitigate a negative impact or enhance or secure a positive impact. Recommended actions on development proposals may require design or layout changes, closer adherence to policy requirements or standards or planning conditions or obligations. In some cases it may be helpful to identify non-planning measures, such as licencing controls or maintenance arrangements. The matrix should bring together commitments made in other assessments, for example plans to mitigate construction impacts.

Monitoring and evaluation

To ensure that the recommended actions are implemented, monitoring arrangements should be put in place. It is particularly important that actions and obligations are carried forward from a masterplan or outline approval into detailed planning applications. A separate assessment may be needed for each detailed application having regard to the overall framework of actions and recommendations.

Large-scale development proposals, phased over a long period time will give rise to potential construction, operational and post-occupation health impacts which may be best monitored and evaluated by way of longer-term health study. A post-occupancy survey of new housing may be recommended to assess the profile of the new population and to reassess the health impacts. Relevant indicators from the borough's Annual Monitoring Report or a sustainability appraisal can help monitor health impacts and outcomes.

HUDU/Jan 2013

Section 1: HUDU Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix

The assessment matrix is designed to rapidly assess the likely health impacts of development plans and proposals, including planning frameworks and masterplans for large areas, regeneration and estate renewal programmes and outline and detailed planning applications. It should be used prospectively at the earliest possible stage during plan preparation, or prior to the submission of a planning application to inform the design, layout and composition of a development proposal.

The matrix does not identify all issues related to health and wellbeing, but focuses on the built environment and issues directly or indirectly influenced by planning decisions. It is generic and should be localised for specific use. Not all the issues or assessment criteria may be relevant and the user is encouraged to prioritise specific actions which focus on key impacts.

The assessment matrix identifies eleven topics or broad determinants. Under each topic, Section 2 of the tool identifies examples of planning issues which are likely to influence health and wellbeing and the section also provides supporting information and references.

Health impacts may be short-term or temporary, related to construction or longer-term, related to the operation and maintenance of a development and may particularly affect vulnerable or priority groups of the population. Where an impact is identified, actions should be recommended to mitigate a negative impact or enhance or secure a positive impact.

Name of assessor / organisation:

Name of project (plan or proposal):

Planning reference (if applicable):

Location of project:

Date of assessment:

1 Housing quality and design

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal seek to meet all the health and wellbeing credits contained in the Code for Sustainable Homes?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal address the housing needs of older people, ie extra care housing, sheltered housing, lifetime homes and wheelchair accessible homes?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal include homes that can be adapted to support independent living for older and disabled people?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal promote good design through layout and orientation, meeting internal space standards?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal include a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing responding to local housing needs?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal contain homes that are highly energy efficient (eg a high SAP rating)?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

2 Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal retain or re-provide existing social infrastructure?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal assess the demand for healthcare services and identify requirements and costs using the HUDU model?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal provide for healthcare services either in the form of a financial contribution or in-kind? Does a health facility provided as part of the development match NHS requirements and plans?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal assess the capacity, location and accessibility of other social infrastructure, eg schools, social care and community facilities?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal explore opportunities for shared community use and co-location of services?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal contribute to meeting primary, secondary and post 19 education needs?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

3 Access to open space and nature

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal retain and enhance existing open and natural spaces?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
In areas of deficiency, does the proposal provide new open or natural space, or improve access to existing spaces?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal provide a range of play spaces for children and young people?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal provide links between open and natural spaces and the public realm?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Are the open and natural spaces welcoming and safe and accessible for all?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal set out how new open space will be managed and maintained?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

4 Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal minimise construction impacts such as dust, noise, vibration and odours?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal minimise air pollution caused by traffic and energy facilities?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal minimise noise pollution caused by traffic and commercial uses?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

5 Accessibility and active travel

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal prioritise and encourage walking (such as through shared spaces?)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal prioritise and encourage cycling (for example by providing secure cycle parking, showers and cycle lanes)?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal connect public realm and internal routes to local and strategic cycle and walking networks?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal include traffic management and calming measures to help reduce and minimise road injuries?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Is the proposal well connected to public transport, local services and facilities?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

Does the proposal seek to reduce car use by reducing car parking provision, supported by the controlled parking zones, car clubs and travel plans measures?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal allow people with mobility problems or a disability to access buildings and places?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

6 Crime reduction and community safety

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal incorporate elements to help design out crime?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal incorporate design techniques to help people feel secure and avoid creating 'gated communities'?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal include attractive, multi-use public spaces and buildings?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Has engagement and consultation been carried out with the local community?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

7 Access to healthy food

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal facilitate the supply of local food, ie allotments, community farms and farmers' markets?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Is there a range of retail uses, including food stores and smaller affordable shops for social enterprises?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal avoid contributing towards an over-concentration of hot food takeaways in the local area?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

8 Access to work and training

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal provide access to local employment and training opportunities, including temporary construction and permanent 'end-use' jobs?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal provide childcare facilities?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal include managed and affordable workspace for local businesses?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal include opportunities for work for local people via local procurement arrangments?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

9 Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal connect with existing communities, ie layout and movement which avoids physical barriers and severance and land uses and spaces which encourage social interaction?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal include a mix of uses and a range of community facilities?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal provide opportunities for the voluntary and community sectors?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal address the principles of Lifetime Neighbourhoods?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

10 Minimising the use of resources

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal make best use of existing land?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal encourage recycling (including building materials)?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal incorporate sustainable design and construction techniques?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

11 Climate change

Assessment criteria	Relevant?	Details/evidence	Potential health impact?	Recommended mitigation or enhancement actions
Does the proposal incorporate renewable energy?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal ensure that buildings and public spaces are designed to respond to winter and summer temperatures, ie ventilation, shading and landscaping.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal maintain or enhance biodiversity?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	
Does the proposal incorporate sustainable urban drainage techniques?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		☐ Positive ☐ Negative ☐ Neutral ☐ Uncertain	

Section 2: Supporting information

General references

[The King's Fund / London Healthy Urban Development Unit (2009) The health impacts of spatial planning decisions](#)

[Allen, J., Boyce, T., Geddes, I., Goldblatt, P., Grady, M., Marmot, M., McNeish, D. (2010) Fair Society, Healthy Lives, The Marmot Review, Strategic Review of Health Inequalities in England Post-2010](#)

[NICE (2011) Spatial planning for health: programme of evidence review work (discontinued)](#) - taken forward by the [Spatial Planning and Health Group](#)

[WHO Collaborating Centre for Healthy Urban Environments University of the West of England, Bristol. Working paper: Health inequalities and determinants in the physical urban environment: Evidence briefing (2012)](#)

[Environmental health inequalities in Europe (2012). Prepared by the World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe](#)

[The Lancet and University College London (2012) Shaping Cities for Health: Complexity and the Planning of Urban Environments in the 21st Century](#)

[Department of Health (2012) Healthy lives, healthy people: Improving outcomes and supporting transparency - Public Health Outcomes Framework for England 2013–2016](#)

[Department of Health (2012) No health without mental health: implementation framework](#)

1 Housing quality and design

Issues to consider

- Code for Sustainable Homes, health and wellbeing criteria
- Internal space standards, orientation and layout
- Wheelchair accessibility and adaptable homes
- Affordable housing and dwelling mix
- Energy efficiency

Potential health impacts

Access to decent and adequate housing is critically important for health and wellbeing, especially for the very young and very old. Environmental factors, overcrowding and sanitation in buildings as well as unhealthy urban spaces have been widely recognised as causing illness since urban planning was formally introduced. Post-construction management also has impact on community welfare, cohesion and mental wellbeing.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
A lack of affordable housing within communities may compromise the health of low-income residents as they are likely to spend more on housing costs and less on other health needs.	Making provision for affordable housing has the potential to improve wellbeing, while housing quality can be improved by use of appropriate construction methods. This includes use of good materials for noise insulation and energy-efficiency, and detailed design considerations to make sure that homes are accessible, adaptable and well oriented.
Poor choice of location, design and orientation of housing developments can be detrimental to physical and mental health. Housing that is overcrowded can also affect mental health, and lead to physical illness and accidents.	Providing a sufficient range of housing tenures with good basic services is also essential. Adaptable buildings for community uses such as health, education and leisure can contribute towards a sustainable community.
The quality of design, including internal sound insulation, daylighting and provision of private space can influence the health and wellbeing of occupiers.	Providing Lifetime Homes (as outlined in Code for Sustainable Homes) allows residents to remain in their home despite changing accommodation requirements. In this context, adaptable housing more easily permits care to be provided in the community.

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply

Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential

Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments

Policy 3.7 Large residential developments

Policy 3.8 Housing choice

Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities

Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing

Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets

Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes

Policy 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds

Policy 3.14 Existing housing

Policy 3.15 Coordination of housing development and investment

Policy 3.16 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

6 Delivering a wide choice of quality homes

7 Requiring good design

8 Promoting healthy communities

Supporting information

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2004) The Impact of Overcrowding on Health and Education

BRE Trust (2010) The Real Cost of Poor Housing

World Health Organization (2011) Environmental burden of disease associated with inadequate housing

Mayor of London (2012) Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance

Mayor of London (2010) London Housing Design Guide Interim Edition

Report of the Marmot Review Built Environment Task Group (2010)

Marmot Review Team (2011) The Health Impacts of Cold Homes and Fuel Poverty

Department for Communities and Local Government Code for Sustainable Homes

Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) Investigation into overheating in homes: Literature review and Analysis of gaps and recommendations

Lifetime Homes Foundation, Lifetime Homes Standards

Department for Communities and Local Government (2008) Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods: A National Strategy for Housing in an Ageing Society

London Assembly (2011) Crowded houses, Overcrowding in London's social rented housing

The City of New York Active (2010) Design Guidelines – Promoting physical activity and health in design

2 Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure

Issues to consider

- Needs and demand for services
- Capacity of existing facilities and services
- Timing, location and accessibility and developer contributions
- Reconfiguring health and social care services
- Multipurpose buildings and co-location of services
- Access and use of buildings by disabled and older people

Potential health impacts

Strong, vibrant, sustainable and cohesive communities require good quality, accessible public services and infrastructure. Encouraging the use of local services is influenced by accessibility, in terms of transport and access into a building, and the range and quality of services offered. Access to good quality health and social care, education (primary, secondary and post-19) and community facilities has a direct positive effect on human health. Opportunities for the community to participate in the planning of these services has the potential to impact positively on mental health and wellbeing and can lead to greater community cohesion.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
Failing to plan for the social infrastructure needs in an area can exacerbate pressure of existing services and worsen health outcomes and inequalities.	The provision of accessible healthcare services and other social infrastructure to support population growth and change is an essential component of creating sustainable, healthy communities.
The under-provision of key services can contribute towards unnecessary extra travel, which can damage the environment and social cohesion.	The planning system can help modernise facilities and improve the quality of services. Developer contributions can help provide and fund new facilities.
For those with mobility problems, including older people, poor access to local services could limit opportunities for social interaction and lead to isolation and depression.	Co-locating some services can improve the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery, for example, primary health and social care, dentistry and pharmacies.
	The provision of support services, including advice on healthy living can prevent ill health.
	Access to a range of education, primary, secondary and post-19 improves self-esteem, job opportunities and earning

	capability.

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 2.12 Central Activities Zone – predominantly local activities

Policy 3.16 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure

Policy 3.17 Health and social care facilities

Policy 3.18 Education facilities

Policy 3.19 Sports facilities

Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities

Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

8 Promoting healthy communities

Paragraph 162 Infrastructure planning

Paragraph 204 Planning obligations

Supporting information

Mayor of London (2010) Health Inequalities Strategy

Report of the Marmot Review Social Inclusion and Social Mobility Task Group (2010)

NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit Planning Contributions Tool (the HUDU Model)

NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit, London Thames Gateway Social Infrastructure Framework

Institute of Public Health in Ireland (2008) Health Impacts of Education: a review

Environmental Audit Committee inquiry into Transport and the Accessibility of Public Services

Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM)

Sport England, Accessing schools for community use

3 Access to open space and nature

Issues to consider

- Opportunities for physical activity
- Access to open and natural space
- Formal and informal outdoor play spaces
- Maintenance of open space and sports facilities
- Integration with other outdoor uses such as food growing

Potential health impacts

Providing secure, convenient and attractive open/green space can lead to more physical activity and reduce levels of heart disease, strokes and other ill-health problems that are associated with both sedentary occupations and stressful lifestyles. There is growing evidence that access to parks and open spaces and nature can help to maintain or improve mental health.

The patterns of physical activity established in childhood are perceived to be a key determinant of adult behaviour; a growing number of children are missing out on regular exercise, and an increasing number of children are being diagnosed as obese. Access to play spaces, community or sport facilities such as sport pitches can encourage physical activity. There is a strong correlation between the quality of open space and the frequency of use for physical activity, social interaction or relaxation.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
Failing to protect local green spaces and playing fields near to communities can limit opportunities for physical activity.	The provision of publicly accessible green spaces and play spaces can encourage physical activity and maintain or improve mental health.
Green spaces that are of poor quality, feel unsafe, or are inaccessible will discourage physical activity and social interaction.	A growing population, particularly an increase in children will require a range of formal and informal play spaces and equipment.
Failing to provide a range of different types of open and play spaces may place pressure on existing spaces where formal and informal activities may conflict with each other.	Natural spaces and tree cover provide areas of shade and can improve the air quality in urban areas.
	There may be opportunities to integrate play spaces with other related health and environmental programmes such as food growing and increasing biodiversity.

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 2.4 The 2012 Games and their legacy

Policy 2.18 Green infrastructure: the network of open and green spaces

Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities

Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation

Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions

Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities

Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature

Policy 7.18 Protecting local open space and addressing local deficiency

Policy 7.22 Land for food

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

8 Promoting healthy communities

9 Protecting Green Belt land

11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Supporting information

Department of Health (2011) Healthy Lives, Healthy People: A Call to Action on Obesity in England

Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (2011) Natural Environment White Paper: Natural Choice securing the value of nature

UK National Ecosystem Assessment (2011)

Foresight Report (2007) Tackling Obesities: future choices

NICE (2008) Guidance on the promotion and creation of physical environments that support increased levels of physical activity (PH8)

Report of the Marmot Review Built Environment Task Group (2010)

Mayor of London (2010) Health Inequalities Strategy

London Health Improvement Board

Well London programme

Mayor of London (2012) Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG

Faculty of Public Health (2010) Great Outdoors: How Our Natural Health Service Uses Green Space To Improve Wellbeing

Sustainable Development Commission (2008) Health, Place and Nature

Sport England Active Design

4 Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity

Issues to consider

- Construction impacts
- Air quality
- Land contamination
- Noise, vibration and odour
- Quality of the local environment
- Provision of green space and trees

Potential health impacts

The quality of the local environment can have a significant impact on physical and mental health. Pollution caused by construction, traffic and commercial activity can result in poor air quality, noise nuisance and vibration. Poor air quality is linked to incidence of chronic lung disease (chronic bronchitis or emphysema) and heart conditions and asthma levels of among children. Noise pollution can have a detrimental impact on health resulting in sleep disturbance, cardiovascular and psycho-physiological effects. Good design and the separation of land uses can lessen noise impacts.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
Construction can result in exposure to land contamination, deterioration in air quality and nuisance from noise, dust, vibration and odours.	The use of construction management plans can lessen construction impacts, particularly hours of working and construction traffic movements.
High levels of road traffic and congestion generated by new developments can result in higher levels of air pollution and noise.	Reduced levels of car parking and travel plans which encourage the use of public transport, cycling and walking will result in better local environmental conditions.
The close proximity of residential units to industrial uses or uses generating late night noise can cause nuisance.	Good design and the sensitive location and orientation of residential units can lessen noise impacts.
	Natural spaces and trees can improve the air quality in urban areas.

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities

Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment

Policy 7.14 Improving air quality

Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

9 Protecting Green Belt land

11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Paragraph 200 Tailoring planning controls to local circumstances

Supporting information

[Mayor of London (2010) Air Quality Strategy 'Clearing the Air'](#)

[Report of the Marmot Review Built Environment Task Group (2010)](#)

[Mayor of London and London Councils (2006) The Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition: Best Practice Guidance](#)

[Environmental Protection UK (2010) Development Control: Planning for Air Quality](#)

[British Medical Association (July 2012) Healthy transport = Healthy lives](#)

[Health Protection Agency (2010) Environmental Noise and Health in the UK](#)

[European Environment Agency (2010) Good practice guide on noise exposure and potential health effects, EEA Technical report No 11/2010](#)

5 Accessibility and active travel

Issues to consider

- Streetscape
- Opportunities for walking and cycling
- Access to public transport
- Minimising the need to travel
- Discouraging car use
- Road traffic injuries

Potential health impacts

Convenient access to a range of services and facilities minimises the need to travel and provides greater opportunities for social interaction. Buildings and spaces that are easily accessible and safe also encourage all groups, including older people and people with a disability, to use them. Discouraging car use and providing opportunities for walking and cycling can increase physical activity and help prevent chronic diseases, reduce risk of premature death and improve mental health.

Possible effects of planning

Negative impacts	Positive impacts
Greater traffic volumes and speeds have increased the risk of road traffic injuries, with pedestrians and cyclists being particularly vulnerable.	Combining active travel and public transport options can help people achieve recommended daily physical activity levels
Poor urban planning has prioritised the car over pedestrians and increased community severance.	By attending to inclusive design, access, orientation and streetscape planners can make it easier for people to access facilities using public transport, walking or cycling.
Over provision of car parking in a development can undermine other travel modes such as public transport and cycling.	Reduced levels of car parking and travel plans which encourage the use of public transport, cycling and walking will result in increased opportunities for active travel.
	Planning can promote cycling and walking by connecting routes and public to wider networks, providing safe junctions and calming traffic and providing secure cycle parking spaces.

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 2.7 Outer London: economy

Policy 2.8 Outer London: transport

Policy 2.9 Inner London

Policy 2.13 Opportunity areas and intensification areas

Policy 2.15 Town centres

Policy 6.4 Enhancing London's transport connectivity

Policy 6.7 Better streets and surface transport

Policy 6.9 Cycling

Policy 6.10 Walking

Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion

Policy 6.13 Parking

Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

4. Promoting sustainable transport

7 Requiring good design

8 Promoting healthy communities

Supporting information

[World Health Organization (2011) Health economic assessment tools (HEAT) for walking and for cycling](#)

[Mayor of London (2010) Transport Strategy for London](#)

[Mayor of London (2010) Cycling Revolution London: London's Cycling Strategy](#)

[Report of the Marmot Review Built Environment Task Group (2010)](#)

[Bristol City Council Essential evidence – benefits of cycling and walking](#)

[Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (2010) Manual for Streets 2](#)

[Department for Transport (2012) Guidance on the Appraisal of Walking and Cycling Schemes](#)

[Department for Transport Local Transport Note 1/11: Shared Space](#)

[Department for Transport (2012) Investigating the potential health benefits of increasing cycling in the Cycling City and Towns](#)

[The City of New York Active (2010) Design Guidelines – Promoting physical activity and health in design](#)

[Transport for London (2011) Transport planning for healthier lifestyles: A best practice guide](#)

[Department of Transport and Department of Health, January 2011, Transport and Health Resource: Delivering Healthy Local Transport Plans](#)

[British Medical Association (July 2012) Healthy transport = Healthy lives](#)

6 Crime reduction and community safety

Issues to consider

- Designing out crime
- Security and street surveillance
- Mix of uses
- Community engagement

Potential health impacts

Thoughtful planning and urban design that promotes natural surveillance and social interaction can help to reduce crime and the 'fear of crime', both of which impacts on the mental wellbeing of residents. As well as the immediate physical and psychological impact of being a victim of crime, people can also suffer indirect long-term health consequences including disability, victimisation and isolation because of fear. Community engagement in development proposals can lessen fears and concerns.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
Poor urban design can exacerbate crime and community safety by creating under-used, isolated spaces without natural surveillance and segregate places by creating barriers such as roads.	The detailed design and layout of residential and commercial areas can ensure natural surveillance over public space. This can be assisted by creating places which enable possibilities for community interaction and avoiding social exclusion
Where the local pedestrian environment is intimidating and inconvenient people are more likely to use cars more or go out less. This reduces social interaction and increases the potential for crime.	Active use of streets and public spaces, combined with effective lighting, is likely to decrease opportunities for anti-social behaviour or criminal activity.
A 24 hour or 'evening' economy could generate anti-social behaviour and disturbance.	Planners can work with the police to get their advice on making development proposals 'secured by design'. They can also involve communities to foster a sense of ownership and empowerment, which can also help to enhance community safety.

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London

Policy 2.15 Town centres

Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities

Policy 3.16 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure

Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment

Policy 7.3 Designing out crime

Policy 7.13 Safety, security and resilience to emergency

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

7 Requiring good design

8 Promoting healthy communities

Supporting information

Mayor of London (2010) Health Inequalities Strategy

Report of the Marmot Review Built Environment Task Group (2010)

Department of Health (2012) No health without mental health: implementation framework

ODPM (2004) Safer Places – the planning system and crime prevention

Secured By Design Design Guides
Design Council Design out Crime

CABE (2009) This Way to Better Residential Streets

7 Access to healthy food

Issues to consider

- Healthy localised food supply
- Hot food takeaways
- Social enterprises
- Allotments and community food growing spaces

Potential health impacts

Access to healthy and nutritious food can improve diet and prevent chronic diseases related to obesity. People on low incomes, including young families, older people are the least able to eat well because of lack of access to nutritious food. They are more likely to have access to food that is high in salt, oil, energy-dense fat and sugar.

Opportunities to grow and purchase local healthy food and limiting concentrations of hot food takeaways can change eating behaviour and improve physical and mental health.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
The centralisation of shopping facilities and growth of large supermarkets can reduce the variety of foods available locally and disadvantage those on limited income to afford a healthy diet.	By considering food access, location and how to facilitate social enterprises planners can help to create the conditions that enable low income people to have better and affordable access to nutritious food.
Redevelopment local allotments, gardens or agricultural land can also reduce the potential for locally grown food.	Planning can assist by preserving and protecting areas for small-scale community projects and local food production, including allotments.
An overconcentration of hot food takeaways can restrict healthy eating choices.	Planning can promote an increase in the diversity of shopping facilities in local centres, restrict large supermarkets, and limit concentrations of hot food takeaways.

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 2.15 Town centres

Policy 2.18 Green infrastructure: the network of open and green spaces

Policy 4.8 Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector

Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs

Policy 7.22 Land for food

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres

7 Requiring good design

8 Promoting healthy communities

Supporting information

Department of Health (2011) Healthy Lives, Healthy People: A Call to Action on Obesity in England

Mayor of London (2010) Health Inequalities Strategy

Mayor of London (2006) London Food Strategy - Healthy & Sustainable Food for London

London Health Improvement Board

Well London programme

Foresight Report (2007) Tackling Obesities: future choices

Report of the Marmot Sustainable Development Task Group (2010)

Sustain (2011) Good planning for good food - using planning policy for local and sustainable food

8 Access to work and training

Issues to consider

- Access to employment and training
- Job diversity
- Childcare
- Business support

Potential health impacts

Employment and income is a key determinant of health and wellbeing. Unemployment generally leads to poverty, illness and a reduction in personal and social esteem. Works aids recovery from physical and mental illnesses.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
Locating employment in inaccessible locations or failing to provide a diversity of local jobs or training opportunities can negatively affect health and mental wellbeing both directly and indirectly.	Urban planning linked to clear strategies for economic regeneration, allocation of appropriate sites and coordination of infrastructure provision can help to facilitate attractive opportunities for businesses, encourage diversity in employment and ensure that local jobs are retained.
A poor quality environment and lack of infrastructure can make places less competitive or attractive to business investment.	Equitable transport strategies can play an important part in providing access to job opportunities. The provision of local work can encourage shorter trip lengths, reduce emissions from transport and enable people to walk or cycle.
A lack of business and employee support through affordable business space and childcare provision can hinder economic and growth and employment opportunities.	Access to other support services, notably childcare, can make employment opportunities easier to access.

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 2.7 Outer London: economy

Policy 2.14 Areas for regeneration

Policy 2.16 Strategic outer London development centres

Policy 2.17 Strategic industrial locations

Policy 3.2 Improving health and addressing health inequalities

Policy 3.18 Education facilities

Policy 4.12 Improving opportunities for all

Policy 6.4 Enhancing London's transport connectivity

Policy 8.2 Planning obligations

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

1 Building a strong, competitive economy

2 Ensuring the vitality of town centres

3 Supporting a prosperous rural economy

Supporting information

Department for Work and Pensions Cross-Government initiative 'Health, Work and Well-being'

Mayor of London (2010) Health Inequalities Strategy

Mayor of London (2010) Economic Development Strategy

Report of the Marmot Review Social Inclusion and Social Mobility Task Group (2010)

Report of Marmot Review Employment and Work Task Group (2010)

Leeds Metropolitan University (2010) Mental Health and Employment review

9 Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods

Issues to consider

- Social interaction
- Mixed communities
- Access to community facilities
- Voluntary sector involvement
- Community severance
- Lifetime neighbourhoods

Potential health impacts

Friendship and supportive networks in a community can help to reduce depression and levels of chronic illness as well as speed recovery after illness and improve wellbeing. Fragmentation of social structures can lead to communities demarcated by socio-economic status, age and/or ethnicity, which can lead to isolation, insecurity and a lack of cohesion.

Voluntary and community groups, properly supported, can help to build up networks for people who are isolated and disconnected, and to provide meaningful interaction to improve mental wellbeing.

Lifetime Neighbourhoods places the design criteria of Lifetime Homes into a wider context. It encourages planners to help create environments that people of all ages and abilities can access and enjoy, and to facilitate communities that people can participate in, interact and feel safe.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
Social cohesion can be undermined by insensitive housing redevelopment and dispersal of resident communities.	Urban planning can help to facilitate social cohesion by creating safe and permeable environments with places where people can meet informally.
Community cohesion can also be affected by infrastructure such as roads or other development that severs community links. Large schemes may disrupt familiar walking routes, or create a barrier to movement.	Mixed-use developments in town centres and residential neighbourhoods can help to widen social options for people.
Poor planning may also result in the loss of community facilities.	The provision of a range of diverse local employment opportunities (paid and unpaid) can also improve both social cohesion and mental wellbeing.
Planning does not directly affect income but it does have many indirect effects.	

The planning system can be used, for example, to hinder or to help the process of providing a range of facilities and providing opportunities for improving levels of equity.	

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all

Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities

Policy 3.16 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure

Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities

Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment

Policy 7.3 Designing out crime

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

8 Promoting healthy communities

Supporting information

NICE (2004) Social capital for health: Issues of definition, measurement and links to health

Mayor of London (2010) Health Inequalities Strategy

Well London programme

Report of the Marmot Review Social Inclusion and Social Mobility Task Group (2010)

Report of Marmot Review Employment and Work Task Group (2010)

Department for Communities and Local Government (2011) Lifetime Neighbourhoods

National MWIA Collaborative (England) (2011) Mental Health Wellbeing Impact Assessment: A Toolkit for Well-being

UK National Statistics: societal wellbeing theme

Young Foundation (2010) Cohesive Communities

10 Minimising the use of resources

Issues to consider

- Making the best use of existing land
- Recycling and reuse
- Sustainable design and construction
- Waste management
- Potential hazards

Potential health impacts

Reducing or minimising waste including disposal, processes for construction as well as encouraging recycling at all levels can improve human health directly and indirectly by minimising environmental impact, such as air pollution.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
If left unchecked, disposal of significant hazardous waste can have a serious impact on the health of those communities living near to collection or disposal sites.	Planning can impose standards and criteria on hazardous waste disposal, recycling and domestic waste and that linked to development. It can ensure that hazardous waste is disposed of correctly, as well as ensure that local recycled and renewable materials are used whenever possible in the building construction process.
Sending out waste from a redevelopment site to be sorted or disposed can increase vehicle movements, emissions and cause significant disruption including noise and dust which can contribute towards health problems for residents	Redevelopment on brownfield sites or derelict urban land also ensures that land is effectively used, recycled and enhanced
There are also ecological impacts (stripping of materials, mining for minerals etc) through excessive use of resources from a scarce global environment.	Through encouraging reduction, reuse and recycling, resource minimisation can be better realised and contribute towards a better environment. Examples of various standards to consider include BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) and CEEQUAL (Civil Engineering Environmental Quality assessment), which are benchmarking tools for non-residential buildings and infrastructure projects

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction

Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure

Policy 5.16 Waste self-sufficiency

Policy 5.17 Waste capacity

Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste

Policy 5.19 Hazardous waste

Policy 5.20 Aggregates

Policy 5.21 Contaminated land

Policy 5.22 Hazardous substances and installations

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

13 Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

Supporting information

Mayor of London (2011) Waste Management Strategies

Report of the Marmot Sustainable Development Task Group (2010)

Mayor of London and London Councils (2006) The Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition: Best Practice Guidance

Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM)

Recycle for London

11 Climate change

Issues to consider

- Renewable energy
- Sustainable transport
- Building design
- Biodiversity
- Flood risk and drainage

Potential health impacts

There is a clear link between climate change and health. The Marmot Review is clear that local areas should prioritise policies and interventions that 'reduce both health inequalities and mitigate climate change' because of the likelihood that people with the poorest health would be hit hardest by the impacts of climate change.

Planning is at the forefront of both trying to reduce carbon emissions and to adapt urban environments to cope with higher temperatures, more uncertain rainfall, and more extreme weather events and their impacts such as flooding. Poorly designed homes can lead to fuel poverty in winter and overheating in summer contributing to excess winter and summer deaths. Developments that take advantage of sunlight, tree planting and accessible green/brown roofs also have the potential to contribute towards the mental wellbeing of residents.

Possible effects of planning

Negative effects	Positive effects
Planning can exacerbate the impacts of climate change by failing to consider relevant influences such as location, materials, designs or technologies that could help to reduce energy consumption or reduce the environmental impact of energy generation.	Urban planning can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by requiring lower energy use in buildings and transport, and by encouraging renewable energy sources.
Building in flood plain areas or a lack of local sustainable urban drainage measures may lead to greater flood risk.	Planning can address sustainability and environmental considerations through the use of standards such as the Code for Sustainable Homes will help to reduce energy demands and increase the amount of renewable energy.

Neglecting to consider the microclimate for the siting of a proposed development, and the influence the development might have on that microclimate, could lead to new buildings that are neither suitable nor adaptable to their environment.	Design techniques can ensure that new housing and public realm can adapt to changes in temperature.
	Flood risk can be reduced through a sequential approach to locating development and by introducing mitigation measures, such as sustainable urban drainage systems in new developments.

London Plan policies (July 2011)

Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation

Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions

Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction

Policy 5.4 Retrofitting

Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks

Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals

Policy 5.7 Renewable energy

Policy 5.8 Innovative energy technologies

Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling

Policy 5.10 Urban greening

Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs

Policy 5.12 Flood risk management

Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Supporting information

[Mayor of London (2011) Delivering London's Energy Future: Climate Change and Mitigation Strategy](#)

[Mayor of London (2010) Draft Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for London](#)

[Mayor of London (2010) Transport Strategy for London](#)

[Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) Investigation into overheating in homes: Literature review](#)

[Department for Communities and Local Government Code for Sustainable Homes](#)

[Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM)](#)

[Report of the Marmot Sustainable Development Task Group (2010)](#)

[Green and Blue Space Adaptation for Urban Areas and Eco Towns (GRaBS) project](#)

[NHS Sustainable Development Unit (2009) Saving Carbon, Improving Health – NHS Carbon Reduction Strategy for England](#)

[Lancet (2009) Health benefits of tackling climate change: evidence](#)

[Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2012) UK Climate Change Risk Assessment](#)

NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit