Written Evidence Submitted by GroundsWell (PHS0250)

The GroundsWell Consortium is a multidisciplinary team of researchers who, in collaboration with local communities and policymakers, are understanding and documenting the role urban green and blue spaces (UGBS) play in the social, economic, environmental, cultural and health systems that make up urban environments. Specifically, Groundswell is identifying how we can use UGBS to prevent ill health and reduce the health inequalities that have emerged in these settings.

Studies have documented the direct and indirect preventative health effects of UGBS on noncommunicable diseases (NCDs) and associated risk factors. Investment in high-quality, equitable UGBS can reduce the burden of mortality associated with cardiovascular disease (1, 2), respiratory disease (3), obesity (4) and risk for type 2 diabetes (5, 6). UGBS can also reduce the risk from exposure to harmful pollutants such as carbon dioxide and particulate matter (7, 8), leading to improved health outcomes and reduced burden on healthcare services. The presence of UGBS also contributes to preventative health through wider environmental co-benefits (9-14).

In 2017, UGBS removed 27,900 tonnes of five key air pollutants, with the avoided health costs estimated at £162.6million (15, 16). It has been estimated that the NHS could save £2.1billion every year in treatment costs, if everyone in England had access to good quality green space (17). There are further cost-savings for the NHS through increased physical activity that comes with UGBS use and improved health (18, 19). UGBS are free to access, available for community groups and social prescribing activities and as part of the UK environmental improvement plan, every house will be within 15minutes walk of a green or blue space. Given the ongoing cost of living crisis, utilising and maximising UGBS for preventative health has the potential to be transformative.

However, disparities exist in the provision and quality of UGBS across the socioeconomic gradient (20, 21), and work is needed to understand how disadvantaged urban communities can benefit from equitable access to high-quality UGBS (22). Through working with communities (with a range of NCDs, diverse backgrounds and from low-income areas), policy-makers and practice stakeholders, we identified the importance of connecting people with UGBS in ways that are relevant to their lives, communities and identities, and of understanding those who do not use/benefit from UGBS and why (23). These conversations pointed to the desirability of UGBS change that supports its co-benefits, such as improved biodiversity, food security and safer communities. Such changes can act as upstream interventions with large reach and are easily modifiable parts of environments that can represent quick wins for UGBS quality and preventative health of the local community. Given these factors, as well as the increased interest in social prescribing and the benefits of UGBS on mental health since COVID-19 (24, 25), it is important for the Health and Social Care Committee to consider the role of UGBS in prevention of NCDs, particularly for areas of high deprivation.

In the planning process, UGBS are often viewed as discrete physical 'assets'. There is inadequate appreciation of how health and the associated co-benefits rely on the integration of these spaces into the surrounding community. Integrating UGBS with management and resourcing regimes, and the social environment is often overlooked (26). UGBS are usually developed with a focus on infrastructure and maintenance rather than community use and health needs. This reinforces health and social inequalities through: inappropriate models of provision; degraded and devalued spaces; tension between diverse users of the space; and issues such as gentrification.

If the Health and Social Care Committee will consider the wider picture of how the separate systems of health and environment and planning could work together more efficiently to reduce NCDs then the ill health prevention potential by 2030 is huge. In the short-term, increasing use of UGBS can impact many of the suggested health prevention topics listed for this call to evidence (obesity, physical activity, mental health, healthy environments) but long-term design and process change is needed. Directives and appropriate resources to allow multiple agencies within health and social care, across NHS, Councils, Regional Authorities, and Charitable Organisations, to tackle this issue collectively as part of a whole system approach is sought. The potential to slow or reverse the rise of NCDs needs a strategy sustainable beyond political cycles. This will ensure that evidence of the benefits of local actions, which often add up to bigger and wider system change, can be generated and understood over the longer term. We must move away from a reactive 'sick' service to a national health strategy that includes keeping people healthy and well. Recognising the importance of the wider determinants of health, including the influence on health of our parks, city coastlines, and canal paths is paramount.

References

1 Gascon M, , et al. Residential green spaces and mortality: A systematic review. Environ Int. 2016;86:60–7

2 Mitchell R, Popham F. Effect of exposure to natural environment on health inequalities: an observational population study. Lancet. 2008;372(9650):1655–60

3. Villeneuve PJ, et al. A cohort study relating urban green space with mortality in Ontario, Canada. Environ Res. 2012;115:51–8

4 Lachowycz K, Jones AP. Greenspace and obesity: a systematic review of the evidence. Obes Rev. 2011;12(5):e183–9

5 De la Fuente F et al. Green Space Exposure Association with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Physical Activity, and Obesity: A Systematic Review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;18(1):97

6 Bodicoat DH, et al. The association between neighbourhood greenspace and type 2 diabetes in a large cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2014;4(12):e006076

7 Shadman S, et al. The carbon sequestration potential of urban public parks of densely populated cities to improve environmental sustainability. Sustain Energy Technol Assessments. 2022;52:102064

8 Zhao L, et al. Effect of urban lake wetlands and neighboring urban greenery on air PM10 and PM2.5 mitigation. Build Environ. 2021;206:108291

9 Bedimo-Rung AL, Mowen AJ, Cohen DA. The significance of parks to physical activity and public health: a conceptual model. Am J of prev medicine. 2005 Feb 1;28(2):159-68.

10 Bowler DE, Buyung-Ali LM, Knight TM, Pullin AS. A systematic review of evidence for the added benefits to health of exposure to natural environments. BMC public health. 2010 Dec;10(1):1-0.

11 Bowler DE, Buyung-Ali L, Knight TM, Pullin AS. Urban greening to cool towns and cities: A systematic review of the empirical evidence. Landscape and urban planning. 2010 Sep 15;97(3):147-55.

12 Lee AC, Maheswaran R. The health benefits of urban green spaces: a review of the evidence. J of public health. 2011 Jun 1;33(2):212-22.

13 Bragg R, Atkins G. A review of nature-based interventions for mental health care. Natural England Commissioned Reports. 2016 Feb 9;204:18.

14 Mitchell RJ, Richardson EA, Shortt NK, Pearce JR. Neighborhood environments and socioeconomic inequalities in mental well-being. Am J of prev medicine. 2015 Jul 1;49(1):80-4.

15 Public Health England, 'Improving access to greenspace - A new review for 2020' Available online: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file /904439/Improving_access_to_greenspace_2020_review.pdf

16 ONS, 2019 'UK natural capital: ecosystem accounts for urban areas' Available online: <u>https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/uknaturalcapitalecosystemaccountsforurbanareas</u>

17 Environment Agency, 2020 'Investing in nature is an investment in the NHS, says Environment Agency Chief Executive' Available online: <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/news/investing-in-nature-is-an-investment-in-the-nhs-says-environment-agency-chief-executive</u>

18 Hunter RF, et al. Social return on investment analysis of an urban greenway. Cities Health. 2020;1–18

19 Jarrett, J., , et al. 2012. Effect of increasing active travel in urban England and Wales on costs to the National Health Service. The Lancet, 379(9832), pp.2198-2205.

20 Hoffimann E, Barros H, Ribeiro AI. Socioeconomic inequalities in green space quality and accessibility—Evidence from a Southern European city. Int J of environ res and pub health. 2017 Aug;14(8):916.

21 Roe J, Aspinall PA, Ward Thompson C. Understanding relationships between health, ethnicity, place and the role of urban green space in deprived urban communities. Int J of environ res and pub health. 2016 Jul;13(7):681.

22 Thompson CW, Aspinall P, Roe J. Access to Green Space in Disadvantaged Urban Communities: Evidence of Salutogenic Effects Based on Biomarker and Self-report Measures of Wellbeing. Procedia - Soc Behav Sci. 2014;153:10–22

23 Laird Y, et al. Stakeholders' experiences of the public health research process: time to change the system?. Health research policy and systems. 2020 Dec;18(1):1-0

24 Geary RS, Wheeler B, Lovell R, Jepson R, Hunter R, Rodgers S. A call to action: Improving urban green spaces to reduce health inequalities exacerbated by COVID-19. Prev Med. 2021;145:106425

25 Olsen J, Mitchell R. S&SR Environments and Spaces Group: Change in use of green and open space following COVID-19 lockdown 'stay at home' phase and initial easing of lockdown.

26 Hunter RF, et al. Environmental, health, wellbeing, social and equity effects of urban green space interventions: A meta-narrative evidence synthesis. Environment international. 2019 Sep 1;130:104923.