Securing constructive collaboration and consensus for planning healthy developments

A report from the Developers and Wellbeing project
The Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA), founded in 1899, is the UK’s oldest independent charity focused on planning and sustainable development. Through its work over the last century, the Association has improved the art and science of planning both in the UK and abroad. The TCPA puts social justice and the environment at the heart of policy debate, and seeks to inspire government, industry and campaigners to take a fresh perspective on major issues, including planning policy, housing, regeneration and climate change.

The TCPA’s objectives are:

- To secure a decent, well designed home for everyone, in a human-scale environment combining the best features of town and country.
- To empower people and communities to influence decisions that affect them.
- To improve the planning system in accordance with the principles of sustainable development.
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In the last few years there has been a renewed understanding that the places in which we live have a strong influence over our health and wellbeing. As the NHS struggles to cope with the costs of “lifestyle” illnesses caused by lack of physical activity, air pollution, poor diet and other environmental factors, many councils are trying to ensure that the new places developed in their areas make healthy lifestyles the easy option.

Nowadays most new homes and places are built by developers – ranging from private-sector housebuilders to housing associations. Developers have a significant influence over what gets built and the form it takes. Having an understanding and appreciation of how they operate and how they view the health and wellbeing agenda is crucial.

For the last five years the TCPA has been supporting and facilitating the creation of healthier places through its acclaimed “Reuniting health with planning” work. We know that many councils have made great progress in establishing strong working relationships between their planners and public health teams. Increasingly, however, they’ve told us that they needed a better understanding about how to work with developers, to bring them into conversations about local health and wellbeing needs.

The aim of this report is to help gain that understanding, to facilitate better collaboration at a local level so that all those involved in creating new places can help to create healthier ones.

I encourage organisations across the professions and sectors to work together to make this happen by following the “calls for action” set out in this report. These are presented to encourage and guide those working at national and local levels to recognise the multiple benefits of healthy development.

As chair of the TCPA, one of the leading organisations championing planning for health, and providing thought-leadership across this agenda, I welcome this publication and hope it inspires and empowers you to collaborate with local partners to create the healthy new homes and places we all want to see built.

Mary Parsons,
Chair,
TCPA
This year marks 70 years since the founding of the National Health Service. Seven decades on it is our country’s most trusted and respected social institution, and one of the best healthcare systems in the world in terms of access, equity and efficiency. But the NHS, alongside social care, is facing unprecedented challenges as a result of an increasing, ageing population, and the burden of long-term conditions.

The statistics are worrying. One fifth of school children are now obese, whilst those adults living with Type-2 diabetes has more than doubled over the space of two decades, to an estimated 4.5 million. Around six million people in England aged 60 and over live with two or more long-term conditions, accounting for 70% of hospital bed days, and half of all GP appointments. One in four of us will experience mental health problems over the coming year whilst social isolation is a significant and growing determinant of ill health. We need, as a society, to do more upstream to stem this tide.

The NHS Five Year Forward View, published in October 2014, set out the changes required to meet these challenges. It placed renewed focus on the prevention of ill-health, recognising that the determinants of good population health extend far beyond established primary and secondary healthcare provision.

Amongst the most significant influences on population health is the built environment, which is intrinsically linked to our opportunities for an active and healthy lifestyle. Safe, accessible environments conducive to walking and cycling are more likely to encourage physical activity. Social spaces designed into streets and buildings allow individuals to meet and interact with their community. Fresh food outlets encourage healthy eating. Parks and open spaces give children the places required to run, play sports, and interact with each other.

In 2016, the Healthy New Towns programme appointed 10 demonstrator sites across England to look at how various interventions, including use of the built environment, could affect changes in population health. It is early days, but engagement, early findings and feedback have all been positive. We are creating a network of developers and housing associations and will share learning from our sites in guidance due for release in March 2019. This report by the TCPA, and the growing evidence base regarding urban form and health outcomes signals the increasing prominence of health and wellbeing as a consideration for built environment professionals – something NHS England wholeheartedly supports.

Specifically this report highlights the importance of embedding the principles of healthy place making into every stage of the development process. It demonstrates how early, effective communication between planning authorities and developers can improve health and wellbeing, support delivery of high quality health and care services and help the NHS to be sustainable for future generations.

Keir Shillaker,
Deputy Director,
Strategy Group, NHS England
Public Health England recognises the influence that good housing and the wider built environment has on health and wellbeing. The aim of our Healthy Places programme is to develop the evidence base and raise awareness of the role which the built and natural environment can play in improving health and reducing health inequalities – and support local and national government and our key stakeholders to address these. We believe that this report by the TCPA is an important contribution to understanding how we in the public sector can work together with those in the building industry to plan, design and build places and homes which are health-promoting and help make healthy choices, easier choices.

Our previous work with the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) has shown that if “health” is designed in from the start, planners can apply this to support better commissioning. Through our collaboration on Re-uniting Health with Planning series we have also looked at how to support better engagement between planners and public health professionals.

However the public sector does not work isolation and what has been missing in our guidance, until now, has been exploration of how engagement with the building sector can help to bring good policies, grand plans and good design for better health outcomes.

As this report notes, private sector developers build most of the new homes in this country so there is a great opportunity to work together to find the common ground and ‘win-wins’ between developers, builders and the public sector to ensure the provision of safe, high quality housing and developments.

This project has helped us gain a deeper understanding of the drivers of investment decisions and the commercial context in which developers operate when creating new developments or regenerating established places. We commend the work of the TCPA and hope this project will provide a valuable foundation for collective action between the public and private sectors to find ways of working that are mutually beneficial and give pointers on how to balance the need to secure value for money with good design; leading to ‘healthy’ developments with better health outcomes for their local communities.

**Professor John Newton,**  
**Director of Health Improvement,**  
**Public Health England**
Executive Summary

Since 2013 many councils have been encouraging collaborations between their planners and public health teams in order to create places in which living a healthy lifestyle is an easy option. A lot has been achieved. However, as councils have gained confidence in their ability to create healthier places, they have realised that to achieve significant change they would need to involve developers and, therefore, understand more about how to do this. To meet this need the TCPA set up the Developers and Wellbeing project in 2017. This project explores how we can encourage a consensus between the public and private sectors and wider stakeholders about the need to build and sustain high-quality, healthy places.

All developers included in this project were in agreement that to secure good-quality healthy developments, council planning services must be adequately staffed and that there must be proactive contributions from wider stakeholders. Developers also said that they needed to get clear and consistent messages from all parts of the council that health and wellbeing is a priority. Too often, they say, different departments in the same council have very different – sometimes even conflicting – priorities, which are reflected in feedback to development proposals during consultation stages.

This report summarises what has been learned and sets out key messages to help promote shared responsibility and collective action among council planning and public health teams, developers, government departments and their agencies, and wider stakeholders to:

- gain a national consensus on the importance of “healthy” development;
- help address the flaws in the housing market in delivering quality healthy places;
- reduce inequalities in access to good, affordable homes;
- target actions earlier in the development process;
- find new ways to get a wider range of developers actively engaged in helping to create healthy places;
- innovate to share the risks and rewards of healthy developments;
- improve the commercial case for healthy development; and
- ensure more effective use of health evidence.
There is now widespread recognition that the places in which we live and work have a major influence over whether or not we live healthy lives – they form part of the “wider determinants of health”. Since 2013 many councils have been bringing together their planning and public health teams to encourage them to collaborate to improve the local built environment so that it is easier for people to live healthy lives.

The TCPA has played a key role in this by facilitating many of these meetings between planners and public health teams, and by publishing a range of guides to support this new way of working. This ongoing TCPA initiative is called “Reuniting health with planning”. As this work has progressed, and councils have become more confident about their ability to shape healthier places, there has been a growing realisation that in order to truly influence local development for the better it will be vital to include developers – and private-sector developers in particular – in these conversations.

During the last ten years, around 80% of all new homes in England were built by private enterprises. Although housing associations and councils are increasing the number of homes they build, the private-sector development industry will continue to be the predominant supplier of new homes for the foreseeable future.

Consequently, although councils provide consent for planning applications and have a role in shaping the development process, it is usually developers who finance and actually build new housing. Many planners and public health teams have found it challenging to achieve wider-public-interest objectives (such as public health) when working with developers and have expressed a need for a better understanding of how developers operate.

Image courtesy of: Lindhurst Group
The project

In order to help councils understand the way that developers work – particularly private-sector developers – the TCPA initiated the “Developers and Wellbeing” project.

The Developers and Wellbeing project was made up of activities carried out by the TCPA between February and November 2017. The project was initiated in response to research findings which suggested that there is a need to engage with the development industry to better understand its perspective, incentivise the creation of healthy developments and achieve shared ambitions for quality of place for local communities and prospective home buyers and tenants. This project gave developers an open and constructive forum to present their views through activities carried out alongside national and local partners and stakeholders, including a national round-table, local workshops, developer interviews and desktop-literature research. The project began with two simple research questions:

- What is the developers’ understanding of health and wellbeing?
- What are the incentives to encourage them to build and maintain high-quality healthy places?

Target audience

Throughout this project, the TCPA has engaged with the following stakeholder groups: planners, developers, property professionals, public health professionals and various smaller disciplines working in the private and public sector. The multi-disciplinary focus of this project is demonstrated by the sheer range of partners supporting and contributing to the activities (see full list in the acknowledgements page). However, developers as well as council planning and public health teams were a primary focus of this publication, making it, therefore, most relevant to them.

Limitations of the project

It was not the aim of this project to overcome fundamental constraints of the existing system, such as questioning the way that viability assessments are undertaken and assumptions and processes employed by developers, such as the cost of land purchase. The activities in this research seek to highlight practical issues in order to provoke discussion, explore potential ways to make the existing system work better for this agenda and seek to justify the strengthening of national and local policy requirements for wellbeing and place-making. In our work, we have not reviewed commercial documents or viability assessments, but these topics would indeed be an interesting focus for future projects. Lastly, as this project only engages with a fraction of the development industry, more outreach work will be needed to the wider industry.

Overview of project activities

Literature review

An initial literature review was undertaken, with findings reported in a May 2017 Town & Country Planning article titled “Who Pays, Who Benefits?”. A summary of the findings are highlighted in Section 4 of this report.

National round-table

A stakeholder round-table was held on 13 June, hosted by the property company Savills, which was attended by a range of guests from across the development industry, national and local government, and special-interest organisations. Perspectives on the round-table were reported in a July 2017 Town & Country Planning article titled “Reflecting on creating healthy places – views from a TCPA roundtable”.
Local workshops
Workshops were delivered in conjunction with councils and their local developers, several of which included a site walking tour. The discussions in the workshops focused on particular development sites and proposals, from a range of development scales and local authority areas, with use values between £173 to £1,095 per sq ft for residential use². Perspectives from the workshops were reported by selected councils in a December 2017 Town and Country Planning article titled “Reflecting on enabling viable and healthy places – views from local workshops”.

Workshops locations

Breakdown of participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>56%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Developer</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Association</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest orgs</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health commissioning</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you to Lucy Greenwood of Savills for providing these statistics from Savills and HM Land Registry sources, September 2017.
A breakdown of the 340 attendees’ main area of responsibility is provided in the chart below:

### Developer interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developer Interviewed</th>
<th>Face-to-face</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purfleet Centre Regeneration Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>19 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waystone Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>20 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redrow Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>20 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Builders Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosvenor Britain and Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>8 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Property Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawsons Property</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>21 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarion Housing Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of workshop participants: 340

- 10 workshops held
- Number of councils involved in workshops: 12
  - Barnet
  - Doncaster
  - Haringey
  - Lincolnshire
  - Mansfield
  - Merton
  - North Tyneside
  - Nottinghamshire
  - Oxford
  - Oxfordshire
  - Southwark
  - Thurrock

- Number of developers involved in workshops: 9

- 735 Minutes of developer interviews conducted
- 10 interviews conducted with developers and development industry representative organisations

Number of new homes covered by workshop discussions: 23,135

Combined annual new homes completions from developers involved in the project from 2016: 38,370

Combined 2016 turnover of developers involved: £10,000,000,000

- 81% of participants citing impact on viability or other commercial issues as a main barrier to delivering healthy places
- 56% of participants citing lack of engagement with developers as a main barrier to delivering healthy places
- 89% of participants reporting an improved understanding and recognition for the value and impact of health on the development industry following the workshops
Considerations for a healthy development

In each local authority’s statutory Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), the health challenges facing the local population are profiled at detailed local and (often) ward levels. Additionally, Public Health England provides local health information through an interactive website. From this information it is evident that all areas share common population health challenges which the planning system can help tackle when bringing forward new developments, including the following:

- reducing health inequalities;
- making it easier for people to be physically active in their day-to-day lives;
- planning for an ageing population;
- addressing mental health and social isolation;
- protecting population from hazards; and
- sustaining community resilience and involvement in place-making.

Population health is generally influenced by the physical environment (10%), access to and quality of healthcare (20%), individual behaviours (30%) and socioeconomic factors such as employment and security (40%). So, as health factors are so closely related to a person’s environment, we can conclude that healthy populations can be reached through planning, such as determining how a place is designed, what opportunities are provided to communities, and how these opportunities and benefits can be maintained and managed over the long term.

While there is no “one-size-fits-all” solution, there are common elements in a healthy development of which there is consensus. As a reference point, these are set out by the TCPA below. It should be recognised that building a healthy development also helps to achieve multiple objectives around flood risk management and air- and noise-quality control:

Movement and access
Creating a place that prioritises active and inclusive environments which provide easy and safe opportunities for everyone to be physically active through sustainable modes of travel.

Open space, play and recreation
Delivering a comprehensive network of natural and public open spaces and places which provide for a range of informal and formal activities for the benefit of everyone’s inclusion and enjoyment.

Food environment
Providing the local community with access to a diversity of food outlets offering healthy food options and providing them with the opportunity to grow their own food in designated public and private spaces which are accessible from their home, school or the workplace.

Buildings
Constructing high-quality, human-scale buildings with healthy working and living environments (internal and external) that will promote the long-term health and comfort of their occupants.

Neighbourhood spaces and infrastructure
Providing improved access to community and health infrastructure to meet local needs, exploring the use of redundant premises and spaces, and seeking opportunities for co-location.

Local economy
Providing a dynamic environment with accessible local industries, services and facilities, which helps secure employment, enterprise and training opportunities for residents and attracts key workers.

---

3 www.localhealth.org.uk
4 University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute
5 Creating health promoting environments. Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA), December 2017.
Considerations for a viable development

In the context of national planning policy, “viability” refers to economic viability. The National Planning Practice Guidance6 considers a site viable for the developer to bring forward development “if the value generated by its development exceeds the costs of developing it” and that it “provides sufficient incentive”, such as a competitive return for the landowner and the developer (typically around 20% of gross development value but varying with each development), phasing and type of land use. The National Planning Policy Framework requires development viability is considered during the policy development and decision-making stages.

One way to describe viability is by understanding the total development value created by the scheme (sales values, rentals, etc.) and comparing it with the remaining costs, including policy and regulatory costs (including but not limited to requirements on health); section 106 obligations and the community infrastructure levy; the cost and availability of finance; and competitive return for the developer and land owner. This method is illustrated in the diagram below (Figure 1), which shows that a development will be deemed “unviable” if the cost factors result in the total development value exceeding the viability threshold, which would result in the developer reducing costs to remain under the threshold. There are also other important contributing factors including phasing and cashflow. However, this should not deter councils from adopting a range of policies (including health and wellbeing), as these policy costs should be considered in the site value7. In other words, if developers know that they will have to cover the costs of policies in a particular place, they should factor this into the price they are willing to pay for the land. However, there can be difficulties if the current or alternative use-value and cost of policy requirements are greater than the value of the new use. Conversely, viability may be positively influenced by the availability of the public sector and publicly-owned land, which allows public bodies to enter into joint-venture arrangements with developers.

Figure 1. What is a viable development?

The viability concerns relating to the delivery of healthy developments are also of importance when bringing forward public-sector land. The Naylor review of NHS Property and Estates notes in its conclusion how best to maximise development value from surplus land in terms of value for taxpayers’ money. It goes on to say that “delivering the more ambitious opportunities will be challenging and involve difficult trade-offs between objectives... This is a delicate balance, which the Government and the NHS will need to weigh and decide on how to prioritise.”8 The review ultimately concludes that reducing planning permission risks might lead to a reduction in open space and increase the potential number of new homes. Planners, through the planning process itself, therefore, must mediate competing interests, costs and benefits.

---

Housebuilders “are not in business to serve the public interest, except incidentally. Their primary concern is to deliver profits for their investors, now and in the future”.

_The Callcutt Review of Housebuilding Delivery, 2007_

### The development process

For the purpose of this project, we used the term “developers” to refer to the different individuals or companies (both commercial and not-for-profit) involved throughout the development process for the primary purpose of building new homes or renovating existing properties for sale and rent. The development process is complex, and there are variations to the processes depending on the business model and type of developer.

In essence, development is about buying land, masterplanning, applying for planning permission, constructing buildings and eventually selling or renting them for a profit, and where relevant ongoing property management. The process is influenced by the way the project is financed, timing and cash-flow issues and the risks involved.

Understanding this process can help us better understand where external influences such as planning policy requirements and public health engagement can add value to the process.

The development process generally includes the elements listed in **Figure 2**. Developers will have in-house staff or employ specialist consultants for technical work such as planning, landscape architecture, transport and masterplanning. There are opportunities, particularly in the site allocations process of the local plan, before any planning application is submitted, for health professionals and wider stakeholders to be involved in discussions between planners and developers/land owners to ensure health considerations are embedded early in the thought process.

---

**Figure 2. Developers’ process for bringing forward development through planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Pre-development</th>
<th>Review strategic and local policy requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse area and site constraints and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pre-planning and design</td>
<td>Undertake pre-application stakeholder and community engagement and consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop masterplan and associated design details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Planning and Construction</td>
<td>Submit planning application to the local planning authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin construction works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Completion and Management</td>
<td>Units ready for occupation or sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement ongoing management arrangements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The developers

It is useful to understand which developers are operating in your council area and what the roles of the developers are on specific sites, as this will influence what you are able to communicate to them in terms of health and wellbeing considerations. There are thousands of housebuilders of varying sizes, from the volume housebuilders to the small and medium enterprise builders. Figure 3 provides an indication of the types of developers.

It should be noted that developers often play different roles across different sites. Private developers are represented by membership bodies such as the Home Builders Federation, the British Property Federation and the Federation of Master Builders. Housing associations, on the other hand, are represented by the National Housing Federation. The TCPA has engaged with each of these representative bodies during the project.

While private-sector developers have built most of the new housing in the last few decades, there are various not-for-profit “housebuilders” playing an increasingly important role in building homes. The Government’s 2017 housing white paper, “Fixing our broken housing market”, and planning practice guidance, both promote greater output from these secondary developers, particularly the self-build market. This means that public health professionals need to be able to engage and communicate with all types of developers, ensuring there is both a consistent message and proportionate policy requirements around the delivery of healthy developments through planning.

Many of the developer types listed in Figure 3 may also be the overall landowner or eventual landlord, whether private, council or other public-sector bodies, and can play a crucial role in shaping good healthy developments. These landowners have the power not only to encourage but also to require healthy development elements are adopted during the planning process through various legal mechanisms such as section 106 agreements, land deals with the developer or rent agreements with business or residential tenants.
Housing associations

There are currently 1,498 registered social housing providers or housing associations in England10. In 2016, they collectively built 17% (24,090) of the total new housing stock11. However, they regularly build social and affordable rent homes to help meet specific demographic needs which would perhaps normally be unprofitable for the private sector. In many developments, housing associations will build some homes for market rent or market sale simply to subsidise the cost of building affordable homes12.

Councils

There has been a large increase in the number of councils setting up local housing companies and entering into joint ventures with private sector developers to deliver affordable housing. In total, there are 198 local authorities which are registered social housing providers. In 2016, they built 2,100 new homes (2% of the overall housing stock)13.

Self- and custom-build

It is estimated that around 7-10% of new housing (12,000) is completed by self- and custom-builders14. These include people who are building their own homes, but are more likely to be small companies that are commissioned to build unique homes for people, or are building only a few homes, often on smaller sites or serviced plots.

The government is keen to encourage self- and custom-builders and councils have to keep a self-build and custom-build register listing people or organisations that want to buy serviced plots in order to build homes. Self- and custom-builders should be encouraged to create healthy places, although planning policy requirements for health should be proportionate to the scale at which they operate. Research undertaken by the FMB15 and HBF16 highlight that self- and custom-builders already face significant barriers due to the complexity of the planning system.

---

10 Current registered providers of social housing. Homes and Communities Agency, February 2013.
15 FMB Housebuilders’ Survey 2016. FMB, 2016
16 Reversing the decline of small housebuilders: Reinvigorating entrepreneurialism and building more homes. Home Builders Federation, 2017.
Four.
Evidence for creating value from development

“There are many other important intangibles which contribute to value. Because markets do not trade explicitly in these things, it is hard to identify and quantify their value. Intangible factors in the area of health, happiness and wellbeing, for example, have the potential to keep the cost of health services affordable and are only now becoming better recognised.”

RICS, Placemaking and value, 2016

The literature review for this project drew together findings from around 60 industry research and statistical publications. Interim findings were published in Town & Country Planning in May 2017 and show that there is potential to harness market forces to deliver health and wellbeing objectives.

Much of the research reviewed was commissioned by the development industry itself. A Savills report in 2016, for example, sets out a land-value model for a theoretical urban extension in order to project the increased benefits of creating better places; later that year, a RICS report found increased values in the relationship between placemaking and commercial value; and in 2017, CBRE published a report on the value of public realm with similar conclusions when exploring international case studies.

While none of the reports refer specifically to health and wellbeing as “outcomes”, the measures examined, such as open space and proximity to sustainable transport have an impact on health, as we know from evidence published by Public Health England.

Publications by organisations such as the UK Green Building Council, and even housebuilders themselves, are usually based on consumer surveys. These provide a useful insight into consumer-driven demand for good design or the inclusion of green spaces in new developments, making a sound business case for encouraging developers to build high-quality and healthy places.

Some publications, such as those from Knight Frank and Nationwide, document the association between house prices and proximity to public transport links, home space and national parks, providing a useful analysis of over a given period of time. Similarly, findings by Lloyds Bank on the impact of food retail stores on property values found that homes within easy reach of a local supermarket are on average £21,512 higher than those in other in nearby areas, rising to as much as £36,480 if located next to a Waitrose.

These statistics indicate that development values can be greater in areas with easy access and proximity to local lifestyle conveniences.

---

Improved pedestrianisation, a new civic square, clearer signage, and better placement of street furniture. Increase in town centre footfall of 25%.

A high number of street trees. Increased land values, up to 16%.

Enhancing place-making through public realm interventions such as improving image, multi-functional nature of spaces and establishing character areas. 8% increase in residential property value within 500m and between 5-6% within 2km. Non-residential values improved by 33% within 100m and 7.3% within 500m.

Upfront investment in place-making delivers an uplift in land value. Increased by 25%.

Enhanced pedestrianisation, a new civic square, clearer signage, and better placement of street furniture. Increase in town centre footfall of 25%.

Premium for a property 500 metres from the nearest railway station, compared with a similar property 1,500 metres away. £42,000 premium.

Proximity to playgrounds in residential areas. Increased land values, up to 16%.

A high number of street trees. Increased land values, up to 17%.

Place-making does add commercial value. Increased value of between 5% and 50%.

Properties with a waterfront compared with those which are some distance from a canal or river. Increased average premium of 19%.

Premium for a property in proximity to a national supermarket compared with a similar property nearby. On average, £21,512 higher.


Ibid


The Value of Public Space, How high quality parks and public spaces create economic, social and environmental value. CABE Space Design Council, March 2004.


Homes close to a national supermarket ring up a price premium of £22,000. Press release. Lloyds Bank, 29 May 2017.
It is increasingly common for developers to devise their own place-making frameworks (see Figure 5). Many of the elements which one would associate with the promotion of health and wellbeing are included in them. Developers’ motivations for producing these frameworks tend to be either to differentiate the quality of their homes from their competitors, as part of their approach to corporate social responsibility, or both.

There are also industry-initiated schemes, such as the Building for Life standard (supported by Design Council Cabe, the Home Builders Federation and Design for Homes) and WELL Building and Community standards. While many developers have voluntarily aligned the design of their developments with such schemes, the developers’ own place-making frameworks are not usually independently assessed. However, the Building Research Establishment (BRE) has developed the independently assessed Home Quality Mark and the BREEAM Communities technical standards.

Figure 5. Examples of developers’ place-making frameworks

Barratt Homes
Creating great places
New design initiative to provide guidance on how to create designs which will achieve Building for Life accreditation. It includes principles such as streets for all, public and private spaces, and facilities and services.

Berkeley Homes
Creating successful places toolkit
A toolkit to help developers apply sustainability ideas to developments, with a structured approach to demonstrate the success of the places created. It is based on a set of 13 criteria, including wellbeing.

Redrow Homes
Creating Britain’s new communities
After engaging their design and planning teams in a series of place-making workshops, Redrow established a place-making framework aligned around six principles, including nature and streets.

Five.
Insights for achieving a healthy and viable development

The following section highlights key insights drawn from the project workshops and interviews to help planners and public health practitioners understand the perspective of developers, so that they can work together to deliver high-quality healthy places more effectively through the planning and development processes.

Language and terminology 21
Creating healthy places can add value for little upfront cost 22
Councils must give developers clear and consistent messages throughout the process 23
Industry benchmarks and competitive advantage 24
Developers want to make a positive difference 25
Quality and marketing 26
Ensuring the right people have the right skills and resources 27
The importance of early and multiple stakeholder involvement 28
Language and terminology

“We don’t see the point of development if we are not taking health and wellbeing into account.”

Private-sector developer comment during an interview

Developers say that they understand the concept and value of “healthy places” in order to be commercially successful in selling housing to prospective homebuyers or renters. However, there is a difference in the way developers discuss healthy places and the way that councils talk about them in policy documents and planning discussions. Take, for example, a comparison between a marketing brochure for a development and a health planning policy:

“In total, [the development] has nine acres of open space in which to meet, relax and enjoy the genial atmosphere of a friendly neighbourhood. It will include walkways, cycle paths, play areas, large open grass areas and tranquil corners with attractive planting and trees. As well as the open space, there are more amenities on the way, such as the new school, cafés and shops, which will all make [the development] a welcoming and dynamic place to live.”

Developer’s marketing brochure

“We will improve health and well-being in [the borough] by supporting healthier neighbourhoods through targeting of unhealthy lifestyles such as smoking and those which cause obesity, addressing health inequalities in terms of ill health and access to health facilities as identified in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.”

Local Authority Core Strategy Policy on Improving Health and Wellbeing

In general, developers are more comfortable talking about “wellbeing” rather than “health”. Images that depict wellbeing, such as families walking in the park or active older people, are often used in their marketing materials. Wellbeing is, perhaps, more associated with happiness whereas “health” has medical connotations, or associations with poor health and illness – neither of which would make great marketing messages to prospective residents of a development. As one developer put it, “health”, to many people, means doctors and dentists, not the wider determinants. A planner said, “health”, i.e. the NHS, is not the same as public health. Developers might think they’ve consulted “health”, and not realise they’ve not had any input from the public health team.

It was notable that the developers which were involved directly or indirectly in this project claimed to be “doing all this already”, while some of the councils that worked with them felt quite strongly that this was not the case. Possibly, the developers have addressed the issue of providing healthcare facilities but had not realised that the council also expected them to address a range of public health concerns and the “wider determinants” of health through the design of the development. One way of overcoming this communication problem might be for public health teams and planners to be more specific in their discussions with developers, perhaps by using the TCPA’s Healthy Environments framework, set out on page 13.
Creating healthy places can add value for little upfront cost

“We create places which will endure as settled, vibrant communities long into the future. These are places where people choose to live, work and spend their time, and that directly encourage people’s wellbeing and quality of life.”

Berkeley Group Annual Report 2017

When shown the six elements of the TCPA Healthy Environments Framework during interviews and workshops, it became clear that developers already understood and recognised our healthy development principles and guidelines. Upon being presented with the elements, one developer responded, “It’s just good planning, isn’t it?” But the challenge is to make the case to developers that “high quality” does not necessarily mean “high specification” and “hard infrastructure”, all of which often lead to higher construction costs and will ultimately lead to higher house prices.

The TCPA’S analysis of 20 marketing brochures that developers had created for prospective customers shows that the most frequently cited benefit was travel, with regular mentions of walking, cycling, driving, train and bus services, highlighting the site’s proximity to the closest main city or ease of access into local centres. There were also mentions of new green infrastructure and the promotion of existing green and open spaces as a selling point. In the same research, references to healthy food and retail environments were considerably weaker, or non-existent. However, councils too often neglect to consider healthy food environments in local plans and planning considerations.

The inclusion of some healthy benefits such as good public transport in marketing brochures does not necessarily mean that all elements are embedded into the masterplanning process, but it does demonstrate that the agenda is already in the developers’ mindset in shaping their communications strategy to convince customers to purchase or rent the property.
Councils must give developers clear and consistent messages throughout the process

“Designing a high-quality place where people want to live, work and enjoy their time should be at the heart of any development. While it may be helpful for government bodies to set the tone of this, it is important that the detail is developed at a local level, allowing communities the opportunity to work with developers on what suits their specific area.”

British Property Federation submission to the LGA Housing Commission 2016

During the Developers and Wellbeing project workshops, developers said that a lack of national and local policy or guidance was the main barrier preventing them from delivering healthy places, with 59% of all responses stating that there is insufficient clarity in the available guidance and standards on health and wellbeing. Developers found the TCPA Healthy Environments Framework to be a useful guide for discussing relevant health issues specific to both the development and the priorities of local authorities. Prior to this, most were not actually aware that any national evidence or guidance existed on the subject. Once the developers were made aware of the existing wealth of information and guidance by the local authority they often recognised its value. For example, in Thurrock the developer has embraced and embedded “Active Design” into the emerging masterplanning of Purfleet Centre regeneration.

Developers require certainty and clarity from local authorities about their expectations for health and wellbeing, firstly in local planning policies or supplementary planning documents, and secondly during planning application discussions. One complaint from developers was that they dealt with many different people and departments in the council and that they usually received different messages from each of them. The confusing and sometimes conflicting messages made it much harder for them to respond, adding time and, therefore, cost to the process.

If councils want to achieve healthier developments they need to set this out clearly in their local plan, its supporting policies, in pre-application discussions and by the planning committee. One developer said, “I’ve never heard a planning committee ask ‘What are you doing about health and wellbeing?’. It never happens.”

Many councils, such as Nottinghamshire, Wakefield and Central Lincolnshire, have now developed local health impact assessment checklists to aid the development management process. It could be thought that this will cause confusion, duplication and contradiction for developers, with such a large amount of guidance perhaps exacerbating the issue rather than addressing it. However, research by the TCPA indicates that there is some alignment of healthy considerations across different checklists and frameworks, so there can be confidence in using any of these in practice33. Adoption of design codes as part of planning permission can also provide greater certainty and clarity around health requirements.

It is worth remembering that developments are brought forward in line with the adopted local plan. Having effective and deliverable planning policies on health is and should continue to be the focus for local authorities wanting to safeguard high-quality healthy development. It is important and necessary for public-health professionals to ensure that tangible health-related guidance is included in policy. There is also an opportunity to flag up the rich set of health evidence in the statutory JSNA produced by each local authority.

Industry benchmarks and competitive advantage

“Designing great places is fundamental to our business: our customers want to live in great places, the vendors of the land we purchase want to work with developers who leave behind a legacy of design quality and local people want developments that enhance their communities.”

Barratt Development Annual Report and Accounts 2017

We are seeing the emergence of industry-led benchmarks and standards, which some developers have embraced. Many developers are aware of, and some have signed up to, industry-led standards, such as Building for Life, which continues to influence much of the developers’ thinking around quality place-making and design. There are also emerging accreditation standards such as the WELL Building and Community standards, Home Quality Mark and industry benchmarks such as the Next Generation Benchmark\(^34\).

Achieving such accreditation often provides developers with a competitive advantage and helps them meet their corporate social responsibility goals. Some developers even use Building for Life and a wide range of health-relevant performance indicators in their annual/integrated/sustainability reports (see Figure 6). While there is still great potential to further improve and increase the use of these indicators, it is encouraging to see them included in corporate reports.

Figure 6. Examples of performance indicators used in developers’ corporate reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space provision</th>
<th>Contributions to local communities</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Transport and access</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Hectares of public open space created.</td>
<td>✓ Committed, combined section 106 contributions and community infrastructure levy payments.</td>
<td>✓ Greenhouse gas emissions intensity.</td>
<td>✓ Developments with homes within 500 metres of a transport node.</td>
<td>✓ Apprenticeships and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Developments with ecological enhancement or protection (%).</td>
<td>✓ Affordable housing completions.</td>
<td>✓ Completed homes provided with smart meters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Developments incorporating features that benefit nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Sites with sustainable drainage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reputation

✓ Use placemaking to deliver improved customer experience.
✓ Customer satisfaction rating (HBF survey).
✓ Percentage of customers who would recommend.

Transport and access

✓ Developments with homes within 500 metres of a transport node.

Housing and planning

✓ Increase in UK average selling price.
✓ Number of planning permissions secured in England over the past 12 months.

Section 4 of this publication has highlighted a wealth of research and data about the commercial benefits of quality places and developments. Research by Saint Gobain found that 30% of buyers across the UK would be willing to pay more for a home that enhances their health and wellbeing\(^35\).


Developers want to make a positive difference

“Given limited public funds, the private sector will be asked to do more to help, by providing services or facilities to meet wider objectives, including those related to health.”


Many of the developers that attended the workshops admitted that their decisions are driven by the aim of maximising housing value and that creating healthy places is a secondary consideration. However, as the evidence in this report demonstrates, creating healthier places often adds value to a development.

In many cases developers are unaware of how their development can make a specific impact on improving health and wellbeing. This makes the case for greater collaboration with local authority public health teams as well as external bodies such as Sport England, Canal & River Trust, and academic institutions on monitoring and evaluation.

The opportunities to ensure that developments make a positive health impact, either through sharing evidence and assessments, engaging in planning policy and pre-application discussion or by encouraging the inclusion of requirements for the use of health impact assessments, can ultimately help create and maintain a healthy and viable development. Opportunities exist to align statutory local authority reporting (Authority Monitoring Reports and the Director of Public Health Annual Report) to performance indicators in developers’ corporate reporting to their investors and shareholders.

In addition, through section 106, developers are required to contribute financially towards local communities and help mitigate development impacts through a combination of financial investment and in-kind contributions, such as building a GP surgery or improving an existing facility. One example is Persimmon Homes, which reported £65 million of financial investment in community facilities alongside their residential developments completed in 2016, 21.9% of which was earmarked for future maintenance; 25.3% for education; 11.4% for monetary contributions to affordable housing; 10.1% for highways; 9.1% for public transport; 6.9% for public open spaces; and 1.4% for leisure facilities.
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Many developers recognise the link between profitability and the quality of a housing development. In marketing terms, this is the “marketing mix”, the optimal set of actions for achieving an equilibrium between price affordability, the quality of the product, the location of place and the effectiveness of consumer promotion. There are also other elements such as the efficiency of the process to achieve an outcome, the skills and capability of people involved and the existence of physical evidence to demonstrate these to the consumer on an ongoing basis with a focus on management and maintenance of environments. Figure 7 illustrates how the marketing mix can be applied to a development.

For example, Barratt Developments’ “Great Places”; Redrow Homes’ “Building Britain’s New Communities”; and Berkeley Group’s “Creating Successful Places”. In Barton Park, the Oxford Barton LLP joint venture (acting as the strategic land developer) between Oxford City Council and Grosvenor Britain and Ireland has set out a process where approval from them is required when plot housebuilders appoint architects to submit design details in the reserved matters applications for developing individual plots.

However, it is notable that this approach is being taken in places with relatively high land values, where affluent buyers expect premium-quality homes. As one developer said, “We are selling at the premium end of the market so there’s an expectation that you’d get quality open space and so on. It’s trickier at the ‘value’ end of the market.”

Figure 7. Marketing mix considerations for healthy, viable development

- **Price**
  Considerations of cost of planning requirements, construction and management, sale price and profitability.

- **Physical Evidence**
  Considerations demonstrating the quality of development, including accreditations, achieving standards and awards, actual delivery and ongoing management.

- **Process**
  Considerations of delivery and procedural transactions, including cashflow from sales, grants or financing arrangements, planning processes and stakeholder and community consultation.

- **People**
  Considerations of the skills and capability of the people involved through the process, including planners, consultees, stakeholders and elected members.

- **Promotion**
  Considerations of communications with prospective homeowners on the quality and benefits of the development through marketing brochures and with local communities through consultation materials.

- **Product**
  Considerations of the quantity and quality of the housing units, and other services or facilities, including as part of the development.

- **Place**
  Considerations of the place and wider location of the development and, more specifically, the siting of housing units.
In order to work more effectively with private-sector developers, some councils might need to provide more training for their planning officers, councillors and public health teams in subjects such as the economics of development.

In a study commissioned by the planning and development industries in 2010, and again highlighted as an issue in the 2012 Harman review, training on development finance was identified as being essential for planners, councillors and consultees, including on how to better manage viability issues.

Understanding development economics is one of the core competencies of a chartered town planner, but others involved in the planning process also need the skills to be confident enough to engage with, and challenge, developers, including public health professionals. Conversely, many developers and surveyors would benefit from being trained to understand the wider public policy role of planning and health professionals.

Ensuring sufficient capacity and capability in a local authority planning workforce to effectively work with developers to bring forward multi-million pound development schemes remains a constant challenge. However, several solutions can be adopted, including the use of planning performance agreements between the local planning authority and the developer to help agree timescales, actions and resources for handling a particular application.
Throughout the project, the developers genuinely welcomed interactions with health professionals. Developers embraced the opportunity to directly engage with the councils in informal settings and multi-disciplinary discussions to help improve and shape the masterplanning process of the development proposals. For example, Thurrock Council’s use of their regular developer forum meeting to contribute to the Developers and Wellbeing project is a good example of maximising positive interaction with developers. During the project workshops, developers used the opportunity to their advantage by engaging with each of the council departments and stakeholders present in the same forum rather than, in reality, where individual and disparate discussions often take place.

Planners, in particular development management case officers, act as a gateway to the developers. During the planning application process, they have a particular role in coordinating responses from statutory and non-statutory consultees such as highways, parks, education, public health and environmental health teams, the police, healthcare providers and commissioners, the Canal & River Trust and the wider general public. During interviews, developers have reported that there are often conflicting messages between consultees and little or no engagement from the local clinical commissioning groups (CCGs). Delays are caused to the planning process when these issues are not resolved early on or raised too late in the process to make material changes to the development.

In practice, there is a need to recognise where best to engage with developers during the planning and development processes in order to avoid potential delays. Research has shown that delays in the planning process can cost the UK economy at least £700 million per year\textsuperscript{37}. There is a need to avoid unnecessary delays without compromising on the quality of the built environment, resulting in poor health from, for example, obesity, which costs the wider economy £27bn per year\textsuperscript{38}.

In one particular instance, when a development had already received outline planning permission, the developer simply remarked, “It is too late [but would be] worth thinking about earlier in the process”. Another said, “If you can offer a quicker better consent, then I’m all for it.”

Based on discussions throughout the project, the TCPA can set out the degree of influence in each of the main planning stages (see Figure 8) so that health and wellbeing issues and relevant guidance can be raised, considered and integrated. The main message is that integration of health considerations into developments is more impactful and effective at “upstream” site selection and policy development stages rather than negotiated on a site-by-site basis. In areas where there is already an adopted local plan, engagement on a site-by-site basis (potentially through HIs) will often be more effective – and the only viable option. Developers also welcome flexibility and adaptability over the timescale of the development, which can often take up to ten years to build out through multiple phases of work.

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
When local planning authorities, land owners and prospective developers identify and access suitable sites and locations for sustainable development within the local plans. Health considerations should be highlighted as part of the sustainability appraisal and strategic environmental assessment.

**Degree of influence:** very high and influential.

When policy requirements are developed to take into account the health and wellbeing strategy and evidence in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. Health considerations should be highlighted as part of the plan’s sustainability appraisal and strategic environmental assessment.

**Degree of effectiveness:** very high with potential influence.

**Examples:** Haringey, Southwark, Coventry, Barton AAP (Oxford).

When further guidance is developed to support specific local planning policies such as active transport, open space, design quality or restricting proliferation of takeaways.

**Degree of effectiveness:** medium with potential influence.

**Examples:** Gloucestershire Active Planning Toolkit, Gateshead Hot Food Takeaway SPD, Planning for Health in Worcestershire Technical Research Paper.

Informal discussions, meetings and public engagement events are often undertaken at this stage with local authorities, stakeholders, consultees and/or communities to discuss design and project activities.

**Degree of effectiveness:** high with potential influence.

Health impact assessments and/or environmental impact assessments, now with human health considerations, are often undertaken at this stage on an established masterplan and submitted as part of a planning application.

**Degree of effectiveness:** Medium and Restricted Influence.


Implementing activity-based health and wellbeing programme.

**Degree of effectiveness:** low with limited influence.

Note: For further examples of further engagement opportunities in the planning process, see the TCPA’s “Good practice guide for public health involvement in planning” (2015).
Six.
Conclusions: Gearing up for a healthy evolution

As the government pledges more support for building the homes the nation needs, we must ensure that new communities are designed in a way which not only encourages healthy living but makes it the easiest choice – something that will require significant change. There is clearly a shared belief among both public and private-sector stakeholders that the scale of the public health challenge requires collaborative effort, and all those working in both sectors should play their role in creating and maintaining healthier places when taking a development through the planning system.

Stakeholders agree that, regardless of the financial challenges facing local government and the impact this has had on the capacity of planning services, by working together they can contribute to reducing poor health and significantly increase mutual benefits for all those involved in the development.

The Developers and Wellbeing project has reached the following conclusions, calling for proactive and considered cooperation from all those involved in the planning and development process:

1. **Gain a national consensus on healthy development:**
   There is a need for greater national consensus among national agencies and local authorities on what a healthy development is and the key mechanisms for delivering it (even if only to ensure consistency and effective implementation at a local level). This can be achieved in future revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance, and in reflecting the importance of the planning process in health-related strategies to underpin local plans and planning decisions.

2. **Address the fundamental flaws in the housing market:**
   There is already a large body of evidence, with increasing consensus, that the housing market is broken and requires reform if it is to deliver the numbers and quality of homes the nation needs. There is no better time than now for all those with an interest in sustainable development to collaborate on calling for improvements to fundamental flaws in the system to improve the way local authorities engage, involve and collaborate with developers to deliver quality homes. The TCPA hopes this report and its wider work on the review of planning provide a useful contribution.

3. **Reduce inequalities in access to good, affordable homes:**
   There is considerable evidence that poor-quality homes have considerable economic and social costs. The suggestions in this report should help to strengthen the case for healthy developments, with high quality and affordable homes for everyone, not just the few who can afford to buy or rent top-of-the-range homes.

4. **Target action earlier in the development process:**
   It is vital that discussions about health and wellbeing take place as early as possible in the development process with development partners, potentially during local plan development and site selection. Health professionals and wider stakeholders can improve their engagement by using tangible suggestions for health and wellbeing at all stages of the process to maximise influence and impact on development quality and health outcomes.

40. See the Raynsford Review of Planning on the state of the current planning system.
Maximise outreach to developers through innovative mechanisms:
Public bodies must make greater efforts to reach and engage with the development industry throughout the planning process if they are to make a meaningful impact. This can be achieved by exploring innovative mechanisms such as local developer forums or adopting protocols for engaging developers with the right level of support from public authorities. This will help improve understanding of one another’s priorities and processes, exploring areas of mutual benefit and value earlier on in the development process.

Innovate to share the risks and rewards of healthy developments:
Partnerships between developers and local authorities, including input from public health professionals and wider stakeholders and consultees, to plan for healthier developments can help to meet a number of shared objectives for developers as well as wider public policy objectives for the local area.

Improve the commercial case for healthy development:
National health agencies and stakeholders need to help councils gain a better understanding of the business case for, and added value of, planning healthy developments. This can be achieved by gaining a better understanding of commercial drivers, building on existing research from industry customer surveys and exploring the benefits of industry kitemarks or accreditations.

Use health evidence more effectively:
Developers should make greater use of the health evidence readily available which has been produced by Public Health England and councils, as well as any applied research from local academic institutions. All those involved in local plans and development proposals should maximise opportunities to share evidence and assessments on population, individual health and socio-economic characteristics and needs, such as those contained in the JSNA (joint strategic needs assessment). Public health professionals, with the help of planners, should communicate evidence to developers to help target interventions and ensure greater impact when integrating health elements into development. Local authorities should also develop and include monitoring indicators on healthy development in existing processes such as the authority monitoring report.

Seven.
Profiles of project developments and their developers

This section presents a profile for each of the developments used as case studies during the project. The developments were selected by each of the local authorities, with subsequent agreement from the developers to be used as a focus in workshop discussions. The profiles aim to provide a snapshot picture of the main healthy development elements considered in the development, how developers perceive the health and wellbeing agenda and whether there are any lessons and outcomes from the process. Annex 1 summarises local population health profiles of areas within which each development is located.
The focus of the workshop was Berry Hill, a new, mixed-use community on 169 hectares of greenfield land along the main routes of the A60 and A617 in south east Mansfield. The development will bring more than £100m of investment into the area. With outline planning permission granted in 2013, the Lindhurst Group, a strategic land developer, is responsible for the overall masterplan and for putting in place the infrastructure (partly funded by an £8.5m Homes and Communities Agency grant for individual housebuilders to develop on specific plots over a ten-year build-out period).

**Policy context**

In a policy context, the Lindhurst Group’s key strength is their adoption of the Spatial Planning for the Health & Wellbeing of Nottinghamshire document in 2016, which includes a rapid health impact checklist, which Mansfield District Council has adopted. The document provides an overview of local health challenges and guidance to district-level local planning authorities on addressing the impact of a development on the health and wellbeing of the population. Perhaps most importantly, it offers the Lindhurst Group certainty as well as a guide for considering health in line with the design code.

**Elements of healthy development**

The development sits in three wards, Berry Hill, Lindhurst and Ransom Wood, each areas with variable health challenges such as child obesity and general poor health (though not significantly dissimilar to the national average).

**Movement and access is key**

While further design details will be set out in a reserved matters application, the masterplan provides a strategic network of traffic-free foot and cycling paths, and shared surfaces throughout the site. Lindhurst Group will provide at least 500 covered cycle parking stands (1000 spaces) across the site, with associated locker facilities, changing areas and showers located within easy walking distance. To promote walking, Lindhurst will provide new pedestrian signage from the site to the local amenities and help raise awareness of the health benefits of walking. Having a travel plan is a requirement from the section 106 agreement, and a “travel plan co-ordinator” will dedicate between two and three days per week to the initiation and publicising of various travel plan initiatives. With the range of sustainable travel initiatives set out in the submitted travel plan, the 2020 target is for 40% drive, 10% Car Share, 35% public transport, 15% walk/cycle from a baseline of 2010, 45% drive, 10% Car Share, 30% public transport, 15% walk/cycle.

The workshop was attended by Lindhurst Group and its representatives, Nottinghamshire County Council, Mansfield and Ashfield District Councils, Mid Notts CCG, Sport England and The Land Trust.
Encouraging outdoor activity and access

Once completed, Berry Hill will have 10.08 hectare of proposed outdoor play space, equipped children’s play spaces and formal sports provision. There will be a network of green open spaces throughout the site, including a large area of structural landscaping which incorporates landscape buffers, green corridors, two play areas and a trim trail, and all dwellings will have accessible outdoor spaces such as private gardens to improve the occupants’ quality of life. Landscaping in Phase 1 of the development has also been approved in July 2017 which includes a large area of structural landscaping, with green corridors, landscape buffers, two play areas and a trim trail.

Performance and success

As part of the proposed masterplan, design codes have been prepared to set out mandatory baseline minimum design standards and principles which are to be adopted by all housebuilders developing on all individual plots. So far, Avant Homes has received approval for up to 95 dwellings in April 2017 and Barratt Homes has received permission for 277 new homes in May 2017. These codes set clear parameters based on the Building for Life principles and allow developments to respond to the six Planning Healthy Weight Environments elements.
Canada Water
A Community People Prefer, Southwark, London

As one of the UK’s largest property development and investment companies, British Land, in partnership with Southwark Council, is planning to deliver a new urban centre in Canada Water, including up to 3,500 homes, two million sq ft of workspace, one million sq ft of retail and leisure space, and over 20,000 jobs. Emma Cariaga, Head of Operations for Canada Water at British Land, says that “Health and wellbeing is a mindset” and is at the heart of the company’s agenda. She says that the development will bring “long-term benefits for those who work, live or spend time in the Canada Water area, both now and in the future, and create a place of enduring social as well as economic value”.

Policy context
Canada Water is designated as an “Opportunity Area” in the London Plan, with existing opportunities or potential for improved public transport access. The Area Action Plan (AAP) for Canada Water, published in 2015, provides the main policy context for the area’s regeneration. It has already identified a number of potential local health challenges and says that there is a need to “improve local healthcare facilities and improve the health and wellbeing of residents by encouraging healthy lifestyles”. The New Southwark Plan will include the following policies on health: SP5 Healthy, active lives and P42 Healthy developments.

Elements of healthy development
The masterplan and development details are still being finalised for submission as part of a planning application, but there are already interesting lessons to be learnt.

Comprehensive understanding of health needs
With data from the NHS Choices and Southwark CCG websites, British Land was able to identify and map local healthcare facilities including GPs, pharmacies, opticians and patient numbers. The company has undertaken initial research using CACI Acorn to understand community health data and inform their masterplan so that it addresses the gaps in facilities and housing products to support social integration. Further community research via Social Life is now underway to explore a more detailed baseline picture of the existing community’s social wellbeing and develop indicators for the future in order to continually consider and address how the masterplan can improve health and wellbeing throughout the area.

Use of neighbourhood spaces as “meanwhile” uses
British Land considers health and wellbeing to be different things. “The beauty with somewhere like Canada Water is that we are able to use our interventions, and the public sector’s interventions, [to be] much more preventative through [utilising] the built environment. In part it’s about the physical; in part it’s about management and curation,” says Emma Cariaga. At Canada Water, a “Phase Zero” is underway well before a planning application is submitted, supporting a range of meanwhile community activities in the existing Printworks building and public spaces in the area, including a community space in the existing shopping centre. It is run by local charities Time and Talents and the Paper Garden. These activities help provide safe and fun spaces for the existing local community, as well as other people from across the Capital, to come together before and during the development, therefore encouraging social connections.

Participating Partners and further information
www.canadawatermasterplan.com
Green and blue spaces
The masterplan will seek to maximise how the natural environment permeates through the site and how to connect many of the 23 open spaces identified within the surrounding 1km (for example, Southwark Park in the south west and Russia Dock Woodland in the north east). Canada Water Dock is also nearby, to the north of the development, which includes a new park to connect areas throughout the site, providing an opportunity to encourage nature, biodiversity and activities for all as well as active travel.

Connected and healthy streets and networks
Transport and accessibility is a key challenge and opportunity at Canada Water. The area already has poor air quality and the council wants to avoid further decline. Eventually, the council hopes the area to be “air-quality neutral”. The masterplan will follow Healthy Streets for London’s “10 indicators” approach, prioritising pedestrian and cycle access, with controlled access for buses and other vehicles, especially through the proposed high street and town centre.

Performance and success
The masterplan is currently being developed, including input and feedback from the local community at every stage over the last four years, with the intention of submitting a planning application in early 2018. This provides an ideal opportunity to consider health and wellbeing earlier in the development process but also as the place evolves. While it is perhaps too early to measure health outcomes from the development, Emma believes there is an opportunity for everyone to work together and ensure a greater role for public health professionals in the process in terms of monitoring to, in her words, “help indicate whether or not we have got it right or what we need to do to influence change”.
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Colindale Gardens
A New Community for a Better Way to Live,
Barnet, London

A new redevelopment on 20.35 hectares of previously-developed land adjacent to Colindale station on the Northern line, Colindale Gardens is set to be Redrow’s flagship development in north west London. Redrow’s group sustainability director Rob Macdiarmid believes there is a real consumer demand for health and wellbeing, citing findings from the company’s “Creating Britain’s New Communities” research report, which also sets out six placemaking design principles. In recognising that health and social wellbeing is increasingly used as a measure of the nation’s overall success, Redrow has set out to ensure that the new community at Colindale Gardens will provide a better way to live in a high-quality build surrounded by nature.

Development details

**Uses**
2,900 new homes (with 20% affordable housing), 10,000 square metres of commercial floor space, a new free school and four hectares of open space provision

**Developer**
Redrow Homes

**Year planning permission granted**
2015

**Project costs**
£37m CIL funding, an £11.25m tube station and £1.58m of improvements to Colindale Avenue, plus travel plan, Peel Link, apprentices and bus services

Policy context

The development sits within the Colindale Area Action Plan (AAP) and is designated as an Opportunity Area in the London Plan. The AAP sets out objectives to identify new and improved routes and connections, coordinate provision of social infrastructure and provide an attractive and safe environment. At the time of the workshop, Barnet Council was consulting on a draft green infrastructure supplementary planning document which, once adopted, would become a material consideration. The SPD seeks to ensure that developments make provision for green infrastructure which enhances the physical and mental health of residents.

**Elements of healthy development**

Senior planning manager Jenny Offord, who is overseeing the development at Colindale Gardens, says that Redrow is “integrating wellbeing into what it already does across all its teams (commercial, technical, sales, construction) to understand that it relates to a better way to live”. Redrow has set up a “pathfinder” team to bring forward the various initiatives within the development, with one element focused on wellbeing and health.

Local Workshop,
12 July, Colindale Gardens Marketing Suite, London

The workshop was attended by Redrow Homes, planning, public health, transport and green spaces officers from Barnet Council, PHE, NHS England, Sport England, The Land Trust, BRE and Sustain.

Participating Partners
and further information
www.redrow.co.uk/developments/colindale-gardens-colindale-442231

Image courtesy of: Redrow Homes
Embedding placemaking principles

The “Creating Britain’s New Communities” research involved a survey of more than 2,000 consumers to help Redrow build better communities in future developments. 87% of respondents said that being part of a community is important to them, and there is evidence of the benefits of social cohesion for mental wellbeing. When asked about the most important factors for creating communities which promote social wellbeing at the local level, respondents said the following: a GP surgery (99.9%), open space/recreation ground (97.4%), local shops (96.2%), park/village green (94.6%) and a bus route (93.9%). This ethos of meeting local and consumer needs was evident in the initial 2014 pre-application consultation with the local communities.

Network of public realm and open spaces

In an area which is only 19.8% open space (compared to 37.7% for the borough and 39.1% for London) the development will be set in an extensive, four-hectare network of public open spaces, including a central park. The central open space will act as the focus for the local community, including playing fields open to the new school. The development will be set in a combination of quiet and active landscaped areas.

On-site healthy living activities

Set in an extensive network of open spaces, Colindale Gardens has the opportunity to prioritise sport, fitness and outdoor life in both formal and informal ways. Once completed, there will be an outdoor gym, an indoor residents’ gym, a fitness trail and an “intuitive” network of walk paths and cycleways. Other elements include the provision of a 510 sq m healthcare facility to accommodate the demand for three additional GPs (created by the proposal) as well as additional floorspace to accommodate provision for the wider-Colindale area as a permanent facility location.

Local employment opportunities

Redrow has provided an extensive local employment programme, including forecasting of job opportunities, notification of job vacancies, local labour targets, jobs brokerage and skills training, apprenticeships and work experience, and use of local suppliers. In agreement with Barnet Council, Redrow has set targets to achieve job creation and work experience, including undertaking local school/college/university site visits.

Performance and success

Redrow issues a survey to its new homeowners because, as Jenny Offord puts it, “it is natural for Redrow to see the product from the customers’ eyes”. Jenny elaborates further to say that “lifestyle is a key selling component and it is embedded in needing to offer a healthy environment to people”. She believes that the landscape-led scheme of Colindale Gardens differentiates itself from neighbouring developments and that there is a distinct role for public health professionals to provide specific detail on how to help integrate health and wellbeing into existing processes and ultimately evaluate outcomes.
Located in a prime location near the M18/M180 junction in South Yorkshire, the objective of the Unity development is to maximise inward investment into the area and help secure regeneration of the area’s most deprived wards. Unity is a 250-hectare mixed-use development brought forward by Waystone, an “enabling” developer based in the Midlands and Yorkshire and the Humber. The development area is split into six “character zones” for different land uses including residential, manufacturing and logistics businesses, a town centre and a new marina.

Policy context
Doncaster’s core strategy focuses on improving quality of life, with Policy CS1 seeking to strengthen communities and enhance their wellbeing by promoting healthy places. This can be achieved through design, of which Unity uses strong sub-regional and local guidance, including the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide and Doncaster Development Guidance and Requirements.

Elements of healthy development
Although building has not yet begun on site, the project’s masterplan is already exhibiting positive elements of a healthy development, and the developer is committed to working with the council’s planning and public health teams. Waystone’s development director, Helen Mcloughlin, believes that more can be done to help improve the health and wellbeing of residents in the neighbouring communities as well as the new residents. Current health data shows around 47.4% of Year 6 children in the project area are obese or overweight, and that there is a higher proportion of residents per GP than other parts of Doncaster.

Employment-led development
Unity aims to create 6,000 new jobs in the area, a place which has never recovered from the decline of mining industries and their associated supply chains. Helen says that improving a local economy is one of the company’s key drivers on projects of this type and that the “success of the development will be measured by local people gaining employment and by attracting a skilled workforce”.

Development details

Uses
More than 3,000 new homes, at least 40 hectares of commercial use with a town centre, 80 hectares of open space (30% of site), an energy generation station and a primary school

Developer
Marcol Waystone LLP (Waystone Ltd and Marcol Industrial)

Year planning permission granted
Outline planning permission April 2017

Project costs
£140 million with £30 million for section 106 contributions

Local Workshop, 17 August, Our Lady of Assumption
The workshop was attended by Waystone Ltd, Doncaster Council planning, public health teams and ward councillors, Public Health England, Sport England, Canal & River Trust, The Land Trust and Doncaster CCG.

Participating Partners and further information
www.j5m18unity.com

Image courtesy of: Waystone
Connectivity
Setting the development in the existing context is important, and connectivity has been an important consideration for Unity given its proximity to both a major motorway corridor, Stainforth and Keadby Canal, and the existing historic communities of Stainforth and Hatfield. As part of this consideration, a “travel plan framework” has been produced, with the developer responsible for its overall implementation and annual monitoring. There will be pedestrian/cycle infrastructure along the length of the proposed M18 (Junction 5) Link Road; commercial developments will reserve 10% of their parking spaces for car sharing; secure cycle parking will be provided which meets local minimum standards; and each commercial development plot will also include showering and changing facilities for staff. Within the residential areas, dwellings will have room for storing a bicycle. A Unity website would also be provided to contain information to residents, employees and visitors on sustainable travel.

Community-led development
The developer supports the establishment of a Unity “forum”, created through section 106 seed money, as it recognises the shared benefits of working with the community, not least so that work can be brought forward more quickly through the planning process. This is a model which has been used previously by the developer on a development in Glasshoughton. If run properly, the forum will not only provide benefits for the local community but could also lead to improvements in the surrounding area.

Design-led development
Unity has a strong focus on design, and as a planning condition it is required to provide a design guide for each zone, approved by the local planning authority. The first reserved matters application has been submitted for Unity Living character zone, with a design guide to direct individual plot developers. The design guide details the design strategy for issues relating to movement and access, open-space character areas, vehicle and cycle parking and landscaping. Helen notes, “There are a lot of things happening under planning that could promote [health and wellbeing] without necessarily having a big price tag,” and says that “Good design doesn’t necessarily cost more.”

Performance and success
Unity’s success can be measured through various means, including annual travel plan monitoring. Ultimately, Helen emphasises, as a developer, “You really do want to be proud of what you are doing. If you are not improving the environment of the people that live in and around the spaces, then you are not succeeding in what you set out to do.”
A 240-hectare strategic site to protect the existing village of Murton in the north east of England, the Murton Gap, which was originally developed into a series of connected neighbourhoods, will offer a quality of living environment in a rural setting. Persimmon Homes is the majority landowner, and its group planning director, Peter Jordan, who also sits on its corporate social responsibility committee, is passionate about achieving commitments to creating good places to live.

Policy context
The Murton Gap Development Framework sets out objectives for healthy lifestyles and increased quality of life. The developer plans to locate housing next to local facilities; create good public transport links to promote walking and cycling on a daily basis; set housing around a central, accessible green space with integrated play and activity areas; and create a local centre. The recently adopted local plan policy S1.2 sets out a spatial strategy for maintaining and improving communities’ health and wellbeing.

Elements of healthy development
Murton Gap’s masterplan indicates that the development will include many of the elements of a healthy development. The use of a design code within the design and access statement, which will accompany the application, will provide further guidance to identify how developers will set out and plan buildings, streets and spaces in each of the six different character areas, and the provision and landscaping of open spaces.

Green spaces adding value
Peter notes that experience from previous developments such as Newcastle Great Park shows, “putting in key open spaces alongside the housing as early as you can is often a good way of adding value to the development”. There will be a strong emphasis on the provision of green and blue infrastructure to ensure residents can benefit from a healthy and active lifestyle. The green infrastructure plan shows provision for a Neighbourhood or Strategic Equipped Area for Play (up to 1,600 sq m), smaller Local Equipped Areas for Play (up to 800 sq m), multifunctional parkland, natural and semi-natural green spaces for informal areas for play and recreation, and 111 allotments across four sites.

Sustainable transport and movement framework
Due to its location, it is not surprising that securing movement and access is a key objective for Murton Gap. This creates good strategic and local highways links, good community connections and promotion of sustainable transport modes, and encourages residents and employees to use the metro, buses, pedestrian routes and cycle ways. Of particular significance, the developer is promoting the construction of a new metro station at the northern boundary, with all houses to be within a 15-minute walk to help cope with increased demand together with improvements to local bus services, and provision of an extensive network of cycleways, bridleway and pedestrian routes. The new transport infrastructure will help to address local congestion and air-quality issues.

The masterplan shows that the internal street hierarchy will aim to slow vehicular traffic and prioritise pedestrians and cyclists. The main highway, which also has an important role in relieving wider local congestion, is designed as a high-capacity link road set to a 40mph speed. Speeds of 30mph or below will be applied throughout the development, with opportunities to incorporate shared surfaces and home zones.
Community activity hub

The provision of approximately 1,000 sq m of retail floor space will form the local retail hub at the heart of the community, which provides the opportunity for access to a healthier food environment. When the designs of the hub come forward, issues relating to integration with sustainable travel options, pedestrian accessibility and reducing the need for car parking will all be considered.

Performance and success

Peter believes that the new community at Murton Gap can help make a difference to the lives of existing and new residents as well as the environment. He says, “Just like any good development, if we come into an area and actually cure existing problems whilst at the same time mitigating our own impact, job’s a good one.” The implementation of the infrastructure delivery schedule will be key to ensuring that highways infrastructure, open spaces, health and educational facilities and retail units are brought forward in a timely way through the development process.
Witham St Hugh
Sustainable Village Extension, North Kesteven, Lincolnshire

Phase III of the Witham St Hugh development is a 68-hectare site located north of the existing larger free-standing settlement on the former RAF Swinderby airfield, including housing, a primary school, community buildings, shops and public open space. 1,125 consented dwellings have now been built from previous phases. Strategic land developer Strawsons Property had already readied the land and infrastructure before selling individual plots to housebuilders, such as Persimmon and Taylor Wimpey, for constructing the homes.

Policy context
The development was granted planning permission in September 2016. The current Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, which was adopted in April 2017, includes Policy LP9, “Health and Wellbeing”, which requires a HIA for developments of 25 dwellings or more, or 0.5ha or more for other types of development, contributions to healthcare facilities and other measures to promote access to a healthy food environment. A Central Lincolnshire-wide “Healthy Planning Checklist” has also been designed to assess the potential health impacts of development proposals.

Development details
Uses
1,250 new homes including provision of 150 care/retirement units (C2/C3), 30 hectares of public open spaces and green infrastructure

Developer
Strawsons Property

Year planning permission granted
September 2016

Project costs
£38 million with £8.5 million for section 106 and £7 million for CIL contributions

Local Workshop, 5 September, Witham St Hugh Children’s Centre
The workshop was attended by Strawsons Property, Persimmon, Lincolnshire County Council planning and public health teams, Public Health England, Sport England, The Land Trust and Sustrans.

Participating Partners
Elements of healthy development
Strawsons Property’s property development manager, Adrian Sail, admits that the development has been driven “not so much by the health and wellbeing agenda but more to do with what will be a nice place to live, and therefore people will want to buy houses there”. From the masterplan, it is clear that many elements of a “healthy” development have been considered and incorporated into the planning process.

Open space and play provision
The approach to balance how best to maximise house values with quality of development has resulted in a lower-density development and more than 40% of the land dedicated to open-space provision. Nearly 30 hectares of land will be earmarked for either open space or green infrastructure, exceeding standards set out in the North Kesteven Open Space policy. This will include a sports space (5.06ha), play areas (1.64ha), allotments (1.45ha), attenuation ponds, SuDS (2.26ha) and greenways on road corridors (9.36ha).

Social infrastructure provision
Earlier development phases provided a primary school (Witham St Hughs Academy), a local centre with retail units, a village hall and a children’s play area. While Phase III will not begin construction until midway through 2018, a walking visit during the workshop has shown that, considering its location, the community will need to be supported by a range of community facilities if it is to meet local needs. The parish council has played an important role in identifying the need to improve and expand the capacity of the existing village hall to accommodate indoor sports facilities. The playing fields, which are to be located next to the village hall, will also act as an alleviation pond in the event of a flood. Regarding healthcare, the developer has agreed to make provision for a primary-care facility within the village centre – which the local community requested through section 106 – although the local NHS has also requested a financial contribution for facilities outside the area.

Creating a community for all ages
There is provision for 150 housing units for retirement living within Phase III. These units are located in plots near to the centre of the village, which is in close proximity to the village hall and local shops. One of the project’s design objectives, “To adopt inclusive design, by making the place accessible for all”, written in the design and access statement, reinforces the multi-generational aspiration of Witham St Hughs.

Active by design
The development will follow the Manual for Streets guidance, with an objective to promote health and fitness benefits. The main spine road will be flanked by a lit, shared footway/cycleway, and shared surfaces will be introduced at junctions and where strategic footpaths cross vehicular areas. Cycle provision includes secure cycle storage for the majority of houses and is in proximity to schools, shops and key bus stops. Promotional activities will be carried out by a travel plan coordinator who will monitor the travel plan annually.

Performance and success
Witham St Hughs is in the final phase of development as a free-standing community. It is important that many of the health elements, which Adrian refers to under the umbrella term “place-making”, are installed early by the developer, before houses are constructed on a plot-by-plot basis. Monitoring mechanisms from the housebuilders through homebuyers’ surveys and annual monitoring from the travel plan should yield interesting results.
High Path  
Compact and Connected Neighbourhood,  
Merton, London

The High Path is a 7.2-hectare community of 608 residential dwellings in a mixture of tower blocks, flats, maisonettes and terraced houses, accommodating a mix of different tenures. It is located adjacent to Merton High Street and South Wimbledon Underground station in south west London. Clarion’s director of Merton regeneration, Paul Quinn, and head of Merton regeneration, Tim Sargeant, say that Clarion’s principles “put placemaking at the absolute core”, and that the regeneration is “about health and wellbeing, and longevity of life”, being the “very first principles” they were trying to work to.

Policy context
The draft copy of Merton Council’s Estates local plan sets out the case for regeneration, site analysis and issues and opportunities to support a series of urban design principles for promoting design, each of which enables healthy lifestyle choices and site-specific planning policies relating to movement and access, open space, landscape and environmental protection. A health impact assessment (HIA) was also carried out on the estates local plan, with recommendations for accessibility and active design, access to open spaces, social infrastructure, employment and training, food growing, air and noise pollution.

Elements of healthy development
The regeneration of High Path is expected to provide high-quality and well-designed neighbourhoods, more private open space for residents, better-quality green spaces, community facilities and job-creation opportunities. It will help address many of the health and wellbeing issues identified in the HIA, including existing low levels of participation in sports and exercise, and significantly lower amounts of the population eating five pieces of fruit or vegetables a day. Clarion Housing Group plans to evaluate the impact of the regeneration on health and wellbeing of the estate residents.

Development details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Phase I – 134 new homes as part of the 1,600-dwelling regeneration plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Clarion Housing Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year planning permission granted</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project costs</td>
<td>For phase one, £635 million, including £24.7 million for community infrastructure levy payments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Workshop,  
25 September,  
Merton Hall

The workshop was attended by Clarion Housing Group, Merton Council planning and public health teams and ward councillors, NHS England, Sport England, The Land Trust and Merton Centre for Independent Living.

Participating Partners and further information
www.mertonregen.org.uk/high_path
Better functional open space and play provision
Paul and Tim identified access to open space as a main priority for consideration, given that the wider ward area has lower levels of open space (12.8%) compared to the rest of Merton (35.9%). A landscape strategy has been developed to maximise functional and vibrant spaces around the new estate, including private amenity spaces. There will also be a 4000sq m linear neighbourhood park spanning High Path, leading to the main high street. Phase I also sets out a play strategy to provide safe, stimulating play facilities which are essential to children’s welfare, health and future development. There will be inter-generational play provision which meets the GLA’s play standards for under 5s (480 sq m), located within the communal courtyards, while provision for 5-11-year olds (330 sq m) and 12+ year olds (196.8 sq m) will be accessible from neighbouring facilities.

Improving Estate links and active travel
The estate benefits from good connectivity and transport links and, in particular, proximity to South Wimbledon Underground station (within 250 metres of the site), which will help achieve the increase in values needed to make regeneration viable. The estate enjoys a good Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL), according to Transport for London, being within walking distance of two other underground stations, a number of bus routes (including two 24-hour bus services), London cycle networks and nearby car clubs. The design of the movement network within the estate, which also links to the wider area, aims to ensure that the neighbourhood is easy to navigate and accessible for all users. The use of a travel plan, overseen by a designated travel plan coordinator who is paid by the developer, will help promote sustainable travel behaviour through shared surfaces to “stimulate” people to walk and cycle to destinations, car club membership and the provision of 245 cycle storage spaces, as well as soft measures such as information packs and a community notice board.

Providing high-quality homes
A main driver for the regeneration is the poor quality of the existing post-war housing stock. The council’s Case for Regeneration report says, “The quality and condition of the existing residential stock is in decline and doing nothing is not an option.” Redevelopment of the whole site will provide greater opportunities to address the health and wellbeing of residents, using a “decanting” strategy to keep the existing community together. In addition, 10% of the homes will be wheelchair accessible or “adaptable” units.

Performance and success
There is a strong commercial driver for delivering the regeneration of High Path to the highest quality of environmental and developmental standards. As part of a wider programme of estates regeneration across Merton, the development values accrued at High Path will cross-subsidise the regeneration at neighbouring Eastfields (Mitcham) and Ravensbury (Morden). However, ultimately, Paul Quinn and Tim Sargeant believe that the regeneration will help improve the quality of life of people living in the area, saying that, as a “sizable proportion” will still be their residents, they will still have an ongoing duty of care.
Purfleet Centre Regeneration Ltd (PCRL) is proposing to redevelop 155 acres of brownfield land in Purfleet to create a new heart for the community along the riverside and around the existing railway station. This development features new homes set around a new town centre including schools, a health centre, community facilities, local shops and leisure uses which, importantly, propose to link and integrate the various existing communities. The first phase of the development, which is adjacent to the riverfront, will comprise 1045 new homes, retail and restaurant units, an integrated medical centre and space for community uses.

Policy context
Thurrock Council adopted its Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development Local Plan document in December 2011. Following the publication of the NPPF, the council identified a number of policies which require updating to ensure that they are in full compliance with the NPPF. These updated policies were adopted by the council in January 2015. In March 2017 the council published a new design strategy which seeks to promote active design and planning healthy weight environments across the borough. Thurrock is currently in the process of preparing a new local plan.

Elements of healthy development
Ken Dytor, executive chairman of Urban Catalyst and joint founder of PCRL, highlights the importance of a good relationship between development and the health sector, and is supportive of aspirations to incorporate healthy, active living at the heart of its design. It has resulted in PCRL committing to making Purfleet a healthy place to live and helping to meet the vision of the local health and wellbeing strategy to “add years to life and life to years”, where Thurrock is a place that “people live long lives which are full of opportunity, allowing everyone to achieve their potential”.

The PCRL design is based on creating a walkable community with a modal shift to sustainable, healthy modes of movement. The development is currently evolving through the integration of “smart footprinting”, with co-locations and intensity of uses. This helps to achieve the company’s core goals (as stated in their “vision”); that it is a healthy environment, with places and communities that keep people well and independent.

Health needs assessment
The foundation for considering healthy living in Purfleet was initiated following the production of a health-needs assessment, which was published in early 2016. It was commissioned by a range of partners, including NHS Thurrock CCG and Thurrock Council, to assess the health and wellbeing needs of the current and future population of Purfleet and its locality area, highlighting issues such as high levels of child and adult obesity and poor air quality. It also included levels of health-service provision for primary, secondary, specialist and adult social care, and used this to propose recommendations for the service mix within the new town centre. Importantly, the plan sets out wider considerations for the Purfleet area, including promoting active travel, managing air quality, providing good-quality green and open spaces, employment opportunities and access to healthy food.

Development details
Uses
Up to 2,850 new homes; a new primary school; a new state-of-the-art media, film, and TV complex; town centre and retail spaces; and community, health and education facilities

Developer
Purfleet Centre Regeneration Limited (Urban Catalyst, Regeneration Investments Ltd., Swan Commercial Services Ltd, Keltbray and Sir Tim Laurence) and Thurrock Council

Year planning permission granted
Outline planning application submitted December 2017

Project costs
£1bn (approx.)

Local Workshop, 27 September, High House Production park
The workshop was undertaken as a special “Local Plan Developer Forum” on health and wellbeing. The forum meets quarterly and welcomes housebuilders, major employers, strategic land agents, investors and housing associations. Speakers on the day included Public Health England, Sport England, David Lock Associates, PCRL and members of the Purfleet Community Forum.

Participating Partners and further information
www.ourpurfleet.com

thurrock.gov.uk
Active and healthy design
Thurrock Council held its first summit on “Health, Well-being and Planning” on September 21 2016, focusing on the opportunities of active design. Delegates were presented with Sport England’s ten “Active Design principles” and were shown how these have been used to inform and consider the masterplan for Purfleet. Building on these principles, PCRL will design the Purfleet masterplan to create an environment which makes the active choice the easiest and most attractive option for residents, improving footways, cycle routes and the “Riverwalk”, and linking the new town centre to the renowned RSPB nature reserve at Rainham Marshes.

Linking education and employment opportunities
Opportunities for education and employment in the creative and media industries will be made possible through the delivery of a state-of-the-art film and television studio complex. PCRL will explore how further training and employment opportunities can be offered to take advantage of the various studios and new schools in the area, addressing the employment and educational profiles set out in the health-needs assessment. In particular, with the new designation of the National College for the Creative Industries on the existing High House Production Park site, there will be a focus on digital skills training.

Performance and success
Ken reflects on positive feedback from local communities and stakeholders regarding PCRL’s approach to the development. He believes its approach to development is more powerful in the way that it begins by asking, “How can you meet a healthy development?” rather than just considering how much green space can be provided. By promoting a flexible masterplanning framework from which to work, taking into account changing future and the advantages, Purfleet has the potential to realise its ambitions to become a healthy and active new community.
Barton Park
Healthy New Town, Oxford

Selected as one of England’s ten NHS England Healthy New Towns, Barton Park, once developed, will provide much needed housing, 40% of which will be social housing, integrated into the existing suburban Barton community. The new town has also acted as a catalyst for Oxford City Council to fund a significant regeneration programme with existing communities in parallel to the development.

Grosvenor Britain & Ireland partnered with Oxford City Council, the landowner of the 38-hectare site, to promote and deliver the land and infrastructure required for this regeneration. Grosvenor’s director of development, Alex Robinson, says: “We established an incredibly productive partnership with NHS England, Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council to shape this Healthy New Town. With new homes, a primary school, a linear park, sporting facilities and a community hub, Barton Park will be an exceptional, integrated neighbourhood offering amenities and community services to new and existing residents.” Oxford City Council and Barton Oxford LLP Director Jackie Yates said: “Barton Park has been a catalyst for regeneration, providing a focus on improving quality of life and health-inequalities issues. It has enabled improved health and community facilities to be developed that are relevant, accessible and complementary for both existing and new residents.”

Policy context
The 2012 Barton Area Action Plan sets ambitions to deliver “a strong and balanced community” and “an environment that promotes community safety, healthy living and well-being”. The Oxford Local Plan 2036 (Preferred Options) proposes policies that require health impact assessments to be undertaken for major developments on space standards, green infrastructure, allotments and travel plans.

Elements of healthy development
Barton Park embodies many of the elements of a healthy development. It promotes walking and cycling, provides social spaces to encourage natural gathering points and community engagement, and has a strong green infrastructure network. In addition, Grosvenor sees the health of the existing community at Barton, which is situated just beyond its site’s boundary, as being a key feature of the development to shape residents’ wellbeing. The company has created a new community engagement manager, and, under the section 106 agreement, the joint venture will bring funding for a significantly expanded GP surgery at the Barton Neighbourhood Centre; new and improved outdoor sports facilities; improvements to existing secondary school education; support for health and social care; and strategic transport provision.

Development details
Uses
A mix of 885 new homes, 40% of which are social; 2,500 sq m of retail; a 3,000 sq m community hub that includes a primary school; and 12.29 ha of public open space

Developer
Barton Oxford LLP (Grosvenor Developments Ltd and Oxford City Council)

Year planning permission granted
Outline planning permission granted in October 2013, with subsequent reserved matters applications in 2015 and 2016

Project costs
£50 million excluding land costs (£15 million for section 106, £35 million for infrastructure)

Local Workshop, 28 September 2017, Barton Neighbourhood Centre

The workshop was held jointly with BOB: MK Urban Design Network and was attended by Grosvenor, Oxford City Council, and Oxfordshire County Council’s planning, transport, urban design and public health teams, Public Health England, NHS England, Sport England and The Land Trust and other councils in the Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Milton Keynes area.

Participating Partners and further information
www.bartonparkoxford.com
Driving quality through the design code and design development

The LLP’s design code sets site-wide principles, standards and benchmarks to frame and create a high-quality pedestrian and cycling network, streetscape, public realm and street furniture, cycle parking and building design. To meet the demands of this design code, housebuilders are required to appoint architects and submit detailed designs in their reserved matters, with the appointment of the architect being approved by the LLP in advance. Grosvenor recognises the need for housebuilders to support this process, and believes that, with it, quality development can be delivered and maintained across the site.

High-quality open space, play and recreational amenities

Barton Park will enjoy a comprehensive network of green infrastructure that includes a 3.84-hectare linear park along Bayswater Brook, accessible from all homes, representing one tenth of the total development site. Four green corridors, or “greenways”, (2.93ha) will link the linear park on the northern boundary with the open space and existing vegetation on the southern boundary while also providing space for informal children’s play.

The developer will connect Barton and Northway communities with three new fit, sports and nature trails, supported by complementary way finding which promotes healthy behaviours and encourages integration between areas. A new sports pavilion will be delivered, including 1.6 ha of sports provision with adult and junior pitches, a 3G artificial pitch, a multi-use games area, an 82x54 grass pitch and an improved community garden (1.17ha) south of the existing newly extended and enhanced allotments.

Performance and success

A strong Barton Healthy New Town governance structure between Oxford City Council, Grosvenor, Oxfordshire County Council Public Health and Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group keeps health a high priority for the area. A key part of the Healthy New Towns project is the creation of a new baseline for health, wellbeing and health inequality, based on data and primary research, to guide the project’s future physical and service plans. In Oxford, a health impact assessment was carried out in May 2017 to identify the potential for enhancing Barton Park’s masterplan, the design of the neighbourhood centre and the redevelopment of Underhill Circus, the local retail centre in Barton.

This will see an improved health and community hub accessible to residents within three months of first occupancy, providing enhanced health services which address the health and wellbeing issues identified by the baseline research for existing and projected populations. Co-designed with the community and supported by the voluntary sector this will aim to improve access to initiatives such as social prescribing but also deliver better utilisation of community assets to help address inequalities faced by existing residents.

Evaluation is another key plank. The Barton Healthy New Town project has been independently assessed for its early impact, efficiency and effectiveness as a healthy new town in the first year of the programme. Subsequent quarterly reporting has highlighted, amongst other things, milestones reached, alongside engagement with and commitment from housebuilders to the health elements of the design code.
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## Annex 1.

### Local population health profiles at local authority and ward levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>England average</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health *</th>
<th>Income deprivation a</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons c</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults b</th>
<th>Adult Obesity b</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight b</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>17.9% (CI: 1.4-18.4%)</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Berry Hill (Nottinghamshire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health</th>
<th>Income deprivation</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults</th>
<th>Adult Obesity</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield (LA)</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.7% (CI: 13.7-19.7)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Hill (Ward)</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindhurst (Ward)</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ransom Wood (Ward)</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canada Water (Southwark)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health</th>
<th>Income deprivation</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults</th>
<th>Adult Obesity</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwark (LA)</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>15.3% (CI: 9.9-20.6)</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherhithe (Ward)</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Docks (Ward)</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Colindale Gardens (Barnet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health</th>
<th>Income deprivation</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults</th>
<th>Adult Obesity</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnet (LA)</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>22.0% (CI: 15.8-28.2)</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colindale (Ward)</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unity (Doncaster)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health</th>
<th>Income deprivation</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults</th>
<th>Adult Obesity</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster (LA)</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.3% (CI: 14.9-23.7)</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield (Ward)</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainforth &amp; Moorends (Ward)</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Murton (North Tyneside)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health</th>
<th>Income deprivation</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults</th>
<th>Adult Obesity</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside (LA)</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.8%* (CI: 6.4-23.2)</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkseaton South (Ward)</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Witham St Hugh’s (Lincolnshire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health</th>
<th>Income deprivation</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults</th>
<th>Adult Obesity</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Kesteven (LA)</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>19.0% (CI: 15.6-22.5)</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle, Swinderby &amp; Witham St. Hugh’s (Ward)</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### High Path (Merton)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health</th>
<th>Income deprivation</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults</th>
<th>Adult Obesity</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merton (LA)</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>16.5%* (CI: 8.1-24.8)</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey (Ward)</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purfleet Centre (Thurrock)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health</th>
<th>Income deprivation</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults</th>
<th>Adult Obesity</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock (LA)</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>36.9%* (CI: 15.5-58.3)</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Thurrock and South Stifford (Ward)</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aveley and Uplands (Ward)</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belhus (Ward)</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ockendon (Ward)</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Barton Park (Oxfordshire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Good or Very Good Health</th>
<th>Income deprivation</th>
<th>Utilisation of outdoor space for exercise/health reasons</th>
<th>Healthy Eating Adults</th>
<th>Adult Obesity</th>
<th>Reception Year Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
<th>Year 6 Obese &amp; Excess Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford (LA)</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>24.4% (CI: 19.8-29.0)</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton &amp; Sandhills (Ward)</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources:

- b Public Health England Local Health tool: [http://www.localhealth.org.uk/#l=en;v=map7](http://www.localhealth.org.uk/#l=en;v=map7). Ward data estimated from MSOA level data

* value based on effective sample size <100