

HEALTHY BUILT ENVIRONMENT LINKAGES A TOOLKIT FOR DESIGN • PLANNING • HEALTH

HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS



PROMOTING EQUITY • ACCESS • DESIGN FOR ALL AGES

Prepared for Tannis Cheadle, Provincial Manager,
Population & Public Health and Andrew Tugwell,
Provincial Director, Population & Public Health
by: Erik Lees, Heidi Redman and Lukas Holy of
LEES+Associates

This toolkit is a project of the PHSA Population
& Public Health team under the leadership of the
Healthy Built Environment Alliance (HBEA).

For more information contact:

Tannis Cheadle, MSW
Provincial Health Services Authority
700 – 1380 Burrard St.
Vancouver, BC
V6Z 2H3 Canada
604.675.7421
pph@phsa.ca

Andrew Tugwell, MPH, B.Ed
Provincial Health Services Authority
700 – 1380 Burrard St.
Vancouver, BC
V6Z 2H3 Canada
604.875.7356
pph@phsa.ca

www.phsa.ca/populationhealth

What is the built environment?

The phrase “built environment” refers to the human-made or modified physical surroundings in which people live, work and play. These places and spaces include our homes, communities, schools, workplaces, parks/recreations areas, business areas and transportation systems, and vary in size from large-scale urban areas to smaller rural developments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The toolkit is organized into different “layers” as follows:

Project Overview	6
Overview of the project including the toolkit purpose, who might use it, and how.	
Approach	10
Description of the methodology used to review the evidence and inform the toolkit content.	
User Guide: Will it Work in My Community?	14
Important questions to keep in mind when using the toolkit, in order to determine whether or not (and how) particular planning principles could be applied in your community. These questions are related to context, quality of evidence, urban vs. non-urban considerations and equity and access.	
Physical Features of a Healthy Built Environment	15
Visual depiction of the five physical features of a healthy built environment.	
Planning Principles	16
List of planning principles for a healthy built environment, organized by each of the five physical features.	
Fact Sheet	17
More information about how planning principles can impact health related outcomes. In some cases the evidence is described in more detail, and in others more detail is provided about the planning principles themselves.	
Linkages Summary	21
Summary sheet for the transportation networks physical feature. For each planning principle, vision statements are identified, and impacts and associated health related outcomes are indicated.	
Health Evidence Diagram	22
Diagram based on the collective evidence review visually depicting the linkages and strength of evidence and direction of effect between planning principles, impacts and health related outcomes. It is an intermediate step to bridge the collective evidence base with the linkages summary and fact sheet.	
Glossary of Terms	23



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Who developed this resource?

This resource is one of a series of products developed under the leadership of BC's Healthy Built Environment Alliance (HBEA) – a network that brings together public health professions, design professions and land use planning professional organizations to better understand the impact of the built environment on health and well-being, and to provide leadership for healthier, more livable communities. Additional resources can be found at:

www.phsa.ca/populationhealth

This toolkit draws on many sources for which we are grateful. In particular, members of the HBE Linkages Toolkit Working Group and Advisory Groups provided invaluable feedback and advice at all stages of the work.

HBE Linkages Toolkit Working Group

- Tannis Cheadle, PHSA
- Dr. Lisa Mu, Medical Consultant
- Dr. Helena Swinkels, Fraser Health
- Claire Gram, Vancouver Coastal Health
- Pam Moore, Interior Health
- Gary Stephen, City of Kelowna
- Dr. Karen Rideout, BC Centre for Disease Control
- Dr. Catherine Elliott, BC Centre for Disease Control
- Dr. Sophie Verhille, National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health
- David Widdis, Regional District of Central Okanagan

Healthy Neighbourhood Design and Healthy Transportation Networks - Advisory Group

- Dr. Lisa Mu, Medical Consultant
- Tina Atva, Urban Systems
- Hazel Christy, Canadian Institute of Planners, Christy & Associates Planning Consultants
- Lauren Klose, Metro Vancouver
- Pam Moore, Interior Health
- Dr. Meghan Winters, Simon Fraser University
- Peter Truch, Opus Consulting
- Alan Callander, Ministry of Transportation
- Heather Evans, Heather Evans Consulting
- Dr. Luisa Giles, BC Centre for Disease Control, National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health
- Michelle Sandsmark, MPH Student, University of Victoria

Healthy Natural Environments - Advisory Group

- Dr. Lisa Mu, Medical Consultant
- Erin Embley, Metro Vancouver
- Ben Finkelstein, Ministry of Environment
- Matt Herman, Ministry of Health
- Murray Kopp, RD of Central Okanagan
- Dr. Patrick Mooney, University of BC
- Helene Roberge, Ministry of Environment
- Mary Storzer, Ministry of Community, Sport & Cultural Development
- Narissa Chadwick, Ministry of Community, Sport & Cultural Development
- Dr. Larry Frank, University of BC
- Lauren Klose, Metro Vancouver
- Bryan Melnyk, Ministry of Health
- Kris Ord, Ministry of Environment
- Ted Sheldon, Ministry of Environment
- Oonagh Tyson, Fraser Health
- Winnie Yu, Ministry of Health

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Healthy Food Systems - Advisory Group

- Dr. Karen Rideout, BC Centre for Disease Control
- Jen Casorso, City of Kamloops
- Claire Gram, Vancouver Coastal Health
- Maren Luciani, City of Kamloops
- Luke Sales, Town of Qualicum Beach
- Kristina Bouris, City of Victoria
- Janine de la Salle, Urban Food Strategies
- Melanie Kurrein, PHSA
- Naseam Ahmadi, MSc Student, University of BC

Healthy Housing - Advisory Group

- Dr. Lisa Mu, Medical Consultant
- Dr. Atiya Mahmood, Simon Fraser University
- Lori Bowie, City of Surrey
- Margaret Eberle, Metro Vancouver
- Breann Specht, Vancouver Coastal Health
- Linda Dix-Cooper, BC Centre for Disease Control
- Victoria Domonkos, MPH Student, University of Victoria

PROJECT OVERVIEW

This foundational document is intended to:

- Facilitate conversations between public health practitioners, planners and others involved in land-use and transportation planning.
- Assist toolkit users in applying health evidence.
- Inform built environment decision-making processes.
- Be a navigational tool to the literature, directing people to further information.

What are we trying to do?

We want to link community design, planning and health. Public health, community planners, and others involved in the design of, and decision making for communities share a responsibility to promote active living approaches and to shape healthier built environments.

The Linkages Toolkit provides consistent evidence-based and expert-informed messages for use in communications and discussion around health and the built environment. It provides a roadmap for emerging and innovative evidence.

The toolkit content is grouped by five physical features of the built environment: neighbourhood design, transportation networks, natural environments, housing, and food systems. For each physical feature, evidence has been assessed and the information is organized according to vision statements, planning principles, impacts, and health-related outcomes.

Who might use this resource?

The primary audience for the Linkages Toolkit is public health practitioners involved in healthy built environment work, planners, design professionals and land-use and transportation planning professionals such as architects and engineers, and others involved in the design of communities such as decision-makers in municipal and regional governments. We intend for this resource to serve as a conversation-starter between public health practitioners and these various audiences.

How might this resource be used?

We anticipate that different individuals or groups might use different layers of this toolkit for various purposes depending on the audience and setting. For example, the Healthy Built Environment Linkages diagram and planning principles (pg.15-16) are communication pieces that could be used to articulate the many ways in which the five physical features contribute to health and to show others how they have a role to play, by highlighting intersections between different sectors and stakeholders. The Health Evidence Diagrams that articulate the strength of evidence (pg. 43-47) might be of most interest to health and planning professionals who want to dig deeper into, and potentially add to the evidence base.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

More specific examples of how this tool might be used:

- As a framework for organizing information and presentations at workshops, webinars or conferences on the healthy built environment.
- As a starting point for informing the development of funding proposals, briefing documents or background papers to obtain support for healthy built environment work.
- To provide and organize background information in staff reports on certain policy and program issues (e.g., new community gardens, new subsidized housing developments, and support for the development of transit networks).
- As a framework to help guide the creation of, and content for long-range plans and strategies (e.g., Official Community Plans, Neighbourhood Plans, Park Master Plans, and Transportation Plans).
- As a basis for partnership in order to carry out activities that are important to the community but fall outside the direct role of local governments (e.g., new school programs, delivery of community food security programs).

Note: We recognize that there are some planning principles over which certain audiences have no direct control. We felt it was important, however, that this toolkit include the entire range of planning principles necessary for healthy built environments.

How did we decide what information to include in the resource?

This is a foundational document. Our intention was to develop a core set of principles that would ideally be addressed in any planning process. The principles were not intended to be a prescriptive list which dictates HBE principles to planners and local government. They are at a high enough level that some of the elements can be applied differently in different settings (i.e., rural, suburban, and urban).

The following criteria helped us make decisions about which principles to include in the toolkit:

- Concentrate on principles for which the evidence is strongest, however, at the same time be mindful of groupings or elements which might be unfairly rejected due to a lack of evidence at this time, or are difficult to study with traditional epidemiological methods.
- Include information that is relevant to planners and developers and is relevant at the municipal level.
- Focus on areas where health can bring value in terms of information and evidence to the planning table.
- Aim to be short, digestible and clear.
- Avoid being prescriptive.
- Avoid being overly specific to particular settings or types of communities.
- Avoid micro-level elements such as specific design targets or performance measures.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

How is this different from other planning toolkits out there?

This resource works through the entire pathway of tracking what happens between planning principles and health outcomes. In some cases this toolkit may highlight principles or relationships that are already commonly included in planning processes, but it adds the weight of health evidence behind them. The content is evidence-based and expert-informed.

This resource is essentially a communications toolkit that identifies and describes linkages and relationships, and provides a framework for thinking and talking about health and the built environment – it will not tell you how to do the work – there are many other tools and resources available that provide that information. This resource is intended to be a conversation starter regarding “what” to do. To learn more about “how” to best implement these principles, see resources like:

planh.ca

PlanH supports local government engagement and partnerships across sectors for creating healthier communities and provides learning opportunities, resources, and leading-edge practices for collaborative local action. The PlanH website complements the Linkages Toolkit by providing information about available resources (e.g., publications, links, videos, action guides), training & support, funding opportunities, success stories and events. The website is a gateway to more resources.

www.uphn.ca/CLASP/

With funding from the Canadian Partnership Against Cancer’s “Coalitions Linking Action and Science for Prevention (CLASP)” program, the Healthy Canada by Design CLASP initiative is uniting existing and emerging cross-sector efforts in six health regions across Canada to promote healthy built environments. This website provides an overview of the CLASP projects, and tools & resources to support policy-makers, public health officials, planners and developers in facilitating the creation of more health promoting communities across Canada.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

www.cip-icu.ca

The Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP) is a collaborative national federation working on behalf of planners and the planning profession to serve as the national voice for Canada's planning community. The CIP website outlines its 2012-2014 Strategic Plan, and provides links to CIP publications (e.g., CIP Professional Practise Manual) and national and international projects (this section highlights some of the projects that CIP members are currently involved in as well as summaries on completed projects). National projects include collaborative work with First Nations' communities and organizations to enhance land use planning within First Nations' communities, and the launch of the Climate Change Impacts Adaptation program funded by Natural Resources Canada. The CIP has been engaged in various international projects for over 20 years as a way to build education and awareness, develop employment and business opportunities, and assist in international cooperation and development.

www.ncceh.ca/en/additional_resources?topic=89&subtopic=159

The National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health (NCCEH) is one of six collaborating centres across Canada created for the purpose of fostering linkages within the public health community. The built environment is currently one of NCCEH's major project areas. The NCCEH has developed an annotated inventory of resources on the built environment developed in partnership with the Canadian Institute of Planners, the Urban Public Health Network (UPHN), and the Canadian Partnership Against Cancer's CLASP initiative. These resources include readiness assessment tools, fact sheets, case studies, as well as evidence reviews.

APPROACH

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

We conducted a literature review process for each of the five physical features. Please see the Evidence Review Methodology section for an overview of the steps. Key information gathered from individual studies was organized into a spreadsheet that included details such as: study design, target population, independent and dependent variables, and reviewer assessments made about the studies such as confidence in findings, and a quality assessment of the source.

We established advisory groups consisting largely of planners, but also including content experts (e.g. academics) for each of the physical features. During the literature review process, advisory group members provided advice and guidance on planning principles on which to base initial evidence searches, highlighted areas requiring further research, provided feedback on the emerging research links, made suggestions for key resources to access, and provided guidance regarding appropriate language.

We used data from the individual studies to create a collective evidence base by systematically clustering together study findings. A grading system developed by PHSA (see the Grading System description for more detail) was then applied to the collective evidence base to assess the strength of the study findings supporting the various links between planning principles, impacts and health outcomes. The results formed the basis for all the toolkit resources. The strength of the evidence is depicted in the Evidence Summary graphics using different types of lines (see the legend in each of the graphics on pg. 43-47).

It is important to note that in many cases the evidence is indirect – there is sometimes little evidence showing that a particular planning principle is directly associated with a specific health outcome. In these cases, we were more effectively able to make the links between the broad planning principles and the health outcomes indirectly (i.e. via the impacts).

The concepts of equity, accessibility and design for all ages are addressed to varying extents in this toolkit. The literature on whether and how planning principles promote equity is scarce but was considered where it was available. Accessibility was addressed in the housing and neighbourhood design sections. Evidence is still emerging in these areas, and future reviews could consider looking more systematically at all of these concepts.

EVIDENCE REVIEW METHODOLOGY

An overview of the evidence review for each of the five physical features is as follows:

1. Conducted an initial scoping literature review to gain a sense of the breadth and depth of the available research related to planning principles, impacts and health outcomes.
2. Drafted an initial set of planning principles from which to work.
3. Used the draft principles on which to base a more thorough literature review using multiple academic databases – this search was focused on attaining peer-reviewed, systematic reviews from reputable scientific journals.
4. Consulted other types of recently published high quality, primary research (e.g., peer reviewed journals and grey literature) when an insufficient number of systematic reviews was available for a specific topic.




APPROACH

For a more thorough description of the evidence review methodology, please connect with the project leaders. Their contact information is available on pg.2.

GRADING SYSTEM

Once the collective evidence base was created, a grading system developed by PHSA was applied to assess the strength of evidence for the links between planning principles, impacts and health outcomes. This system was informed by existing grading systems and tailored to suit the needs of this project. It classified the evidence links according to criteria such as the number, type and quality of included studies, consistency between studies, and degree of confidence in the collective findings. Where evidence was limited, the expert knowledge of the advisory group members was also factored into the link strength and used to identify additional areas of study that should be reflected in the toolkit. The following link strengths appear in legends on the Health Evidence Diagrams (pg. 43-47).

Health Evidence Diagram Legend








Thicker, darker lines indicate stronger relationships. Coloured bubbles around the impacts and outcomes (as compared to grey bubbles) mean the evidence is clearer about this effect. Below are explanations of the symbols used in the legends.

- Strong:** Consistent findings from good quality research.
- Moderate:** Link is supported by research, but is lacking in terms of quality or consistency.
- Inconclusive:** Inconsistent findings, often from a limited number of studies. No conclusions can be drawn from the research we reviewed.
- Expert opinion:** We found no or a very limited number of studies, but the link is supported by expert knowledge.
- New research area:** A search has been undertaken, but there is insufficient research to indicate “moderate” or “strong” strength of evidence because the research topic is new and the evidence is still emerging.
- Negative effect:** Red arrows indicate an undesirable change.
- No effect:** Null symbol indicates the research shows no change in the impact or outcome.
- Question marks:** Indicate that direction of change is not known because there is either insufficient or inconsistent evidence, or because we have not yet searched for evidence.
- For future evidence review:** Grey circles indicate that we have not yet searched for evidence, but inclusion of the impact or outcome is recommended by expert advice or a search has been done, but we have not yet had the time to thoroughly review the evidence.

APPROACH

Linkages Summary Legend

	Positive effect
	Negative effect
	No effect
	Conflicting evidence on direction of effect
	For future evidence review

The legends included in the Linkages Summaries (pg. 38-42) summarize the directionality of the impacts and health related outcomes as related to the planning principles. The Linkages Summaries are different from the Health Evidence Diagrams in that they don't graphically depict the strengths of evidence, but rather focus on the directionality of the impact and health related outcome relationships. Below are explanations of the symbols used in the legends.

- Positive effect:** Coloured circles indicate a desirable change.
- Negative effect:** Red circles indicate an undesirable change.
- No effect:** Null symbol indicates research shows no change in the impact or outcome.
- Up arrow:** Indicates an increase in the effect.
- Down arrow:** Indicates a decrease in the effect.
- Unknown direction of effect:** Question marks indicate that direction of change is not known because there is either insufficient or inconsistent research, or because we have not yet searched for research.
- For future evidence review:** Grey circles indicate that the effect was predicted by expert knowledge, to be confirmed by future research review, or that the effect was predicted by some review of the evidence, but we did not have time to thoroughly review the evidence to confirm this effect.

APPROACH

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

While we acknowledge that policy strongly influences the built environment, there was a careful decision made to focus on the physical features of the outdoor built environment and their respective health related outcomes. Physical features were generally restricted to larger scale elements.

We were limited by time and resource constraints in our evidence review and therefore focused primarily on systematic reviews. One limitation of this strategy is that more recent primary studies have not yet been included in published reviews. In other cases, we think there is probably evidence out there but we either couldn't find it, didn't have time to find it, or research hasn't yet been done in the particular area. There may be evidence in case studies, qualitative evidence or promising practices that were not explored in our search. As such, we view this toolkit as an initial stage in building a comprehensive evidence base for links between the planning principles and health related outcomes.

Even with these limitations, we are confident that the toolkit is a good representation of the most important elements of a healthy built environment. We used information from the evidence review combined with expert input from the advisory groups to guide the content. The toolkit is therefore evidence-based and expert-informed.

USER GUIDE

WILL IT WORK IN MY COMMUNITY?

PLANNING YOUR COMMUNITY

When using the toolkit, keep the following in mind:

Context is key: is it right for my community?

When deciding if interventions are right for your community, it is important to consider factors such as the location and population of your community, existing community health issues, community preferences, as well as the context of the research supporting the interventions¹. These considerations will help to determine if the planning approach is applicable or transferable to your community, and if they can be successfully implemented. Rather than a prescriptive set of rules, the material in this toolkit provides a starting point to ***ask the right questions in your local context.***

Quality of evidence: how much do we know?

Academic research regarding links between the built environment and health has increased at a rapid rate over the last five to ten years. However, a number of methodological issues and gaps still exist in the literature. This resource is intended to facilitate ***evidence-informed decisions*** that take into account the context in which decisions are made.

Non-urban areas: what new opportunities exist?

Much of the research linking community planning and design with health has focused on the urban environment. ***Ways in which the physical environments of non-urban areas affect health is less well known.*** Strategies that have worked in urban environments may be successful in non-urban settings; however, it is important to make evidence-informed decisions and consider the local context when planning to implement new strategies. As such, strategies to support or improve health in non-urban communities may be different.

Equity and access: who will be included?

Care must be taken ***to ensure the community's most vulnerable members are supported.*** Apply an "equity lens" with an emphasis on age- and child-friendly design, and supporting vulnerable populations, such as those with low incomes, mental illness or disabilities.

Why link community design, planning and health?

Public health practitioners, community planners, designers and decision-makers in municipal and regional governments share a responsibility to promote active living, and to shape healthier built environments in order to promote good health.

What is the built environment?

The phrase "built environment" refers to the human-made or modified physical surroundings in which people live, work and play. These places and spaces include our homes, communities, schools, workplaces, parks/recreations areas, business areas and transportation systems, and vary in size from large-scale urban areas to smaller rural developments.

¹Contextual considerations identified in this user guide were informed by work conducted by Nicholas Smith in 2012 for Dr. Helena Swinkels, MHO, Fraser Health.

PHYSICAL FEATURES OF A HEALTHY BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Healthy Neighbourhood Design

Vision:
Neighbourhoods where people can easily connect with each other and with a variety of day-to-day services.

Healthy Transportation Networks

Vision:
Safe and accessible transportation systems that incorporate a diversity of transportation modes and place priority on active transport (e.g., cycling, walking and transit) over the use of private vehicles.

Healthy Housing

Vision:
Affordable, accessible, and good quality housing for all that is free of hazards and enables people to engage in activities of daily living while optimizing their health.



Healthy Natural Environments

Vision:
a built environment where natural environments are protected and natural elements are incorporated, and are experienced by and accessible to all.

Healthy Food Systems

Vision:
A built environment that can support access to and availability of healthy foods for all.

PROMOTING EQUITY • ACCESS • DESIGN FOR ALL AGES



PLANNING PRINCIPLES FOR A HEALTHY BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Healthy Neighbourhood Design



1. Enhance neighbourhood walkability
2. Create mixed land use
3. Build complete and compact neighbourhoods
4. Enhance connectivity with efficient and safe networks
5. Prioritize new developments within or beside existing communities

Vision: Neighbourhoods where people can easily connect with each other and with a variety of day-to-day services.

Healthy Transportation Networks



1. Enable mobility for all ages and abilities
2. Make active transportation convenient and safe
3. Prioritize safety
4. Encourage use of public transit
5. Enable attractive road, rail and waterway networks

Vision: Safe and accessible transportation systems that incorporate a diversity of transportation modes and place priority on active transport (e.g., cycling, walking and transit) over the use of private vehicles.

Healthy Natural Environments



1. Preserve and connect open space and environmentally sensitive areas
2. Maximize opportunities to access and engage with the natural environment
3. Reduce urban air pollution
4. Mitigate urban heat island effect

Vision: A built environment where natural environments are protected and natural elements are incorporated, and are experienced by and accessible to all.

Healthy Food Systems



1. Enhance agricultural capacity
2. Increase access to healthy foods in all neighbourhoods
3. Improve community-scale food infrastructure and services

Vision: A built environment that can support access to and availability of healthy foods for all.

Healthy Housing



1. Increase access to affordable housing through provision of diverse housing forms and tenure types
2. Ensure adequate housing quality for all segments of society
3. Prioritize housing for the homeless, elderly, low income groups, and people with disabilities
4. Site and zone housing developments to minimize exposure

Vision: Affordable, accessible, and good quality housing for all that is free of hazards and enables people to engage in activities of daily living while optimizing their health.

The order in which the physical features and principles are listed is not necessarily an indication of their priority or strength of evidence.

HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS FACT SHEET



SUMMARY

Transportation networks enable us to travel from place to place as we go about our daily lives. **How we design our transportation networks can have a significant impact on our health.** In the public realm, land use decisions influence the choices people make in how they move around. Consider, for instance, a person's decision on how to commute to work: the convenience of taking public transit, the safety of cycling and the distance and time it takes to walk. These factors all influence the preferred means of transport. Prioritizing "active transportation" (primarily walking, cycling and the use of public transit) and encouraging mobility of all people, can help achieve an increase in physical activity which can lead to better mental and physical health.


Vision:

Safe and accessible transportation systems that incorporate a diversity of transportation modes and place priority on active transport (e.g., cycling, walking and transit) over the use of private vehicles.

WHAT DO HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS LOOK LIKE?

Planning Principle:

1. Enable mobility for all ages and abilities



Promote safer streets and encourage physical activity.

- Improving streetscape aesthetics and making streets more usable by providing sidewalks, crosswalks, lighting and benches are all factors associated with an increase in physical activity among older adults.
- Research suggests that people belonging to ethnic minorities or those of low socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to walk or cycle to school, making it especially important that these groups have good access to active transport infrastructure.
- Traffic calming methods such as narrow traffic lanes and residential traffic diversion can reduce traffic speed and volume, which reduces pedestrian and cyclist injury and encourages active transportation.




HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS FACT SHEET



Planning Principle:

2. Make active transportation convenient and safe




Encourage the decision to cycle, walk, or use transit through smart infrastructure and engineering choices.

- Separated bike lanes alongside major city routes, quiet residential bikeways, off-street bike paths and traffic signage have all been shown to be effective ways to encourage bike use.
- Providing easy access to trails and paths can encourage walking and cycling for active transport. Trails and paths should be located within residential areas to improve accessibility.
- Numerous studies have found that on-road marked bike lanes reduce rates of injury and collision while cycling.



Planning Principle:

3. Prioritize safety



Establish a hierarchy of street users, giving priority to walking, cycling, and public transit, rather than private vehicles.

- Traffic calming features such as narrow lanes and street trees are associated with an increase in walking.
- Street safety improvements such as red-light cameras, left turn lanes and separated cycle routes have been shown to greatly decrease the occurrence of traffic collisions and injuries among all road users.
- Interventions to reduce neighbourhood crime rates could potentially improve physical activity levels, especially among older adults.




HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS FACT SHEET




Planning Principle:

4. Encourage use of public transit




Enable the decision to use public transit by making it safe, convenient and accessible to everyone.

- Providing bike parking shelters and bike racks at bus stations has been shown to encourage the use of public transit.
- Convenient access to public transit can encourage equality by enhancing mobility among a wide range of vulnerable groups including children, older adults, women and people with disabilities.
- It is important to provide well maintained, safe access to transit stops. Achieving this can result in increased levels of physical activity since people often get to and from transit stops on foot or by bike.
- The relationship between use of public transit and effects of air pollution is an emerging area of study. While the use of transit helps lower overall ambient air pollution levels, it may be associated with higher personal exposure to air pollution.



Planning Principle:

5. Enable attractive road, rail, and waterway networks



Encourage the use of active transport by enhancing the experience of cycling and walking.

- Studies linking aesthetic features to active transportation have mixed results. However, some evidence suggests that improving neighbourhood aesthetics, especially in parks, can promote physical activity, including walking, and cycling.
- There is some indication that signs of street decay, such as trash and vandalism can decrease levels of physical activity, especially among older adults.



HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS FACT SHEET



REFERENCES


- Romain, C., J.M. Oppert, C. Weber, H. Charreire, P. Salze, D. Badariotti, A. Banos, C. Fischler, C. Giacoman Hernandez, B. Chaix and C. Simon. "Determinants of Childhood Obesity: What Can we Learn from Built Environment Studies?" *Food Quality and Preference*, (2011).
- Coupland, K., S. Rikhy, K. Hill, and D. McNeil. "State of the Evidence: The Built Environment and Health 2011-2015." *Public Health Innovation and Decision Support, Population & Public Health*, Alberta Health Services, (2011).
- Durand, C. P., M. Andalib, G. F. Dunton, J. Wolch and M. A. Pentz. "A Systematic Review of Built Environment Factors Related to Physical Activity and Obesity Risk: Implications for Smart Growth Urban Planning." *Obes Rev* 12, no. 5 (2011): e173-82.
- Feng, J., T. A. Glass, F. C. Curriero, W. F. Stewart and B. S. Schwartz. "The Built Environment and Obesity: A Systematic Review of the Epidemiologic Evidence." *Health Place* 16, no. 2 (2010): 175-90.
- Fraser, S. D. and K. Lock. "Cycling for Transport and Public Health: A Systematic Review of the Effect of the Environment on Cycling." *Eur J Public Health* 21, no. 6 (2011): 738-43.
- Hanson, H.M., M.C. Ashe, H.A. McKay, and M. Winters. "Intersection Between the Built and Social Environments and Older Adults' Mobility: An Evidence Review." *National Collaborating Centre For Environmental Health*, (2012): 1-14.
- Hosking, J., P. Mudu, and C. Dora. "Health Co-Benefits of Climate Change Mitigation- Transport Sector: Health in the Green Economy." *World Health Organization*, (2011).
- McCormack, G. R. and A. Shiell. "In Search of Causality: A Systematic Review of the Relationship between the Built Environment and Physical Activity among Adults." *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 8, (2011): 125.
- Kramer, M.G. "Our Built and Natural Environments: A Technical Review of the Interactions Among Land Use, Transportation, and Environmental Quality." No. EPA 231K13001. (2013).
- Pont, K., J. Ziviani, D. Wadley, S. Bennett and R. Abbott. "Environmental Correlates of Children's Active Transportation: A Systematic Literature Review." *Health Place* 15, no. 3 (2009): 827-40.
- Reynolds, C. C., M. A. Harris, K. Teschke, P. A. Cripton and M. Winters. "The Impact of Transportation Infrastructure on Bicycling Injuries and Crashes: A Review of the Literature." *Environ Health* 8, (2009): 47.
- Rosso, A. L., A. H. Auchincloss and Y. L. Michael. "The Urban Built Environment and Mobility in Older Adults: A Comprehensive Review." *J Aging Res* 2011, (2011): 1-10.
- Rothman, L., R. Buliung, C. Macarthur, T. To, and A. Howard. "Walking and Child Pedestrian Injury: A Systematic Review of Built Environment Correlates of Safe Walking". *Inj Prev*, (2013): 1-9.
- Saelens, B. E. and S. L. Handy. "Built Environment Correlates of Walking: A Review." *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 40, no. 7 (2008): S550-66.
- Van Cauwenberg, J., I. De Bourdeaudhuij, F. De Meester, D. Van Dyck, J. Salmon, P. Clarys and B. Deforche. "Relationship Between the Physical Environment and Physical Activity in Older Adults: A Systematic Review." *Health Place* 17, no. 2 (2011): 458-69.
- Van Holle, V., B. Deforche, J. Van Cauwenberg, L. Goubert, L. Maes, N. Van de Weghe and I. De Bourdeaudhuij. "Relationship Between the Physical Environment and Different Domains of Physical Activity in European Adults: A Systematic Review." *BMC Public Health* 12, (2012): 807.
- Wong, B. Y., G. Faulkner and R. Buliung. "GIS Measured Environmental Correlates of Active School Transport: A Systematic Review of 14 Studies." *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 8, (2011): 39.

HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS LINKAGES SUMMARY



PLANNING PRINCIPLE	IMPACT	HEALTH RELATED OUTCOME
--------------------	--------	------------------------

1. Enable mobility for all ages and abilities




→ Improve the health of the whole community by promoting safer streets and encouraging physical activity.

- ↕ physical activity
- ↕ walking
- ↕ perception of safety
- ↕ transit use

→ ↕ unintentional injury

2. Make active transportation convenient and safe




→ Encourage the decision to cycle, walk, or use transit, through smart infrastructure and engineering choices.

- ↕ walkability
- ↕ transit use
- ↕ physical activity
- ↕ walking
- ↕ noise
- ↕ safety
- ↕ cycling

-
- ↕ obesity
 - ↕ mental health
 - ↕ unintentional injury
 - ↕ social connectivity
 - ↕ premature mortality
 - ↕ all-cause mortality

3. Prioritize safety




→ Establish a hierarchy of street users, giving priority to walking, cycling, and public transit, rather than private vehicles.

- ↕ traffic safety
- ↕ perceptions of safety
- ↕ cycling
- ↕ walking
- ↕ physical activity
- ↕ ambient air quality

-
- ↕ unintentional injury
 - ↕ quality of life
 - ↕ respiratory disease
 - ↕ mental health
 - ↕ social connectivity

4. Encourage use of public transit




→ Enable the decision to use public transit by making it safe, convenient and accessible to all.

- ↕ vehicle miles traveled
- ↕ transit use
- ? exposure to air pollution
- ↕ ambient air quality
- ↕ noise levels
- ↕ cycling
- ↕ walking
- ↕ physical activity

-
- ↕ obesity
 - ↕ unintentional injury
 - ↕ quality of life

5. Enable attractive road, rail, and waterway networks



→ Encourage the use of active transport by enhancing the experience of cycling and walking.


- ? cycling
- ↕ walking
- ↕ physical activity

↕ ↕	Positive effect
↕ ↕	Negative effect
↕	No effect
?	Conflicting evidence on direction of effect
↕ ↕ ?	For future evidence review





HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS EVIDENCE DIAGRAM



GLOSSARY

Active transportation: Active transportation refers to any form of human-powered transportation such as walking, cycling, using a wheelchair, in-line skating or skateboarding. People often combine the use of active transportation with public transit as a complementary means of getting around (Public Health Association of Canada and Montréal Urban Ecology Centre).

Agricultural capacity: The potential for agriculture based on class ratings for various types of land (e.g., Class 7 is considered non-arable, with no potential for soil bound agriculture) (BC Agricultural Land Reserve).

Biodiversity: The short form for biological diversity, which is the diversity, or variety, of plants and animals and other living things in a particular area or region (California Biodiversity Counsel).

Biological productivity: Also known as bioproductivity, it is the rate and amount of production which occurs in a given ecosystem over a given time period (Michel Serres Institute).

Body Mass Index (BMI): A simple index of weight-for-height that is commonly used to classify underweight, overweight and obesity in adults. It is defined as the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in metres (kg/m^2) (World Health Organization).

Brownfields: Usually former industrial lands that are now vacant or underused but have the potential to be redeveloped for new uses. Brownfields may be contaminated due to past or present activities. Examples of brownfields include: closed factories, gas stations, and waterfront lands formerly used for commercial port operations (Ontario Ministry of the Environment).

Cardiovascular disease: Also referred to as heart disease, or heart and blood vessel disease, it includes numerous problems, many of which are related to a process called atherosclerosis. Atherosclerosis is a condition that develops when a substance called plaque builds up in the walls of the arteries. This build-up narrows the arteries, making it harder for blood to flow through (American Heart Association).

Chronic disease: Also referred to as non-communicable disease, is not passed from person to person, but rather they are of long duration and generally slow progression. The four main types of chronic disease are cardiovascular diseases (e.g., heart attacks and stroke), cancers, chronic respiratory diseases (e.g., chronic obstructed pulmonary disease and asthma) and diabetes (World Health Organization).

Communicable disease: Also known as infectious disease, is caused by pathogenic microorganisms, such as bacteria, viruses, parasites or fungi. Communicable diseases can be spread, directly or indirectly, from one person to another. Zoonotic diseases are infectious diseases of animals that can cause disease when transmitted to humans (World Health Organization).

Community kitchens: Also called collective kitchens, they are community-based cooking programs where small groups of people come together to prepare meals and take food home to their families. In a community kitchen every member contributes by planning, preparing, and cooking food. Community kitchens create opportunities for learning about the importance of healthy eating and developing the skills to prepare healthy and affordable meals (Community Kitchen’s Best Practise Toolkit – Canada).

Connectivity: Refers to the directness of links and the density of connections in a transport network. A highly permeable network has many short links and intersections, and minimal dead-ends. As connectivity increases, travel distances decrease and route options increase, allowing more direct travel between destinations, and creating a more accessible and resilient transportation system (healthyplaces.org).

Densification: Facilitated sustainable settlement planning through efficient use of spatial resources including bulk service infrastructure, energy sources and a decreasing supply of well-situated land. It is a key strategy to mitigate urban sprawl on the periphery of established development, while accommodating demand proximal to existing economic opportunities and infrastructure (City of Johannesburg, South Africa).

Ecosystem services: Simply stated, the benefits people derive from ecosystems. Besides provisioning services or goods like food, wood and other raw materials, plants, animals, fungi and micro-organisms provide essential regulating services such as

pollination of crops, prevention of soil erosion and water purification, and a vast array of cultural services, like recreation and a sense of place (International Union for Conservation of Nature).

Equity (in health): Exists when all people can reach their full health potential and are not disadvantaged from attaining it because of their race, ethnicity, religion, gender, age, social class, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation or other socially determined circumstance (National Collaborating Centre for Determinants of Health).

Food system: The whole array of activities, ranging from input distribution through on-farm production to marketing and processing, involved in producing and distributing food to both urban and rural consumers (Michigan State University – Department of Agricultural Economics).

Greenway: A corridor of undeveloped land preserved for recreational use or environmental protection (Webster Dictionary).

Infill development: Development that occurs in underutilized or undeveloped land in already developed urbanized areas, thereby “filling in” an unused part of a community (Resources for the Future – organization).

Mixed land use: Enables a variety of land uses including residential, commercial, and industrial to be co-located in an integrated way that supports sustainable forms of transport such as public transit, walking and cycling, and increases neighbourhood amenity. Mixed land use developments can enhance the economic vitality and perceived security of an area by increasing the number of people on the street and in public spaces (Smart Growth).

Morbidity: The incidence of illness in a population (diffen.com). Morbidity is typically used to quantify the burden of disease related to a specific illness, e.g., ‘cardiovascular morbidity’.

Mortality: The incidence of death in a population (diffen.com). Mortality can refer to the overall death rate in a population (e.g., all-cause mortality), or death related to a specific illness (e.g., cardiovascular mortality).

Overcrowding: Living in housing that does not have enough bedrooms for the size and make-up of resident households, according to the National Occupancy Standard (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation).

Radon: Radon is a colourless, odourless radioactive gas that is formed naturally by the breakdown of uranium in soil, rock and water. As a gas, radon is slowly released from the ground, water, and some building materials that contain very small amounts of uranium, such as concrete, bricks, tiles and gyprock. Radon gas breaks down further to form additional radioactive particles called radon daughters, or “progeny” that can be breathed into the lungs (Health Canada).

Sprawl: Also known as urban sprawl, it is a development pattern characterized by the following features: low-density development with new growth appearing primarily on previously undeveloped or agricultural land; outward development at the city edge, in contrast to a process of densification within the city’s existing boundaries; emphasis on separation of major land uses (residential, commercial, industrial) and on single-use

development (in contrast to mixed-use development); and disconnected residential development where new subdivisions are not contiguous with each other or with the rest of the city (Alberta Health Services).

Urban heat island effect: Describes built up areas that are hotter than nearby rural areas. The annual mean air temperature of a city with 1 million people or more can be 1–3°C warmer than its surroundings. In the evening, the difference can be as high as 12°C. Heat islands can affect communities by increasing summertime peak energy demand, air conditioning costs, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, heat-related illness and mortality, and water quality (US Environmental Protection Agency).

Vulnerable populations: Vulnerable populations are those which have increased susceptibility to adverse health outcomes as a result of inequitable access to the resources needed to handle risks to health. Examples of vulnerable populations include: Aboriginal peoples, people living in poverty, immigrants and temporary workers, refugees, people with disabilities, and people who are gender and sexually diverse (Calgary Health Region).

Walkability: The extent to which the built environment supports and encourages walking by providing for pedestrian comfort and safety, connecting people with varied destinations within a reasonable amount of time and effort, and offering visual interest in journeys throughout the network (Journal of Aging and Physical Activity).