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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Knowle West in South Bristol has a population of about 15,000 and was mostly built in the 1920s and 1950s. Although for many Knowle West is a great place to live and there is a strong sense of community, it has high levels of deprivation, with some parts of it being in the poorest 1% nationally. Filwood, in the heart of Knowle West, has the second lowest score under the Bristol Quality of Life Survey Liveability Index and there are significant health challenges. Life expectancy is the second lowest in Bristol, with high levels of cancer mortality and heart disease mortality. The level of obesity is one of the highest in Bristol, as is the level of smoking.

Work started on the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy in September 2009 and the vision for the area was agreed as “A community full of confidence and pride, skilled and healthy, living in a thriving Bristol neighbourhood that is green and well connected and low in living costs” – known as the ‘Knowle West Vision 2030’.

With major change proposed for Knowle West, the Healthy City Group of the Bristol Partnership considers it vital that health and well-being in its widest sense is integrated into the regeneration plans. Therefore the group has initiated a health impact assessment (HIA) process to review potential health impacts. This report is based on a participatory workshop for the draft Knowle West Regeneration Strategy. The workshop looked at the wider social, economic and environmental foundations for health and well-being – how housing, transport, employment, open space etc impact on people’s health – rather than being limited to the provision of health services.

The workshop took place on 21 July 2010 and was attended by 36 people, including local residents, local workers, strategic policy makers, service providers and a local councillor. Marcus Grant and Hugh Barton from the WHO Collaborating Centre for Healthy Cities and Urban Policy at the University of West of England (UWE) facilitated the process.

The workshop used the Spectrum Approach for participatory HIA. This provides a quick but holistic overview of a particular development project from a health and sustainability standpoint. It does not weight one criterion against another (which implies trade-offs), but rather identifies an acceptable bottom line in relation to each criterion. It involves a set of agreed health criteria, systematic evaluation and a colour-coded grading system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Negotiable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spectrum adopts a threshold approach. All criteria need to reach yellow as a minimum for the plan, project, policy or proposal to be acceptable. Ideally, they should all be blue or green. A good score on one criterion cannot outweigh or compensate for a poor score on another criterion.

The proposals were graded against 23 criteria, grouped around the determinants of health. The workshop was split into five groups and each looked at five or six criteria in depth. So each criterion was looked at by at least one group. Each group graded both the current situation (the baseline) and the proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowle West Regeneration Strategy Health Impact Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Strategic Links</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Strategic transport links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Strategic sectoral links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Homes for all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Public services that support well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Managing difficult change and transition</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Lifestyle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Diet and food access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Active lives through open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Community buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Stakeholder involvement in planning and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Provision of local facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – Accessibility of local facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Local economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Local jobs, training and wealth creation during construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Local jobs, training and wealth creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – City-wide destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Built environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - Quality of the public realm as a place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – Quality of the public realm to support active travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - Sustainable construction</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Natural environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – Air / Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – Resource use - waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – Resource use - water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Global ecosystem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - Carbon emissions, by buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - Carbon emissions, by transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 – Biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They then reported to a plenary session, which allowed all present to record a verdict on each criterion.
The participatory grading was then refined through providing an independent assessment and expert commentary by the WHO Collaborating Centre for Healthy Cities and Urban Policy at UWE and a final grade given. These are summarised in the table above.

The lack of detailed information available at the time of the workshop has lead to a number of criteria for the proposal being graded as yellow due to uncertainty. With more detail, there is little doubt many grades would be higher. It will be a valuable exercise to repeat the HIA after the next iteration of Knowle West Regeneration Strategy following design development after the public consultation in October and November 2010 to review and grade subsequent progress.

The assessment clearly identified three high priority issues for action under the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy where the baseline grade was red:

- Strategic transport links (1)
- Provision of local facilities (10)
- Local jobs, training and wealth creation (12 & 13)

Overall the direction of travel was positive. The Strategy was assessed to lead to an improvement in 17 criteria against a baseline grade. Two criteria were unchanged (Food and diet (6); Waste (19)) and there were two criteria (Air quality and noise (18); Carbon emissions by transport (22)) where the proposals were assessed as having the potential for a lower grade outcome than the baseline conditions. The nature of two of the criteria was that they did not have a baseline grade.

There are four criteria (Homes for all (3); Active lives through open space (7); Quality of the public realm (15) and Carbon emissions by buildings (21)) where there is a realistic opportunity of achieving a blue grade as exemplary good practice.

The HIA came out with 29 recommendations, which are summarised below:

**CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

- Repeat the HIA workshop after the next iteration of Knowle West Regeneration Strategy to again help link local information and participation into the design process.

- Widen the scope of the “Improve health and well-being” objective of the Knowle West Vision 2030 to include the wider determinants of health.

- Include the social cost of carbon within the cost-benefit analysis of any Knowle West Regeneration Strategy cost-benefit analysis.

- Further embed community engagement and empowerment, including specific initiatives with young people and other equalities communities and a re-look at the membership and terms of reference of the Knowle West project board.
• Organise an exploratory half-day co-ordinating workshop to explore the relationship between the physical regeneration, service planning and neighbourhood management processes.

HIGH PRIORITY ISSUES

• Give access and transport a higher priority and produce a discrete local transport and access action plan as part of the next iteration of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy.

• Make the development of Jarman’s local centre a high priority for the area and ensure it is in the first phase of the Knowle West regeneration programme. It needs to be more than a retail centre and should include a family pub, space for social interaction, a local market, events and a focus for community activities.

• Fully exploit the opportunity for training and support for local jobs through the long construction phase and produce a local employment, training and business support plan as part of the next iteration of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy.

HOMES

• Adopt the policy aspirations in the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy for the Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 5 now and Level 6 from 2013) and Building for Life (Silver now and Gold from 2016) as the minimum standards and set targets for improvements to existing buildings using assessment tools such as BREEAM Domestic Refurbishment.

• Ensure that all housing developments meet the Bristol City Council Allotment Strategy standard of 7 plots per 1,000 people as the minimum allocation.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

• Revisit and redesign the elements in the proposals that break the existing green network to ensure that the connectivity is maintained.

• Implement proposals for a MUGA (multi-use games area), Formal Green Space and Children and Young People’s Space as an early priority to ensure that the BCC Parks and Green Space Strategy standards are met.

• Protect existing species and habitats wherever possible and incorporate the priorities in the Local Biodiversity Plan in the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy. Where habitats are damaged there should be a commitment to mitigation so that there is no net loss overall.
URBAN DESIGN

- Bring forward specific proposals for key spaces and routes and for
design codes as part of the next iteration of the Knowle West
Regeneration Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

- Explore opportunities for district heating, cooling and power provided
through a local sustainable energy centre.

- Produce a waste and recycling plan as part of the next iteration of the
Knowle West Regeneration Strategy

- Bring forward measures to ameliorate the impact of increased
economic activity, higher densities and population numbers on air
quality, noise levels and carbon emissions by transport as part of the
next iteration of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy.
1. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally the impact on health has not been an explicit consideration in regeneration plans. If health does get mentioned, then it rarely went beyond the provision of new health facilities and access to health services, as provided by the National Health Services.

However, much of what affects our health lies outside the domain of the health sector. There is increasing recognition that the environment is a major determinant of our health and well-being. Whether people are healthy or not, is determined by a complex interaction of their circumstances, lifestyle factors and environment. Many factors combine to affect the health of individuals and communities, such as where they live, the state of their environment, their income and education levels, their relationships and hereditary factors.

We have been building, and continue to build, unhealthy conditions into our towns and cities. Sprawling communities and edge of town retail and leisure developments have led to increasing levels of car dependency and reduced levels of walking and cycling. As a result the level of physical activity for many people is falling, with consequential increases in obesity and related conditions exacerbating obesity levels and health inequalities. This has not been helped by the poor quality of much of our green open space.

The loss of local facilities, which is a further consequence of this type of development, leads to a decline in the local networks of friendship and support that are important for the mental health and well-being of many vulnerable groups. Too much of our public realm is dominated by the car and major roads sever communities, disrupting interpersonal networks and reducing social contact.

While too many people live in poor housing conditions and have limited access to good quality open space and other services and facilities with consequential impacts on health and health inequalities. At the same time, our increasing dependence on fossil fuels for heating, transport and economic development is contributing to the problems of climate change and peak oil, which pose some of the greatest health threats of all.

Thus, issues such as employment, transport, access to green spaces, social support, education, housing, community cohesion and health equalities are all components of a healthy community. As recognised by the “Joint Strategic Needs Assessment of Health and Wellbeing in Bristol” (October 2008, updated August 2009) finds that “A poor built environment, urban congestion and traffic pollution all impact on physical and mental wellbeing and a key challenge is to work towards a healthier, more sustainable Bristol”.

This needs a co-ordinated and integrated approach with better health a consideration in all areas of the strategic regeneration process. This should ensure that improvements in health and tackling health inequalities is an ‘outcome by design’ rather than by chance. Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a tool to help achieve this.
HIAs can be used for plans, projects, policies or proposals. They will produce a set of evidence-based practical recommendations that will inform decision-makers on how best they can promote and protect the health and wellbeing of local communities they serve. The purpose of HIA is to assist decision makers by giving them better information. Its purpose is not to make the decision for them.

HIAs should maximise the positive impacts and minimise the negative impacts of the proposals and address health inequalities. They will identify any unintended health consequences that may either lend support to the plan or suggest improvements to it. They will also contain a clear analysis of whether the health of the whole population or just certain sections within the population will be affected.

With major change proposed for Knowle West, the Healthy City Group of the Bristol Partnership considers it vital that health and well-being in its widest sense is integrated into the regeneration plans. Therefore the group has initiated a HIA process to review potential health impacts; how positive impacts can be improved and any negative impacts addressed. This report is based on a participatory workshop for the draft Knowle West Regeneration Strategy.

The focus for the workshop was to look the wider social, economic and environmental foundations for health and well-being, such as how housing, transport, employment, open space impact on people’s health, rather than being limited to the provision of health services. The outcomes of the workshop will feed into the consultation on the draft Knowle West Regeneration Framework that is taking place in October and November 2010.

The workshop involved a wide range of key stakeholders and used the Spectrum approach for participatory HIA. It was facilitated by Marcus Grant and Hugh Barton. Marcus is the Chair of the Bristol Partnership Healthy City Group and works together with Hugh at the WHO Collaborating Centre for Healthy
Cities at the University of West of England.

The Spectrum approach aims to provide a quick but holistic overview of a particular development project from a health and sustainability standpoint. Effectively it acts as a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of a project, and thus can be useful in public and political as well as professional/technical form.

It involves a set of agreed health criteria, a colour-coded grading system, a threshold approach and systematic evaluation. The Spectrum approach does not weight one criterion against another (which implies trade-offs), but rather identifies an acceptable bottom line in relation to each criterion, with clear implications for action.

Good decisions are not about economic viability versus social justice versus environmental sustainability, but about how to find integrated solutions that achieve all three.
2. KNOWLE WEST

Approximately 15,000 people (6,000 dwellings) currently live in Knowle West in South Bristol, which was mostly built between the 1920s and 1950s. It covers an area of 325 hectares, approximately 2 kilometres by 1.5 kilometres and contains an estimated 1,200 local jobs.

For many Knowle West is a great place to live and there is a strong sense of community. However it has its share of problems, due to concentrations of deprivation and poverty, mixed with its physical distance from employment, services and facilities in the rest of the city. Educational attainment is low and unemployment high. Filwood Broadway has declined and much of the built environment is in need of improvement.

It has high levels of deprivation. The Indices of Multiple Deprivation for 2007 (IMD2007) show that six of the eight Super Output Areas (SOAs) in Filwood are within the 10% most deprived SOAs in England, with one in the 1% most deprived.

These six SOAs are Throgmorton Road, Ilminster Avenue West, Filwood Broadway, Inns Court, Leinster Avenue and Glyn Vale. In addition Ilmister Avenue East (Knowle ward) and Marksbury Road (Windmill Hill) are also in the poorest 10%. Four of the 10 most deprived SOAs in Bristol are in Filwood.

Health is a key challenge in Knowle West. Under the health deprivation and disability domain of IMD2007, four of the SOAs are in the poorest 10% nationally. Life expectancy is 76.0 years, the second lowest in Bristol (compared to 84.4 years in the highest area), with high levels of cancer mortality and heart disease.
mortality. 59% of adults have a Body Mass Index of over 25 (a measure of obesity and overweight), one of the highest in Bristol. 10% of babies are low birth weight (under 2.5 Kg), which is well above the city average.

According to the 2009 Quality of Life survey, 46% of people have a limiting long-term illness, health problem or disability (the second highest in the city). In terms of people reporting that their health is good or fairly good in the last 12 months, at 75% it is the second lowest in Bristol (the highest is 97%) and only 73% of people are satisfied with health services (third lowest in the city).

42% of people live in households with a smoker, the highest in Bristol, while 43% of people have five or more portions of fruit or veg per day, the lowest in Bristol. Only 9% of people cycle at least once a week, compared to the Bristol average of 15.5%. However, 34% of people take exercise at least five times a week, which is about the city average.

Filwood has the second lowest score (37) under the Bristol Quality of Life Survey Liveability Index. The overall Bristol score is 51 and the highest is 73 and the proportion of people satisfied with their local neighbourhood as a place to live is one of the lowest in the city at 64%.

This is not surprising given the high proportion of people who think anti-social behaviour is a problem (57%), there are problems from drunk and rowdy behaviour (76%, second highest in Bristol), drug use and drug dealing is a problem (66% the highest in Bristol). Only 56% are satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces (the lowest in the city); 52% satisfied with children’s playgrounds (one of the lowest in the city); and 39% with the appearance of streets an public places (one of the lowest in the city) Access to local employment is lowest in the city at 41%, as is easy access to a shop selling fresh fruit and veg (81%). Satisfaction with the bus service (48%) is well below the city average.

However only 15% of people have been a victim
of crime in the last 12 months, below the city area of 18.4% and satisfaction with the cost and availability of housing (50%) is above average.

In the past, the area has benefited from a number of regeneration schemes (eg Single Regeneration Budget, Sure Start, Neighbourhood Renewal, South Bristol Urban, Objective 2). Although there have been a range of physical improvements (eg the Health Park, Mede Centre and Knowle West Media Centre) and programmes addressing community safety, employment and social concerns in the past, many of the underlying structural issues still need to be tackled.

Work with local organisations and stakeholders in early 2010 on a Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Filwood ward prioritised three areas for action planning by service providers, which were:

- Mental Health and Wellbeing
- Smoking
- Weight and Nutrition

A fourth priority of improving partnership working underpins all of these actions plans.

The strategy recognises the importance of the built environment in promoting health and wellbeing and thus the need to integrate and co-ordinate the actions in the strategy with the regeneration plans for the area.

There are five objectives under the Mental Health and Wellbeing action plan including Objective 4 – Issues around the Built Environment - with the following action:

Feed into the Health Impact Assessment and the Knowle West Regeneration Framework the importance placed by stakeholders on the provision of quality open space, allotments, smallholdings and community gardens, transport links, community meeting spaces which contribute towards improved mental health

There are four objectives under the Weight and Nutrition action plan including Objective 2 – Support improvement of the built environment to encourage physical activity and growing of food locally – with the following action:

Feedback to the Health Impact Assessment and Knowle West Regeneration Framework the importance of cycling and walking routes, green spaces and quality urban design to maximise physical activity levels in Filwood. This includes the need for consideration of land being set aside for communal or individual gardening/growing, which will be of particular importance if housing becomes higher density.

These issues have been incorporated into the HIA and the recommendations in this report.
4. KNOWLE WEST REGENERATION STRATEGY

The Knowle West Regeneration Strategy (formerly know as a Framework) will plan for the future of Knowle West and guide investment over the next 20 years. It will outline how the area can significantly improve from new development, boost the local economy and be revitalised. Developments are likely to include:

- New housing supporting new shops and community facilities
- New employment opportunities
- New education and skills facilities
- Better public transport, and
- Improved open green spaces and play spaces

The development of the plans started in September 2009 where almost 100 people, including local residents, community representatives and Council representatives attended the ‘Knowle West Futures Conference’. The outcome of the conference was the “Knowle West Vision 2030”, which has been finalised as:

“A community full of confidence and pride, skilled and healthy, living in a thriving Bristol neighbourhood that is green and well connected and low in living costs.”

Thirteen community objectives were identified:

1. Raise income through employment
2. Improve health and wellbeing
3. Widen local choice of housing size and tenure
4. Refurbish existing housing stock
5. Improve and develop primary school provision
6. Reinforce a close-knit neighbourhood
7. Access safe, ecologically rich, open space
8. Pride of place
9. Build a future-proof community
10. Improve access to low-cost transport
11. Public & community initiatives in advance of private investment
12. Improve arts and culture
13. Develop play and youth facilities by planning with young people

Underneath the “Improve health and well-being” objective sit three high-level actions:

- Provide locally accessible health facilities
- Develop improved health and lifestyle education offer
- Keep and improve the Health Park

Although the overall objective is broad and to be welcomed, the three high-level actions under it are limited to the provision of health services and health education. They do not address the wider health and well-being agenda as
defined by the World Health Organisation (1948) as being: “Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity”. Though a number of the high-level actions under other objectives will have positive health outcomes.

It would be better if these wider social and environmental determinants of health were made explicit under the “Improve health and well-being” and it is recommended that the following high-level actions are added:

- Create a pattern of development that provides good places to live in and enables active lifestyles and social interaction and play.
- Provide good access to open space and green infrastructure, good housing, employment, education, affordable safe and nutritious food and clean water
- Avoid adverse health impacts from development

The challenges and possible solutions for Knowle West were discussed in the first major round of consultation in November 2009. There were a number of events where residents said what they thought the problems were and put forward their ideas. Residents’ comments have been considered and the ideas have been turned into a draft regeneration plan.

A working draft of this regeneration plan was the subject of the HIA workshop in July 2010.

Bristol City Council and consultants Urban Initiatives have further developed the plans and they went for community consultation in October and November 2010.
The regeneration plans show five different options for Knowle West, varying from do nothing through to highest investment and change. All the four Council options except the do nothing one involves some replacement of homes. In the lower investment and change options less homes will be replaced than in the higher investment and change options. An option prepared by the Knowle West Residents Planning Group, representing local residents, has also been included in the consultation.

The most interventionist of the options (option 5) is set out in the box below. Although the proposals looked at by the HIA workshop were similar to Option 5, the level of detail was not available at the time of the workshop.

**Homes**
There will be 3,300 new homes. This increase in population will support additional community benefits and more services and facilities in a new shopping centre. 900 homes will be demolished. It also includes a fund to improve over 1,000 existing homes.

**Shopping Centre**
There will be a new shopping centre at Jarmans. According to our retail experts this will give the centre the best chance of success. Small shopping parades will be supported at Illminster Avenue, The Mede and Melvin Square.

**Filwood Broadway**
Proposals will include substantial redevelopment to provide new homes and new employment space. Emphasis will be put on local business start up units. Existing community facilities will be improved or re-provided in new premises.

**Inns Court**
Inns Court will be redeveloped, which the council thinks will provide the best chance of getting really good homes and solving all of the existing problems.

**Social and community provision**
There will be a network of improved community hubs at the Mede, Eagle House, Filwood Broadway and two improved neighbourhood-shopping parades at Illminster Ave and Melvin Square. This option will also provide two new primary schools. In addition, there is the potential for a new secondary school.

**Jobs**
There will be new bigger employment space off Hartcliffe Way and mixed use development at Novers Hill. A green business park will be created off Hengrove Way. This option provides space for 1000 new jobs, excluding education and construction jobs.

**Getting around**
Internal links will be improved to make moving around the area and walking between the centres easier. There will be a new link from Hartcliffe Way to Broadbury Road and up to the new Jarmans shopping centre. Coupled with improvements to the main east-west route, Daventry Rd and Leinster Road, it will be much easier to get in and out of the area and increase the chances of getting a quality bus route.

Access to the new facilities being developed on Hengrove Park will be dramatically improved. It will change roads in Melvin Square to provide a green space directly in
front of Connaught School. In addition, there will be a new direct link from Inns Court, through to Jarmans to ensure that people can easily walk to the shopping centre. There will also be new links from Throgmorton and Willinton Road to the new homes on Airport Road, and from Downton Road to Novers Road. Routes for walking and cycling will be improved through the Northern slopes and link up with a network of routes that will connect the shops and community hubs.

**Filwood Park and other green spaces**
There will be new homes provided around a smaller, improved Filwood Park. In addition, it will provide 6 new play areas for smaller children.

**Investment**
Replacing existing homes at Inns Court with a new link to the shopping centre is likely to prove even more attractive to private sector investors. The introduction of a new route linking Jarmans more directly to Airport road and Hengrove Park is likely to make Jarmans the new shopping centre more attractive to supermarket operators.

For more information:

[www.bristol.gov.uk/kwrf](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/kwrf)
[www.knowlewest.co.uk](http://www.knowlewest.co.uk)
[www.urbaninitiatives.co.uk/kw](http://www.urbaninitiatives.co.uk/kw)
5. THE WORKSHOP

The all-day workshop (see Appendix 1 for the programme) took place on Wednesday 21 July 2010 at the Knowle West Walk-in Centre on the Knowle West Health Park off Downton Road. In total 36 people attended (see Appendix 2) including local residents, local workers, strategic policy makers, service providers and a local councillor.

The objective of the workshop was:

To bring together a multidisciplinary expert group, and use a recognised method (rapid health impact appraisal), with the aim of ensuring that the Knowle West Regeneration Framework is designed with the health of local residents as one of its priorities.

The workshop started with an explanation of the proposals on the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy, so that there was a common understanding of the plans that were going to be subject of the HIA.

A briefing on the Spectrum Approach (see Appendix 3) followed this. This included agreeing the assessment criteria.

Twenty-three health and well-being criteria had been discussed by the Bristol Partnership Healthy City Group on 2 June 2010. These represented the whole range of social, economic and environmental concerns and were grouped in to the categories in the public health map.

The criteria were then circulated to the workshop participants prior to the workshop. Following discussion, a number of amendments were made before the final criteria were agreed.
The workshop then broke up into five groups. Each group looked at five or six criteria (see Appendix 4). This meant that every criterion was looked at in depth by at least one group who then discussed and scored both the current situation (the baseline) and the regeneration proposals using the Spectrum grades and recorded the reasons for the score.

Each group was also asked to consider the impact on health inequalities under each criterion and flag up any concerns. Perhaps, inevitably, given the nature of the proposals to regenerate an area with high levels of deprivation, the impact on health equality was nearly always positive.

In the second cycle, a plenary session went through each of the 23 criteria with a report from the relevant group and a short discussion and then allowing all present to record a verdict.

The participatory grading was then refined through providing an independent assessment and expert commentary by the WHO Collaborating Centre for Healthy Cities and Urban Policy at UWE and a final grade given. The grading of the proposal is a matter of careful analysis and informed judgement.
This report records and reflects on the whole process and the final assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Spectrum grading system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BLUE**: excellent  
The health determinant is fully addressed  
A very well-designed policy is backed with realistic action plan and partner backing as appropriate. Delivery is secure and exemplary. |
| **GREEN**: good  
The health determinant is generally addressed.  
| **YELLOW**: negotiable  
The health determinant is partially addressed.  
There are significant areas of doubt. A more successful outcome depends on further work but based on the currently approach taken. |
| **ORANGE**: problematic  
The health determinant is very weakly addressed.  
A more successful outcome depends on basic changes in, for example, stakeholders, funding or remit. In some cases the criterion is addressed but remains largely aspirational. It is not likely to be satisfactorily fulfilled without major reassessment. |
| **RED**: an unacceptable level  
The health determinant is not being addressed at all.  
It is not likely to be satisfactorily fulfilled. |
Limitations of the workshop

There were three main constraints on the workshop:

1. Limited time. The task for the workshop was ambitious for the time available.
2. The lack of detailed information on the proposals available to the workshop, which meant that for many criteria being graded yellow when they might have been graded green if the information had been available.
3. When originally planned the workshop would have been in the middle of the public consultation, which would have meant that details of what was proposed would have been widely available before the workshop. However the public consultation was delayed and the plans were still evolving. It was thus understandable that the council did not want to circulate details of proposals that were still subject for change. As a consequence it was not possible to send out information before the workshop and more time at the workshop was spent explaining what was proposed. Consideration was given to changing the date of the workshop. However all the arrangements had been made and people had the date in their diary. There was also the opportunity of the workshop influencing the proposals as they developed.

Evaluation of the Workshop

Because of time constraints it was not possible to carry out an evaluation of the workshop on the day. The next day all participants were e-mailed and asked to comment on:

1. The Spectrum process used - did it work, was it relevant for you
2. How the workshop went on the day - timings, the presentations etc
3. Venue and catering, administrative arrangements etc
4. Anything else
5. Overall was a good, useful day for you

Eight people responded (22% of the participants). There comments are set on full in Appendix 5. Overall they were very positive. However there are some lessons for future work. These are:

- We tried to do too much in one-day.
- Splitting the workshop into two sessions would make the task more manageable (thought there is a risk that not everybody could attend both sessions). The first session could set and agree the criteria (and possibly score the baseline) and the second session could score the proposals.
- People need to see and study what is proposed before the workshop, so that at workshop there just needs to be a short question and answer session to clarify the proposals rather than a full explanation.
- There were too many criteria. We need to focus down on the critical issues to give them greater depth and discussion.
- We need to consider having larger groups to get a greater variety of expertise in each group. This would mean fewer groups, each having to look at more criteria, so they will need more time.
- Would have been good to split up the feedback section with a break, as it was a long time to give full attention in order to put in vote.
- Given that people have different levels and types of knowledge – local residents and worker to professional experts – general knowledge to specialist knowledge - there needs to be some guidance on when it is appropriate for people to vote and when they should abstain. Consideration should be given to weighing different people’s votes if there is an imbalance between local residents, local workers and outside experts.
6. THE OUTCOME OF THE WORKSHOP

Over the next 40 pages are a record of the workshop and its outcomes for each of the 23 criteria, set out in the following format:

- The title of the criterion.
- The full criterion, with any explanatory statement.
- The grade given by the sub-group that looked at the criterion in depth.
- A box showing the grade each person gave for both the current (baseline) position and the proposals set out in the Knowle West Regeneration Framework following the plenary discussion. This shows both the spread of views and the degree of consensus. Not everybody gave a grade for every criterion, which is why the numbers vary.
- Comments of the group
- Any further points raised in the plenary discussion.
- Further expert commentary by the authors of this report
- Final grading, recommendations and conclusions by the authors
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A. Strategic Links

1 – Strategic transport links

Is there good connectivity to and from the rest of the city by public transport and cycling?

This includes orbital connections across south Bristol, not just radial routes to and from the city centre.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group A assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of Orange to Yellow.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group recognised the current good transport links with the city centre, but highlighted the poor links to other communities in South Bristol and within Knowle West itself (these local links are the subject of criterion 11).

Public transport services were considered poor and expensive with poor quality bus stops and vehicles that were not accessible for wheelchair users and others with mobility problems.

There were doubts about the ability of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy to affect bus services and operators as they are run on a commercial basis.

Plenary

The plenary session emphasised the existing poor public transport service, with questions about reliability, frequency, destinations served, lack of orbital services and poor bus stop infrastructure.

The proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) was welcomed, but there is uncertainty about whether it will be implemented and concern at the lack of a Plan B if it doesn’t happen. Countering this was the view that other proposals (increased density, more people living in the area, increased economic activity) would support public transport services whatever system there was.
Commentary

There seems to be a disjoint between the potential BRT proposals and the strategic area planning. Good connectivity to the city centre will be vital for health and health equalities.

Connectivity to rest of South Bristol is also essential for employment (eg Brislington Trading Estate, Cater Business Park, St Philip's Marsh), training (eg Gatehouse Centre, South Bristol Skills Academy), education (eg Bridge Learning Campus, Oasis Hengrove, Merchants Academy) and retail (imperial Park, Symes, Whitchurch and Bedminster) and for people outside Knowle West to visit facilities such as the Media Centre, the Park Opportunity Centre and the Health Park.

BRT route should be designed to maximise the numbers of people living within 400m of a BRT stop and to go along Leinster Avenue to serve the key centres in Knowle West, particularly Jarman’s

Good links the local and national cycle network and good walking routes to the rest of the city should be provided.

The impact on Knowle West of schemes outside the area, such as the South Bristol link road and the Callington Road link, need to be identified and strategies put in place to maximise economic opportunities and mitigate detrimental impacts including community severance, noise and pollution.

Increasing the grade here is vital for the area in terms of reducing car traffic and its inevitable impacts and promoting bridging social capital. Other improvements to public transport such as ‘showcase bus corridors’ need to be included if BRT does not happen and for orbital routes.

Conclusion and Recommendations
Baseline: Red
Proposal: Yellow

Currently the lack of connectivity holds the area back in terms of social inclusion and economic options. The proposal could improve the situation but a much stronger improvement is called for. We would strongly recommend that improving this criterion is a high priority and becomes the focus of planning and transport officers at a much higher strategic city level and at the West of England Partnership.
2 – Strategic sectoral links: 
Is there good involvement with other relevant sectors, transport, planning, health, economic development, employment, police, education and community development in the process?

This includes understanding and acting on the needs for better co-ordination and the extent the proposals that the regeneration process have involved cross-sectoral collaboration.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group B assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of Yellow to Green.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group highlighted that involvement varied across sectors. The main areas for improvement were identified as public transport operators, the police and the health sector.

There is a need to look at how existing partnerships work together and ensure partnerships are on-going (not just one-offs for particular initiatives). There is a potential role for the City Council’s neighbourhood partnership needs to be explored further.

The proposed Community Fund was welcomed to support local training and employment (both construction and end use).

Plenary

No additional points were made.

Commentary

The workshop participants have highlighted the potential role of the Neighbourhood Partnerships in getting a better score for this criterion. It was telling that the locally embedded public health community development worker had not yet been involved in the initiative. With the coalition’s localism/’Big Society’ agenda, total place (and its sister total capital) all pointing in the same direction the aspiration for a blue grade here should be attainable.
Conclusion and Recommendations
Baseline: Orange
Proposal: Yellow/Green

We recommend that the new localism/Big Society agenda is trialled in the Knowle West initiative (building on existing partnerships rather than setting up another new initiative), with a re-look at the membership and terms of reference of the Knowle West regeneration project board.
B. People

3 – Homes for all:
Is the range of housing (affordability, tenure, type and size) proposed meeting local need?

This criterion puts the person at the centre, in terms of their lifetime needs for a home. It encompasses the variety of housing stock, responding to local current and future needs in terms of size, form and lifetime / accessibility issues and the need for safety. It also includes needs of the more affluent.

Stakeholder views

The sub-groups C&D assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of Orange to Yellow

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group felt that now there was an over-dependence on council housing that can be inflexible and make it difficult for people to move. There is an over-dominance of 3 bedroom houses and there is very little private rented houses. The lack of choice in the area means that often people have to leave the area to find what they want. Questions were asked about the basis for calculating future housing needs of the area and how the Torpoint development is going to be integrated with the whole redevelopment of Knowle West.

The group identified key priorities as:
- Housing tenures to be mixed up. Having areas with only social housing and areas with only owner-occupied must be avoided.
- Having a bigger range of size and types of home.
- Having more private rented housing.
- Need for affordable homes
- A clear strategy setting out how two thousand new homes will be successfully integrated into the existing community.
- A systematic approach to improving the existing housing

The reported aspirations in terms of energy efficiency, improving existing, and Lifetime Homes was moving in the right direction, but the plans need to be followed through in the detailed implementation. There should be a clear and strong commitment to achieve high grades under the Code for Sustainable Homes and Building for Life (including Lifetime Homes).
Plenary

The proposals need to think through the kind and tenure of housing provided and how it addresses the current lack of flexibility, adaptability, tenure mix and affordability.

There needs to be a diversity of housing across each phase with opportunities for aspirational housing and self-build.

Commentary

A full assessment of housing need against provision was not present at the workshop. In terms of health, some overlooked aspects are the importance of future adaptability and quality of the existing housing stock to meeting changing requirements without necessitating moving home. This can entail construction issues such as avoidance of truss based roof structures and even pre-adaptable housing designs.

This wider agenda also speaks to a variety of tenure and housing solutions including elements of self-build, self-develop and solutions for an ageing population such as co-housing and other approaches to building community support. Affordable housing should be distributed throughout the development and a single design standard adopted for all housing, regardless of tenure.

Conclusion and Recommendations
Baseline: Orange
Proposal: Yellow/Green

Ten participants at the workshop plenary awarded a green grade for this criterion. This is certainly a key issue for the health of the current and future residents and the community in general.

The policy aspirations in the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy for the Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 5 now and Level 6 from 2013) and Building for Life (Silver now and Gold from 2016) should be the minimum standards in Knowle West Regeneration Framework.

We recommend that a clarification and refocus on the wider and long-term health and well-being benefits included in this criterion should be sought. Focussing on this criterion has the potential to release much design creativity and produce some innovative new housing and improvements to the existing housing stock. If the scheme could be graded as ‘blue’ at a future assessment this would reflect a very high (an exemplary), but achievable, response to providing for local need. We recommend that achieving a ‘blue’ grade becomes an aspiration for the design team.
4 – Public services that support well-being:
Does provision respond well to local need in terms of health, education and social support for all ages?

This includes acknowledging the needs of vulnerable groups in improving well-being and health inequalities through support.

**Stakeholder views**

The sub-group E assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of Orange to Yellow

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-group**

The sub-group noted the need to differentiate between health, education, social support and other public services in considering their quality.

There is a need to consider outcomes as much as the quality of provision. So although there have been a range of initiatives there is still low education achievement, high levels of obesity and teenage pregnancy. Which raises the question as to whether the service provision is relevant and appropriate?

Major improvement is needed to the schools. There are vacancies in local primary schools and no secondary school in the area. There is a new Oasis academy being built at Hengrove and new secondary schools at Bridge Learning Campus in Hartcliffe, Merchants Academy in Withywood and Brislington Enterprise College.

The new South Bristol community hospital that is outside the area, is due to open in 2012, but that could mean some services moving there from the Knowle West Health Park.

![Knowle West walk-in health centre](image-url)
Plenary

The plenary discussion raised the importance of distinguishing whether the issue is:

- The quality of the service
- The appropriateness or relevance of the service
- Access to the service
- The level or quantity of the service

Commentary

The question of effective delivery of local services that respond to local need is important especially in a period in which they could be a focus on place-based participatory budgeting.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Baseline: Orange
Proposal: Yellow

We recommend that this agenda is initially tackled through an exploratory half-day co-ordinating workshop. This should involve both the multiple agencies supporting well-being in the area and those best placed to comment on needs and service delivery to date. It would explore the relationship between the physical regeneration and service planning and neighbourhood management processes so that they are mutually supportive, better integrated and co-ordinated.

5 – Managing difficult change and transition:
Is there support for the potential disruption to work, homes and support networks that can come with large-scale regeneration programmes?

Stakeholder views

The sub-group A assessment for this criterion was that the grade for the current proposal was Orange

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline – n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group highlighted the deep concerns and anxiety about change and the future. It was felt there a lot of ignorance about the implications of change on people individually and on the community as a whole. There was concern that
vulnerable groups are being or will be left out. There is a need to work with Health and Social Care and other ‘on the ground’ service deliverers now.

The question was raised about whether there was the proper management in place of the disruption, especially for people with special needs/requirements.

**Plenary**

There is already anxiety in the community about what is happening. One issue is how many people will move back to the area after decanting – and what support will there be for them in their new communities, if they do not move back.

**Commentary**

There is certainly evidence of the intention to support this community and vulnerable members through this period of change. Particular attention will need to be given to this due to the issues surrounding proposals for demolition of homes, decanting and re-location. Currently despite good intentions both plans and statements of commitment to deliver support remain hazy. There is a strong connection between the health outcomes for this criterion and that of criterion 9 - Stakeholder involvement in planning and management. Within the current financial climate, there is the additional challenge of managing expectations and dealing with concerns about the uncertainty of if or when the proposals will happen.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Baseline: n/a**

**Proposal: Orange**

Our recommendation is for a more transparent and responsive approach to the local community with respect to the developing proposals. This won’t be easy but the potential goals are a deliver a stronger community, resident buy-in to the scheme and scheme with a better fit to local needs. These goals will all contribute to improving the health outcome.
C. Lifestyle

6 - Diet and food access:
Is there good local access to nutritional and affordable food through provision of allotments or other opportunities for growing?

Stakeholder views

The sub-group B assessment for this criterion was that the current proposal makes no impact on a baseline grade of yellow.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group highlighted that existing allotment provision is good where it is, but is patchy across the area (e.g., there are none near Inns Court) and many people have large gardens. There is a local veg box scheme.

There will be a loss of gardens (and thus food growing opportunities) with the increase in density and infill development.

The group identified a number of opportunities to promote food growing (to ameliorate the loss of gardens) that could be included within Knowle West Regeneration Strategy:

- Opportunities for temporary uses pending development
- Trees with edible fruits – edible landscape
- Garden share and gardening clubs
- New allotments

To enable garden sharing, housing design need to include access to back gardens.
Plenary

No additional points made

Commentary

In terms of health, opportunities for food growing are not just a dietary issue. It has been shown that considerable health benefit can be gained through the physical activity, through contact with nature and through social interaction (in allotments and community gardens). There are a number of powerful examples where community-growing initiatives have been used to support training, employment and inclusion objectives. The Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Focus on Filwood, highlights the importance of food growing for mental health and wellbeing, healthy eating and physical activity.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Yellow
Proposal: Yellow

The policy that all new housing developments should meet the Bristol City Council Allotment Strategy standard of 7 plots per 1,000 people is the minimum allocation. Other food growing opportunities should also be sought, if funding can be secured, through projects meeting multiple objectives.

7 - Active lives through open space:
Is there a good range of opportunities for outdoor activity in attractive open space?

This includes appropriate provision and access - accessible and attractive open space including green space, trim trails, recreational provision, children’s play opportunities and sports for all ages.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group C assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of Orange/Yellow to Yellow

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Proposal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-group

The group noted that there is a lot of green space (around Knowle West rather than in it), but it is not connected or properly maintained.

There should be an interconnected green network both inside Knowle West and to other parts of Bristol. In particular access to Hengrove Park needs improving by dropping the level of road or by a green bridge.

Plenary

It was felt there was no good quality public open space. The open space that was of a good quality was all within the grounds of institutions (eg schools, Health Park, Park Opportunity Centre).

There was concern that the development proposals for Filwood Park were breaking a green connection across to Hengrove Park. However when people voted as individuals a green grade was given to the proposals as a whole.

Commentary

The Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Focus on Filwood, highlights the importance of quality green open spaces for mental health and wellbeing, healthy eating and physical activity.

The City Council’s draft Area Green Space Plan for Knowle, Filwood and Windmill Hill shows gaps in provision of Formal Green Space across the whole of Knowle West and of Children and Young People’s Space in parts of the area (Inns Court, Newquay Road area and Timsbury Road/Glyn Vale area). There is also a gap in provision of a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA); Access to Informal Green Space and Natural Green Space meets the standard. Filwood Playing Fields should be retained to support active sports.
The draft Area Green Space Plan does not include proposals for Knowle West, as they will be part of Knowle West Regeneration Strategy.

Some of the proposals in the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy actually break the connectivity of green space network. The development of Filwood Park breaks the link from Filwood Park to Hengrove Park to the south and to the Airport Road Open Space to the east. The proposed new housing off Salcombe Road further breaks the Airport Road Open Space link through to Imperial Sports Ground.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Baseline:** Orange  
**Proposal:** Yellow/Green

Access to well-maintained, good quality green open space is essential for good health and well-being. So it is important that Knowle West Regeneration Strategy includes proposals for a MUGA, Formal Green Space and Children and Young People’s Space to ensure that the standards are met. These should be an early priority for implementation.

The elements in the proposals that break the existing green network need revisiting and redesigning to ensure that the connectivity is maintained.

The issue of maintenance need to be tackled.

The Council’s draft Green Space Plan is a good starting point. Given the local needs and importance of green infrastructure, we recommend that achieving a ‘blue’ grade becomes an aspiration for the design team.
D. Community

8 – Community buildings:
Is there a range of viable community facilities planned for?

This addresses strategies to reduce isolation and social exclusion. It includes policies supporting the development of confident mixed communities.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group D assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal makes not change to a baseline grade of Yellow

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group thought that a number of existing community buildings have been struggling to be well-run and viable.

The group concluded that how community buildings are run (that they are seen as belonging to and run by or in partnership with local people) is more important than how ‘posh’ they are. They reported that effective local ownership could mean a scruffy building is a good asset.

Other conclusions were that buildings need to be well designed for flexible use and adaptability to future needs and that multi-use of buildings should be encouraged. In particular schools were seen as an under-used resource. Any new schools need to have the capacity, ownership, management and design to enable them to be used by the community out of hours.

Plenary

Pubs can be an important community focus and it was highlighted that there were now no pubs in the area.
**Commentary**

Good community buildings provide a focus for community activity and space for social interaction and are important for developing bonding social capital. The need for community meeting places to support mental health and well-being was identified in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Focus on Filwood.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Baseline: Orange/Yellow**

**Proposal: Yellow**

The grade increases very slightly in light of this proposal, but as with several other criteria, there is an opportunity to achieve a better score here from soft actions and not just increased capital spend. Better collaboration between providers and the community and supporting increased levels of local management are both part of the way forward.

**9 - Stakeholder involvement in planning and management:**

Is there effective involvement of the community in planning of the change process and future management of the resources?

Responsiveness to expressed community aspirations, evolving community needs and ownership.

**Stakeholder views**

The sub-group E assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of orange to yellow

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Proposal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-group**

The group recognised that there was both not enough consultation (only a couple of workshops for a population of 16,000 people) and that Knowle West people are difficult to engage and it is difficult to get beyond the people who are always involved.

The group suggested some ideas to improve engagement:

- A road show to go out and meet people where they are, rather than expect them to come to you
- Ensure that leaflets are accessible and meet the needs of residents
- Use local people and/or an impartial person to facilitate events
- Involve residents in Spectrum/HIA process
• Extend the consultation to give enough time to reach people
• Local resident representation on the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy project board

Plenary

No additional points made.

Commentary

The group had mixed messages about the quality of the existing consultation processes. Standard council ‘consultation’ approaches seem to be applied in what is a special situation. There is a need to use innovative techniques. It is especially important to get future local ownership of the process and management right – that regeneration is not done to a community, but is done by and with the community.

Robust community structures need to be developed now that will be able to take forward future implementation and management (e.g., community land trusts, development trust, community interest companies).

Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Orange/Yellow
Proposal: Yellow

In order to secure the long-term social changes sought, models for local involvement in planning and management of the changes and the proposed facilities and organisations should be prepared. Local people, though appropriate participative and representative structures must be included in drawing up options for viable models.

Specific initiatives to involve and engage young people and other equalities communities in the area should take place.
E. Activities

10 – Provision of local facilities:
Is there an appropriate range of shops (including food shops) in local
neighbourhood centres?

Stakeholder views

The sub-groups A&B assessment for this criterion was that the impact of
current proposal changed a baseline grade of red to green.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group recognised that there is universal recognition that local facilities are
not satisfactory. Access to affordable, healthy food is poor and Filwood
Broadway, the local neighbourhood centre, is not fulfilling its function

The proposed new centre at Jarman’s was welcomed. It needs be more than
a shopping centre. It needs to be a focal point for the community with a family
type pub, be a transport hub served by BRT and a range of public transport
services. There should not be too many car parking spaces to encourage
active travel.

There should be support for existing local shops to improve and relocate to
Jarman’s, if appropriate, rather than it being full of retail chains.

The group asked if delivery was secure and if there was a Plan B
if Jarman’s didn’t go ahead.
There was concern that the proposed centre on Filwood
Park would undermine the
viability of Jarman’s.

Plenary

There is already a small
Somerfield incorporated into the
petrol filling station on Hengrove
Way.
Commentary

Improving local services and developing a new district centre is one of the top priorities for Knowle West It needs to have the full range of services and facilities expected in a local centre and become a hub for the community. It will provide clear health benefits in improving access to affordable, healthy food and promoting social capital and civic pride. The need for community meeting places to support mental health and well-being was identified in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Focus on Filwood.

It is important not to recreate the conditions that led to the decline of Filwood Broadway. The proposed centre at Filwood Park, with its main road access/frontage, is a clear threat to the vitality and viability of Jarman’s. If there is to be new centre at Filwood Park it needs to be properly planned, limited in size and be in the later phases of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy to allow Jarman’s to become established.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Red
Proposal: Yellow/Green

This is a high priority for the area. Jarman’s is in first phase of Knowle West Regeneration Strategy – a strong signal to the local community of the improvements to come and commitment of different agencies to deliver them. It needs to be more than a retail centre and should include a family pub, space for social interaction, a local market, events and a focus for community activities.

The Yellow indicate the uncertainty in the delivery of Jarman’s at present and the unresolved issues about the effect of the Filwood Park proposals.

11 – Accessibility of local facilities:
Is there good accessibility in the neighbourhood by walking and cycling in terms of distance?

It includes having direct, convenient and attractive routes to a good range of facilities and the planning of housing areas to make walking and cycling the easy (normal) choice for residents.
**Stakeholder views**

The sub-group E assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of orange to green.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-group**

The group highlighted that current walking and cycling provision is poor quality, though it is better for walking than cycling. Public transport is not good.

Wide, straight streets encourage high traffic speed that increases the perceived risks of cycling and thus discourages cycling. There are also cultural issues to be addressed (ie cycling is not ‘cool’, aspirations to own a car). Currently use of the car is the easy (normal) choice.

There needs to be a plan to improve both cycling infrastructure (network of safe routes, cycle lanes, secure parking at destinations, storage at home and signage) and to address some of the barriers (eg training, maintenance, events, promotion and 20 mph limit to reduce traffic speeds).

There should be an overall strategy to promote a pattern of movement based on the transport user hierarchy set out below - direct routes for walking and cycling, indirect routes for private cars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport User Hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reducing the need for travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Walking and providing access for people with mobility impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public transport (including taxis) and emergency vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Powered two wheelers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Commercial vehicles (including heavy goods vehicles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cars (shopping and visitors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Non-local motor traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plenary**

No additional points made

**Commentary**
The health benefits of active travel are well documented. The Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Focus on Filwood, highlights the importance of cycling and walking for physical activity and mental health. Promoting active travel (walking and cycling) and channelling car movement is vital for improving physical activity, addressing obesity, improving road safety and reducing environmental impacts from air pollution to peak oil and climate change. The proposals include improved routes, which should increase permeability for walking and cycling.

However, there are no proposals to limit or channel car use or restrict vehicle speeds (eg 20 mph limits). But there are proposals for new roads (extending Broadbury Road across Filwood Park to meet Hengrove Way; extending Illminster Avenue to meet Airport Road; and a road link from Inns Court through to Filwood Park). This will actually improve accessibility by car so there is unlikely to be any modal shift away from the private car to more sustainable forms of transport. In fact, there could a shift towards greater car use.

A new link from Inns Court to Jarman’s is also proposed. It is not clear what the nature of this link is. It should be for walking and cycling only.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Baseline: Orange
Proposal: Yellow

The ‘green’ grade given by the majority of participants is maybe an optimistic assessment that does not fully acknowledge the urgency of the situation given peak oil, climate change, the obesity epidemic and health inequalities. As more work is needed on developing a local transport and access plan, the grade has been reduced to ‘yellow.

Therefore, we would strongly recommend that improving this criterion is a high priority through producing and implementing a local transport and access plan for Knowle West as part of the regeneration strategy.

The vision of a local transport and access plan should be a transport system where the easiest, most convenient, most affordable way of getting about the area is by walking and cycling, combined with public transport.

The aim should be that walking and cycling becomes so easy and safe that it is normal for all short journeys (20/25 minutes - 2 km walking or 8 km cycling) and that there is a clearly defined expectation of the public transport network.

The existing definition set out in the City Council Bus Strategy is a good starting point: that 98% of residents live within 400 metres (5 minutes walk) of
a bus stop, which is served by a route with a daytime frequency of at least four buses per hour, a journey time of no longer than 25 minutes to the city centre and 15 minutes to the local neighbourhood centre.

Elements of a local transport and access plan include:

- High quality safe, accessible direct and convenient walking routes into and through the neighbourhood
- High quality direct and convenient segregated cycle routes into and through the neighbourhood
- High quality shelters and seating at bus stops with real time information within 400 metres of all homes
- 20 mph zone across Knowle West, supported by design measures (e.g. road narrowing and surface treatments)
- Support for car club/s
- Manage and channel appropriate car access
- Reducing Hengrove Way to a single carriageway, giving it a street / boulevard character and reducing the severance with Hengrove Park
- Reducing levels of car parking

The local transport and access plan needs to be integrated with the recommendations under criteria 1 (strategic transport links), 16 (quality of the public realm) and 22 (carbon emissions by transport).
F. Local economy

12 - Local jobs, training and wealth creation during construction:
Is use being made of local labour to generate supply chain opportunities for local businesses, training and skills during construction?

Stakeholder views

The sub-group D assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of red to yellow.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group highlighted that currently there is very little training and hardly any local employment.

There is a huge potential opportunity to skill-up and employ local people to be employed in the regeneration. There are currently young people growing up in families where unemployment is the ‘norm’. If there is serious emphasis on up-skilling and employing local people this can start to break the cycle of permanent joblessness

Plenary

No additional points made

Commentary

Employment is a recognised determinant of health. Employing local people helps money circulating within the local economy

Greater local ownership and pride in the regeneration of the area if it has literally been re-built by local people.
Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Red
Proposal: Yellow/Green

The opportunity for training and support for local jobs though the long construction phase needs to be fully exploited consideration. Given the council’s experience with local labour and training initiatives such as On-Site Bristol and the Imperial Park Regeneration Fund a ‘green’, if not ‘blue’, should be achievable.

13 - Local jobs, training and wealth creation:
Is the land and infrastructure there to support opportunities for local businesses and local people?

This covers the opportunities generated for local businesses and local employment, including training needs, skill development, home working and live-work units, and third sector economy.

Stakeholder views

The sub-groups C&E assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of red to orange/green.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Proposal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group wanted more information on what was proposed. On the current information available they felt it was unclear how what was proposed would meet local economic and employment objectives.

The group highlighted the current lack of jobs in the area. There are no big employers, no pub, few shops and no training centre (only some activities at the Mede). Of the jobs that there are, many are low skill, low paid and part-time. There is a high level of unemployment and economic inactivity and a thriving informal economy. This exacerbated by people having a limited job-search area.

The group asked if enough land had been allocated for employment development and whether there were the transport links to attract investment. This is not just an issue for Knowle West, but for the whole of South Bristol.
What is planned for the ‘green business park/enterprise centre’ and what will happen to the existing businesses and employment on the Hengrove Way Business Park?

Will development create jobs for local people? There is a need for training programmes to ensure that local people have the skills to take-up new job opportunities. There is an opportunity to link job creation to apprenticeships at the South Bristol Skills Academy. It was also recognised that employment would give non-Knowle West residents a reason to come to Knowle West.

There needs to be a range of different types of jobs - nursery units/workshops/small business units for help self-starters - retail/service – Jarman’s – green and digital technologies – creative industries.

**Plenary**

Has sufficient employment land been allocated? And is it accessible? Will there be the transport investment to ensure good access to the motorway network (eg Callington Road link to the M32)? Questions were asked about what happens to the First Bus Depot on Hengrove Way?

Training and skills are essential for local people to get jobs created so there needs to be a training plan.

**Commentary**

Employment is a recognised determinant of health. So employing local people helps money circulating within the local economy.

Has there been an employment needs study for Knowle West and a calculation of the land needed to meet that need. The following simple calculation estimates a requirement of the order of 12,500 sq m of B1/B2/B8 floorspace or 3.1 hectares of land.

Assuming there is a need for 5,000 new jobs to meet the existing job deficit and job needs of new housing proposals. Then if 50% will be in city centre and 25% will be in the rest of South Bristol, there needs to be 1,250 additional jobs created within Knowle West (double the existing number). If half of these are in retail, school, social care, etc and half are in employment development, then 625 jobs at 20 sq m per worker means 12,500 sq m of B1/B2/B8 floorspace. A plot ratio of 40% means 3.1 Ha of land.
Existing businesses should be retained where possible. Opportunities and suitable locations should be identified and promoted and a range of sizes and types of business units, including live/work units and incubator units, should be provided - especially in ICT, digital media, creative and environmental technologies.

Complementing the physical development there needs to be a package of business support, training and skills development.

Beyond the remit of Knowle West Regeneration Strategy is the issue of the accessibility of South Bristol (particularly in comparison with the North Bristol) for the delivery of goods and for employment (see criterion 1). This needs to be addressed if private investment is to attracted to Knowle West and South Bristol generally.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Red
Proposal: Yellow

This is a key criterion driving the regeneration. The stakeholder score of 'yellow' should send a warning shot across the development group. If there is a single-issue area that is the raison d’etre of the regeneration, this must be the one. Further exploration of why, based on this appraisal, the proposal does not score at least a ‘green’, if not a ‘blue’, should be a priority. Proposals to maximise local jobs, training, supporting local businesses, attract inward investment, bring forward sufficient employment land for development and wealth creation need to be brought forwards as a high priority. A local employment, training and business support plan should be produced as part of the next iteration of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy.

14 – City-wide destination:
Will Knowle West be ‘on the map’ as a destination serving city wide cultural, retail or business needs?

Better integration with the rest of the city and supporting the development of 'bridging social capital'
**Stakeholder views**

The sub-group A assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of orange to green.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-group**

The group felt that there are already a number of good reasons to visit Knowle West - KW Media Centre, KW Health Park (Walk-in centre, kidney dialysis), Mede Centre, views across Bristol, The Park Opportunity Centre and the Mede Centre – even if poor transport made it difficult to visit. There is also the nearly play park, cinema and leisure complex on Hengrove Park and neighbouring Imperial Park retail park.

This would be further enhanced with the proposed green business park and developments on Hengrove Park (South Bristol Skills Academy, South Bristol Community Hospital, leisure centre and swimming pool).

There is a need for a pub and a good retail centre.

**Plenary**

No additional points made

**Commentary**

A positive communications and place-marketing strategy should support the regeneration proposals.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

Baseline: Orange
Proposal: Yellow/Green

Although there are good reasons to visit Knowle West, existing transport to reach facilities such as public transport and the cycle network are poor, so we agree with the baseline grade of orange. As proposals proceed a green should be achievable for this criterion, giving a marked improvement in integration of the area with other parts of the city. A positive communications and place-marketing strategy should be developed to support the regeneration strategy.
G. Built environment

15 - Quality of the public realm as a place: Will the streets and places be attractive and safe?

This covers street trees, quality street materials and design, seating and clear signage. It includes design and management, sense of place, safety and perceptions of safety and on-going management.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group B assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of orange to green.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

One suggestion from the group was to provide a sense of space would be a tall landmark structure at Jarman’s.

The introduction of home zones and a 20 mph speed limit across the whole area would make the streets safer.

The proposed tree-lining of main streets was welcomed, but questions were raised about the quality of maintenance.

A safe crossing of Hengrove Way is needed. This would be easier if Hengrove Way was reduced to a single carriageway with a street/boulevard character.

Plenary

No additional points made

Commentary

The legibility and permeability of the area needs to be improved. There is scope for introducing a network of living or shared streets. The Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Focus on Filwood, highlights the importance of quality urban design to maximise physical activity and community spaces to support improved mental health.
Design Codes are a valuable tool to high quality, well designed places and deliver a range of more sustainable processes and outcomes from development.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Orange
Proposal: Yellow/Green

The lack of detailed proposal stops a higher grade being achieved at the moment. It is recommended that specific proposals for key spaces and routes and for design codes are brought forward as part of the next iteration of the Regeneration Strategy. A high grade, even ‘blue’ should be achievable with further attention to this during the next design iteration.

16 – Quality of the public realm to support active travel: Does street design give priority to movement in the following order: walking (including disabled access), cycling, public transport use and finally access by car?

Stakeholder views

The sub-group C assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of orange to yellow.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group felt there was not enough detail about what was proposed to comment meaningfully on this issue. There is a need for more information.

Plenary

The plenary wanted to see the idea of Living Streets having a stronger promotion in the proposal. A living street would be a street in which the needs of car drivers are secondary to the needs of users of the street as a whole; a space designed to be shared by pedestrians, playing children, bicyclists, and low-speed motor vehicles. The living street is an attempt to design for all the functions of a street.

Concern was raised that although the plans suggested increased permeability for walking and cycling, that this was also so for the private car so there was unlikely to be any modal shift away from the private car to more sustainable forms of transport.
Commentary

The Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Focus on Filwood, highlights the importance of cycling and walking routes and quality urban design to maximise physical activity.

Knowle West Regeneration Strategy should include a discrete local transport and access plan based on the transport user hierarchy (see criterion 11) this should then follow through into street design and the pattern of movement.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Orange
Proposal: Yellow

More design focus needs to be given to the quality of the residential public realm. The regeneration scheme provides an opportunity for Bristol to respond to the developing agenda for streets to be used to better support activity and interaction and not the primacy of private motor vehicle movements – integrated with a local transport and access plan (see criterion 11). With very little impact on capital spend, and a lot of impact on community benefit, a stronger active residential road approach should send this grade up into ‘green’ or even ‘blue’.

17 - Sustainable construction:  
Will there be careful use and re-use of materials in design, construction and life in the area?

This includes provision for materials re-use, repair and recycling, attention paid to the source of materials, carbon emissions and the quality of the build - including fit for purpose, appropriate space standards, accessibility, durability and flexibility for future alternate uses/expansion. It also acknowledges the good practice of re-use of existing stock where possible rather than demolition.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group D assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal was yellow.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline – n/a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Sub-group

The group felt that sustainable construction should be a requirement – local materials, including reuse of materials from demolition – and that digital connectivity needed to be included (and this had to cover existing homes as well as new ones).

Buildings must be designed to be flexible and adaptable, eg allowing future loft conversions, extensions and home-working.

The basics, like insulation, are still poor for many existing homes so there needs to be a programme to improve the existing housing stock.

Plenary

It was raised that there is a national requirement to achieve Sustainable Homes Code Level 6 by 2016 for new homes. The dilemma between having high standards and financial viability was discussed.

Commentary

Reducing energy use helps address issues of fuel poverty (a health inequality issue), climate change and peak oil. Buildings should be designed to allow future adaptation and adopt minimum space standards. Sustainable construction includes retaining and refurbishing existing buildings wherever possible. There are five thousand existing homes in Knowle West. It is equally as important that they are improved to a high standard as ensuring that all new homes are built to a high quality.

To improve the environmental performance of existing buildings in the area the benefits of using the following tools should be explored:

- BREEAM Domestic Refurbishment (a new standard that aims to assess the environmental performance of housing refurbishment works)
- EcoHomesXB (that monitors the environmental performance of social housing)
- BREEAM IN-Use (to assess existing non-domestic buildings)

There could be potential to work with the Great British Refurb campaign (www.greatbritishrefurb.co.uk).

Items to be covered in build specifications compatible with sustainable construction objectives include:

- At least 80% of construction materials to reach A or B rating in the BRE Green Guide for Construction
- 25% of materials specified to be re-used or recycled
- 100% of timber to be Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified or reclaimed
- uPVC to be avoided for building elements
- Natural and low VOC (volatile organic compound) finishes to be used
Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: n/a
Proposal: Yellow

The policy aspirations in the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy for the Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 5 now and Level 6 from 2013) and Building for Life (Silver now and Gold from 2016) should be the minimum standards in Knowle West Regeneration Strategy.

The Knowle West Project Board needs to agree a minimum build specification and set and agree targets for improvements to existing buildings using assessment tools such as BREEAM Domestic Refurbishment.
H. Natural environment

18 – Air / Noise:
Will an environment be created that has good air quality and low levels of noise?

Poor air quality and acute or chronic low level noise, all contribute to poor quality of life and disease.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group E assessment for this criterion was that the current proposal makes no impact on a baseline of green.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group found it difficult to grade noise and air quality as none of them lived in the area. What information on air quality is available from the City Council’s Pollution Control?

In terms of air pollution it was felt that the geographical situation, topography, the lack of industry in the area and the surrounding green areas should mean that air quality is good.

Economic growth is likely to reduce air quality (more industrial activity and traffic). There needed to be good public transport to help ameliorate this. Tree planting will also improve air quality.

The regeneration itself will create construction noise and dust.

Plenary

It was pointed out that increasing housing density means that neighbours will be living closer together and so that sensitivity to noise will increase.

The increase in population will create more noise and probably more traffic and other activities that will reduce air quality.

Commentary

Real time air quality information in Bristol can be found at: www.bristol.airqualitydata.com
The nearest monitoring stations to Knowle West are at Parsons Street school and at the junction of Wells Road/Airport Road. Air pollution is low at both stations on the Air Pollution Index.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Baseline: Green**

**Proposal: Yellow/Green**

This was one of only two criteria where the proposals led to the grade being reduced compared with the baseline. Increased economic activity, higher densities and population number will reduce the grade unless explicit measures are taken to ameliorate their impact on air quality and noise.

**19 – Resource use - waste:**

*Is there suitable provision and support for reducing waste, for re-use, repair and recycling?*

**Stakeholder views**

The sub-group A assessment for this criterion was that the current proposal makes no impact on a baseline of yellow.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline – n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-group**

The group highlighted the lack of local facilities. There is no Household Waste Recycling Centre in South Bristol. There is some fly-tipping in the area.

There is a local charity and social enterprise Re:work that has a lot of potential. It offers training and placements to young people and those returning to work. One of its projects is re:store, which has a shop on Filwood Broadway where it repairs and restores old furniture for sale.
Knowle West Regeneration Framework provides the opportunity for (micro) waste to heat/power facilities. There will be potentially a huge amount of waste created during construction.

Plenary

As there was limited information, it was difficult to grade.

Commentary

The Knowle West Regeneration Strategy should incorporate a waste and recycling plan that includes providing:

- Waste reduction measures
- High quality and convenient storage and collection space for all recyclables within buildings and in the public realm
- Advice and guidance to residents and building users
- Community composting facilities

Conclusions and Recommendations

Baseline: Yellow
Proposal: Yellow

The limited information made this criterion difficult to assess. However, there is a lot of potential to deliver improvements through having a waste and recycling plan.

20 – Resource use - water:
Are there suitable proposals to reduce water demand and manage run-off and drainage in a sustainable manner?

This includes grey/rain water use, sustainable urban drainage systems, whole catchment management, not building inappropriately or housing people in areas of flood risk.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group B assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of orange to yellow.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group felt there was not enough detail about what was proposed to comment meaningfully on this issue. There is a need for more information.
The group identified a number of opportunities to improve water efficiency that could be included within Knowle West Regeneration Strategy:
- Green roofs (on residential and non-residential buildings)
- Water butts for houses
- Rain-water harvesting in new developments (Jarmans)
- Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)
- New homes built to the highest standards with water efficient appliances

**Plenary**

As there was limited information, it was difficult to grade.

**Commentary**

Water efficiency is an element under Sustainable Homes Code or BREEAM assessments (for non-residential development), so achieving a high score under these would meet this criterion. Water efficiency will become an increasingly important health issue as water metering spreads. Water poverty could compromise residents health through restricting many hygiene activities we now take as routine.

With more extreme weather events predicted, reduced rates of run-off from higher areas such as much of Knowle West will be important in reducing flood risk in surrounding lower lying areas.

Water efficiency measures are included in the Sustainable Construction build specification (criterion 17).

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Baseline: Orange**
**Proposal: Yellow**

A major regeneration scheme presents opportunities for neighbourhood or street level provision of water and wastewater facilities that house by house renovation never does. Yet there seems to be little evidence that this issue is being addressed in any comprehensive manner. New attractive landscapes, features and environments can be created, which can provide a community with a high level of robustness in the face of threats from global warming. The aim would be to achieve water neutrality. ‘Blue’ should be the target here, with a minimum of ‘green’ being achieved.
I. Global ecosystem

21 - Carbon emissions, by buildings:
Is maximum use being made of measures to reduce carbon emissions
by buildings throughout their lifetime?

This includes energy efficiency of buildings; layout for solar access and
planting for wind shelter and reduced wind speeds. It also includes the degree
to which energy needs can be met through on-site energy capture or provision
of off-site renewable energy.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group C assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current
proposal changed a baseline grade of orange to yellow.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group felt there was not enough detail about what was proposed to
comment meaningfully on this issue. There is a need for more information.

The group wanted to know if the proposed retro-fit of existing homes will be of
a high standard? What will be covered – eg cavity wall, roof insulation, high
efficiency boiler, solar panels?

The refurbishment of existing housing provides opportunities for local job
creation that should be exploited under through the Knowle West
Regeneration Strategy.

Improving energy efficiency will help reduce fuel poverty and support health
equity.

Plenary

No additional points made

Commentary

Energy efficiency is an element under Sustainable Homes Code or BREEAM
assessments (for non-residential development), so achieving a high score
under these should meet this criterion.
Carbon emission measures are included in the Sustainable Construction build specification (criterion 17).

Regeneration plans should explore opportunities for district heating, cooling and power provided through local sustainable energy centre

In line with the Government’s “UK Low Carbon Transition Plan” (July 2009) developments should value any changes in emissions by integrating the social cost of carbon (the cost of the damage of carbon emitted in the atmosphere) into their cost-benefit analysis through the shadow price and/or non-traded price of carbon (based on the cost of mitigating emissions currently £51 per tonne).

This needs to cover the lifetime of the development (ie demolition of any existing building, construction and in operation). This ensures developments account for their climate change impacts. Thus, where a development reduces emissions valuing, this change will increase the benefits of the development, while where a development increases emissions, carbon valuation will increase the costs of the development.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Orange
Proposal: Yellow/Green

The social cost of carbon should be included within the cost-benefit analysis of the Knowle West Regeneration Framework cost-benefit analysis.

With a commitment to meeting high standards, ‘blue’ should be a target to galvanise action by all stakeholders under this criterion, with a minimum of ‘green’ being achieved.

22 - Carbon emissions, by transport:
Are there effective proposals to reduce demand for carbon intensive transport?

This includes providing homes near to good quality transport nodes or in locations that that promote lower emission modes of transport and mixing uses to reduce the demand for travel.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group D assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of yellow/green to orange.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-group

The group felt it was vital that BRT went through the centre of Knowle West (serving Jarman’s) and not round the edge of the area – putting it through the centre of the area will increase the prosperity of the locality, bringing businesses in and giving easy access for local residents to the city centre (and residents of other areas to Knowle West).

There is a real potential to put transport infrastructure based on public transport, active travel and shared car schemes (eg city car club) first, before any increase in car ownership starts to gridlock the area causing adverse health impacts from congestion (ie noise, air pollution, community severance, suppression of physical activity)

Plenary

We need to reduce transport – but there is likely to be an increase in car usage due to increased income levels leading to greater car ownership. There are no proposals to limit car usage and there are some proposals for new roads. Having more jobs and service within Knowle West could reduce the need to travel to some extent.

Commentary

Although the plans include proposals to improve public transport and suggested increased permeability for walking and cycling, the plans to date will also improve mobility and access for the private car. There are no proposals to limit or channel car use or restrict vehicle speeds. But there are proposals for new roads that will actually improve accessibility by car; so there is unlikely to be any modal shift away from the private car to more sustainable forms of transport. In fact, there could a shift towards greater car use.

In line with the Government’s “UK Low Carbon Transition Plan” (July 2009) developments should value any changes in emissions by integrating the social cost of carbon (the cost of the damage of carbon emitted in the atmosphere) into their cost-benefit analysis.
Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Yellow
Proposal: Orange

The high probability of an increase in car usage if nothing else is done means that this was one of only two criteria where the proposals led to the grade being reduced compared with the baseline. It is essential there are mitigation measures to improve the grade.

Knowle West Regeneration Strategy should include a discrete local transport and access plan based on the transport user hierarchy (see criterion 11) with the explicit objective of reducing carbon emissions. The social cost of carbon should be included in the cost-benefit analysis.

23 – Biodiversity:
Are there appropriate proposals to support and encourage biodiversity?

This includes retention/ enhancement of existing valued habitats; creation of new habitats and appropriate management of habitats in relation to existing and proposed development.

Stakeholder views

The sub-group E assessment for this criterion was that the impact of current proposal changed a baseline grade of yellow to green.

In the subsequent plenary session individuals gave the following assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-group

The group felt it was difficult to judge the existing situation without specialist expertise. Has there been an ecological survey of the area?

Proposals that could improve biodiversity include:
- Create a network of green spaces that maintain connectivity of green space
- Improvements to the Northern Slopes (a site of nature conservation interest)
- Improved green spaces
- Tree lined streets
- A strategy for community gardens, allotments and edible urban forest that includes improved biodiversity and community engagement in its objectives
Plenary

There was concern that as more land became be maintained (eg gardens and parks) with less biodiversity value or built on and there was less wild/abandoned land there would be an overall reduction in biodiversity.

Commentary

Some of the proposals in the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy actually break the connectivity of green space network. The development of Filwood Park breaks the link from Filwood Park to Hengrove Park to the south and to the Airport Road Open Space to the east. The proposed new housing off Salcombe Road further breaks the Airport Road Open Space link through to Imperial Sports Ground.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Baseline: Yellow
Proposal: Yellow/Green

The proposals that break the existing green network should be revisited so that the connectivity is maintained. The local biodiversity action plan should be referred to with regards to habitat creation and species choice, especially for street trees and amenity landscape areas.

Existing species and habitats should be protected wherever possible, and if this is not possible there should be a commitment to mitigation so that there is no net loss overall to improve the grade. At least 90% of trees and planting should be specified as indigenous and/or fruiting.
7. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The workshop was well received and there was a lot of enthusiasm and engagement in the room. It brought together a wide range of knowledge and expertise that led to rich debate, which hopefully has been reflected in this report.

We hope that the design team, planners and developers and the community can use this report, and the detailed analysis it contains to improve the grades during further stages of design development.

The lack of detailed information available has lead to a number of criteria for the proposal being graded ‘yellow’ due to uncertainly. We feel confident that with more detail the grades would be higher. It will be a valuable exercise to repeat the HIA after the next iteration of Knowle West Regeneration Strategy following design development after the public consultation in October and November 2010 to review and grade subsequent progress.

The commitment of the Council to achieve at least ‘excellence’ under BREEAM for Communities is welcomed and implementing the recommendations that have come out of this HIA should help achieve this.

It is pleasing to see that “Improve health and well-being” is one of the objectives of the Knowle West Vision 2030. Although the overall objective is broad and to be welcomed, the three high-level actions under it are limited to the provision of health services and health education.

They do not address the wider health and well-being agenda as defined by the World Health Organisation (1948) as being: “Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity”. Although, it is acknowledged that a number of the high-level actions under other objectives will have positive health outcomes.

It would be better if these wider health outcomes were made explicit under the “Improve health and well-being” objective and it is recommended that the following high-level actions are added:

- Create a pattern of development that provides good places to live in and enables active lifestyles and social interaction and play.
- Provide good access to open space and green infrastructure, good housing, employment, education, affordable safe and nutritious food and clean water.
- Avoid adverse health impacts from development.

There were four criteria (Homes for all (3); Active lives through open space (7); Quality of the public realm (15) and Carbon emissions by buildings (21)) where there is a realistic opportunity of achieving a ‘blue’ grade as exemplary good practice.
The assessment clearly identified three high priority issues for action under the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy where the baseline grade was ‘red’:

- Strategic transport links (1)
- Provision of local facilities (10)
- Local jobs, training and wealth creation (12 & 13)

The proposed new centre at Jarman’s addresses the lack of local facilities, provided its delivery is not undermined by the developments on Filwood Park (criteria 10).

More work is needed developing proposals for local jobs, training and wealth creation (criteria 12 & 13) to improve their grade, but it feels this is achievable.

The transport proposals (assessed under four criteria 1, 11, 16 & 22) are more problematic and could lead to increased car use. It is strongly recommended that is given a high priority and that a discrete local transport and action plan is produced as part of the next iteration of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy.

Overall the direction of travel was positive. The Strategy was assessed to lead to an improvement in 17 criteria against a baseline grade. Two criteria were unchanged (food and diet (6); waste (19)) and the nature of two of the criteria was that they did not have a baseline grade.

There were two criteria (Air quality and noise (18); Carbon emissions by transport (22)) where the proposals were assessed as having the potential for a lower grade outcome than the baseline conditions. This is due to increased economic activity, higher densities and population number and the likely increase in car usage due to increased income levels leading to greater car ownership. It is essential that mitigation measures be brought forward to improve these grades.

There is a need to continue to embed community engagement (5, 8 & 9).

The strategy needs to look for synergy between those criteria with lower grades. There is the opportunity for well-designed initiatives, such as training allotments or an attractive watercourse based greenway, to deliver on many fronts and so can increase several grades at the same time. This kind of project can only come forward though collaborations between local people, local organisations and funding agents - private, civic and public.

National policy directions, such as ‘place based budgeting’ and community involvement in planning set a stage for success.
## 8. RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Repeat the HIA workshop after the next iteration of Knowle West Regeneration Strategy following design development after the public consultation in October and November 2010 to review and grade subsequent progress – and to again help link local information and participation in the design process.</td>
<td>LSP Healthy City Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Widen the scope of the “Improve health and well-being” objective of the Knowle West Vision 2030 to include the wider determinants of health:  
  - Create a pattern of development that provides good places to live in and enables active lifestyles and social interaction and play.  
  - Provide good access to open space and green infrastructure, good housing, employment, education, affordable safe and nutritious food and clean water  
  - Avoid adverse health impacts from development | KW Project Board |
| 3. Include the social cost of carbon within the cost-benefit analysis of any Knowle West Regeneration Framework cost-benefit analysis. (criteria 21 and 22) | KW Project Board |
| 4. Trial the new localism/Big Society in the Knowle West initiative (building on existing partnerships rather than setting up another new initiative), with a re-look at the membership and terms of reference of the Knowle West project board. (criterion 2) | KW Project Board  
LSP Thriving Neighbourhoods Board |
| 5. Adopt a more transparent and responsive approach to the local community with respect to the developing proposals. (criterion 5) | KW Project Board  
Community in Partnership  
KW Residents Planning Group |
| 6. Develop new models (eg community land trusts, development trust, community interest companies) for local involvement in planning and management of the changes and the proposed facilities and organisations. Local people, though appropriate participative and representative structures must be included in drawing up options for viable models. (criterion 9) | KW Project Board  
Community in Partnership |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Undertake specific initiatives to involve and engage young people and other</td>
<td>KW Project Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equality communities in the area. (criterion 9)</td>
<td>Community in Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organise an exploratory half-day co-ordinating workshop to explore the</td>
<td>KW Project Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship between the physical regeneration, service planning and</td>
<td>Community in Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbourhood management processes. This should involve both the multiple</td>
<td>Local public service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencies supporting well-being in the area and those best placed to comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on needs and service delivery to date. (criterion 4) The issue of maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of open space needs to be tackled. (criterion 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promote and develop better collaboration between providers of community</td>
<td>BCC Community Buildings Local VCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buildings and the community and support for increased levels of local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management. (criterion 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH PRIORITY ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Give access and transport is a higher priority and produce a discrete</td>
<td>KW Project Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local transport and access action plan as part of the next iteration of the</td>
<td>BCC Transport Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle West Regeneration Strategy. This needs to include connectivity between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle West and the rest of Bristol (not just the city centre) and within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle West (criteria 1, 11, 14, 16 &amp; 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Identify the impact on Knowle West of schemes outside the area, such as</td>
<td>KW Project Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the South Bristol link road and the Callington Road link and put in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies put in place to maximise economic opportunities and mitigate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detrimental impacts including community severance, noise and pollution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(criterion 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Make the development of Jarman's local centre a high priority for the</td>
<td>KW Project Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area and ensure it is in the first phase of Knowle West regeneration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme. It needs to be more than a retail centre and should include a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family pub, space for social interaction, a local market, events and a focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for community activities. (criterion 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fully exploit the opportunity for training and support for local jobs</td>
<td>BCC Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>though the long construction phase. (criterion 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Produce a local employment, training and business support plan as part of</td>
<td>BCC Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the next iteration of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy. (criterion 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Develop a positive communications and place-marketing strategy to</td>
<td>BCC Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy. (criterion 14)</td>
<td>BCC Communications and Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Adopt the policy aspirations in the Bristol Development Framework Core</td>
<td>KW Project Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for the Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 5 now and Level 6 from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013) and Building for Life (Silver now and Gold from 2016) as the minimum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards in Knowle West Regeneration Strategy. We recommend that a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification and refocus on the wider and long-term health and well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits included in this criterion should be sought. (criteria 3 and 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Agree a minimum build specification. (criterion 17)</td>
<td>KW Project Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Adopt targets for improvements to existing buildings using assessment</td>
<td>KW Project Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tools such as BREEAM Domestic Refurbishment. (criterion 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ensure that all housing developments meet the Bristol City Council</td>
<td>KW Project Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment Strategy standard of 7 plots per 1,000 people as the minimum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocation. (criterion 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Revisit and redesign the elements in the proposals that break the</td>
<td>Design team BCC Nature Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing green network to ensure that the connectivity is maintained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(criteria 7 &amp; 23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Implement proposals for a MUGA, Formal Green Space and Children and</td>
<td>KW Project Board BCC Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young People’s Space as an early priority to ensure that the BCC Parks and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Space Strategy standards are met. (criterion 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Seek additional food growing opportunities, if funding can be secured,</td>
<td>KW Project Board BCC Sustainable City Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through projects meeting multiple objectives. (criterion 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23. Protect existing species and habitats wherever possible and incorporate the priorities in the Local Biodiversity Plan in the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy. Where habitats are damaged there should be a commitment to mitigation so that there is no net loss overall. At least 90% of trees and planting should be specified as indigenous and/or fruiting. (criterion 23) | KW Project Board  
BCC Nature Conservation |
| **URBAN DESIGN**                                                              |                                               |
| 24. Bring forward specific proposals for key spaces and routes and for design codes as part of the next iteration of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy. (criterion 15) | Design team                                   |
| 25. Give more design focus needs to the quality of the residential public realm to ensure that local streets are used to better support activity and interaction and not the primacy of private motor vehicle movements (criterion 16) | Design team                                   |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES**                                                  |                                               |
| 26. Explore opportunities for district heating, cooling and power provided through a local sustainable energy centre. (criterion 21) | KW Project Board  
BCC Sustainable City Team  
Centre for Sustainable Energy |
| 27. Produce a waste and recycling plan as part of the next iteration of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy and includes:  
- Waste reduction measures  
- High quality and convenient storage and collection space for all recyclables within buildings and in the public realm  
- Advice and guidance to residents and building users  
- Community composting facilities (criterion 19) | KW Project Board  
BCC Sustainable City Team |
| 28. Bring forward proposals with the aim of Knowle West becoming 'water neutral' as part of the next iteration of the Regeneration Strategy. (criterion 20) | KW Project Board  
Environment Agency |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 29. Bring forward measures to ameliorate the impact of increased economic activity, higher densities and population numbers on air quality, noise levels and carbon emissions by transport as part of the next iteration of the Knowle West Regeneration Strategy. (criteria 18 and 22) | KW Project Board  
BCC Sustainable City Team |
## GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active sports space</strong></td>
<td>Those areas that are used for a variety of organised and competitive sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong></td>
<td>Light industrial, office and research and development use class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong></td>
<td>General industrial use class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B8</strong></td>
<td>Warehouse and distribution use class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCC</strong></td>
<td>Bristol City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BP</strong></td>
<td>Bristol Partnership – the LSP for Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRE</strong></td>
<td>Building Research Establishment – renamed BRE in 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREEAM</strong></td>
<td>BRE Environmental Assessment Method is a widely used environmental assessment method for buildings. It sets the standard for best practice in sustainable design and has become a de facto measure used to describe a building's environmental performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bristol Quality of Life Survey</strong></td>
<td>Annual postal survey since 2001 of 4,000 – 6,000 people selected randomly from the electoral register. Questions are asked covering a wide variety of topics ranging from perception of crime to access to services and satisfaction with various aspects of the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building for Life</strong></td>
<td>Building for Life is the national standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods based on 20 criteria covering: Environment &amp; community; Character; Streets, parking and pedestrianisation; and Design and construction. Building for Life is run by CABE and the Home Builders Federation with Design for Homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMI</strong></td>
<td>Body Mass Index is a measure of body fat based on height and weight that applies to adult men and women. It is defined as the individual's body weight divided by the square of his or her height. The formulae universally used in medicine produce a unit of measure of kg/m². A BMI of 18.5 to 25 indicates optimal weight for your height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding social capital</td>
<td>The social networks within communities or socially homogeneous groups of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging social capital</td>
<td>The social networks between communities or socially heterogeneous groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Bristol (bus) Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s and young people’s space</td>
<td>These are spaces specifically designed to increase opportunities for children and young people to play or meet safely within equipped and unequipped environments. Sub-types include, wheels parks, games areas, children’s play space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>Climate change is a long-term change in the statistical distribution of weather patterns over periods of time that range from decades to millions of years. It may be a change in the average weather conditions or a change in the distribution of weather events with respect to an average, for example, greater or fewer extreme weather events. Climate change may be limited to a specific region, or may occur across the whole Earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In recent usage, especially in the context of environmental policy, climate change usually refers to changes in modern climate. It may be qualified as anthropogenic (ie dervied from human activities) climate change, also known as global warming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This refers to the increase in the average temperature of Earth’s near-surface air and oceans since the mid-20th century and its projected continuation. Most of the observed temperature increase since the middle of the 20th century (if not the beginning of the industrial revolution) has been caused by increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases, which result from human activity such as the burning of fossil fuel and deforestation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH)</td>
<td>The code is an environmental assessment method for new homes based upon BRE Global's Ecohomes and contains mandatory performance levels in 7 key areas: Energy efficiency/CO₂; Water efficiency; Surface water management ; Site waste management ;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Household waste management; Use of materials; and Lifetime homes (applies to Code Level 6 only). The Code has a scoring system of six levels, with level 6 being ‘zero carbon’.

Community (or social) cohesion

Community or social cohesion is a term used to describe the bonds or "glue" that bring people together in society, particularly in the context of cultural diversity. Community or social cohesion is what must happen in all communities to enable different groups of people to get on well together. A key contributor to community cohesion is integration, which is what must happen to enable new residents and existing residents to adjust to one another.

Community Interest Company (CIC)

Community Interest Companies are limited companies, with special additional features, created for the use of people who want to conduct a business or other activity for community benefit, and not purely for private advantage. This is achieved by a "community interest test" and "asset lock", which ensure that the CIC is established for community purposes and the assets and profits are dedicated to these purposes.

Community Land Trust (CLT)

A community land trust is a non-profit, community-based organisation that acquires land, fixed assets and then holds them in perpetuity for the benefit of the local community. Functions can include providing and managing affordable housing, workspace, community buildings and assets and green space.

Connectivity

Connectivity refers to the number of connections to and from a particular place; the degree it is linked into the wider area.

Design codes

A design code is a set of written and graphic rules that establish with precision the two and three dimensional design elements of a particular development or area – and how these relate to one another without establishing the overall outcome. Codes provide a positive statement about the particular qualities of a place.

Design codes aim to provide clarity over what constitutes acceptable design quality for a
particular site or area, and thereby provide a level of certainty for developers and the local community alike.

Design codes set out design principles aimed at delivering better quality places, for example the requirements for streets, blocks, massing and so forth, or they may focus on landscape, architectural or building performance issues (for example, increasing energy efficiency).

**Development Trust**

Development trusts are community owned, based and led organisations. They use self-help, trading for social purpose, and ownership of buildings and land, to bring about long-term social, economic and environmental benefits in their community.

They are independent, but work with the public sector, private businesses, and with other community groups. There is no set form of legal structure, and a development trust may be registered as a company limited by guarantee, a community interest company or an industrial and provident society. Many register as charities.

**EIA**

Environmental Impact Assessment

**Formal green space**

Sites with a consciously organised layout whose aim is aesthetic enjoyment. This can include sweeping landscapes such as the Repton landscapes of the historic estates, to ornamental gardens that include flower beds and features such as statues.

**Green roof**

A green roof, or living roof, is a roof of a building that is partially or completely covered with vegetation and a growing medium, planted over a waterproofing membrane. It may also include additional layers such as a root barrier and drainage and irrigation systems.

**Grey water**

Greywater is wastewater generated from domestic activities such as laundry, dishwashing, and bathing. Greywater differs from water from the toilets which is designated sewage or blackwater to indicate it contains human waste. Greywater composes 50–80% of residential wastewater generated from all of the house’s sanitation equipment (except toilets).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIA</td>
<td>Health Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal green space</td>
<td>Informal in layout and character, where the emphasis is on informal recreation. They generally have few or no additional facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNA</td>
<td>Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for health and well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>Knowle West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legibility</td>
<td>Legibility is the degree at which a place is understandable, readable or easy to navigate. Successful places are easy to find. Knowing where you are and how to get around is essential to enjoying a place and all its attractions. We intuitively use all sorts of clues to navigate. The size and type of buildings tell us whether we are on an important route or a side street. Buildings, landscape or public art can stand out from the everyday fabric of a place, making its location more memorable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime Homes</td>
<td>The Lifetime Homes Standard is a set of sixteen design criteria intended to make homes more accessible and easily adaptable for lifetime use. The concept was initially developed in 1991 by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and Habinteg Housing Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>A Lifetime Neighbourhood is one in which civic and social processes together with physical conditions achieve the following outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- An environment that is accessible and inclusive, aesthetically pleasing and safe (in terms of both traffic and crime)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A community that offers plenty of services, facilities and open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A strong social and civic fabric, including volunteering and informal networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A culture of consultation and user empowerment amongst decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A strong local identity and sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Street</td>
<td>A street in which the needs of car drivers are secondary to the needs of users of the street as a whole; a space designed to be shared by pedestrians, playing children, bicyclists, and low-speed motor vehicles. The living street is an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attempt to design for all the functions of a street.

**LSP**
Local Strategic Partnership (the Bristol Partnership)

**MUGA**
Multi-Use Games Area

**Natural green space**
Sites providing people with access to, and experience of nature. It includes woodland, grassland, scrub, hedgerows and wetland.

**NHS**
National Health Service

**Peak oil**
Peak oil is a phrase often used to describe the situation when global oil supplies reach a peak. Following this peak, oil supplies decrease and never rise again. Meanwhile, demand for oil continues to increase at an extraordinary rate.

Fossil fuels provide us with an enormous amount of energy, and there are no equally cheap, useful and abundant alternatives for power, heating or transport. Many products are fossil fuel based including many plastics, paints, fertilizers and pesticides.

Peak oil will force us to look at the world differently. We will have to reduce our consumption because prices will force us to and not because of attempts to be green and environmentally friendly.

**Permeability**
Permeability describes the extent to which urban forms permit (or restrict) movement of people or vehicles in different directions. Permeability is generally considered a positive attribute of an urban design, as it permits ease of movement and avoids severing neighbourhoods. Permeability can be different for different means of transport. Filtered permeability is the concept that networks for walking and cycling should be more permeable than the road network for motor vehicles.

**SA**
Sustainability Appraisal, which addresses economic and social as well as environmental effects.

**SEA**
Strategic Environmental Assessment look at the effects of certain plans and programmes on the
environment. They were introduced under European legislation.

**SOA**

Super Output Area are nationally defined statistical areas that are not generally subject to boundary change are reasonably consistent in terms of size of population. At the lower level SOAs have an average population of 1,500. Within Bristol there are 252 lower level SOAs.

**Social capital**

Social capital refers to connections within and between social networks. Though there are a variety of related definitions, they tend to share the core idea "that social networks and social cooperation have value, that social contacts affect the productivity of individuals and groups.

**Social cost of carbon**

The cost of the damage of carbon emitted in the atmosphere.

In line with the Government’s “UK Low Carbon Transition Plan” (July 2009) developments should value any changes in emissions by integrating the social cost of carbon (the cost of the damage of carbon emitted in the atmosphere) into their cost-benefit analysis through the shadow price and/or non-traded price of carbon (based on the cost of mitigating emissions currently £51 per tonne).

This needs to cover the lifetime of the development (ie demolition of any existing building, construction and in operation). This ensures developments account for their climate change impacts. Thus, where a development reduces emissions valuing, this change will increase the benefits of the development, while where a development increases emissions, carbon valuation will increase the costs of the development.

**SuDS**

Sustainable Urban Drainage System

**SWRDA**

South West Regional Development Agency

**UWE**

University of the West of England

**VCS**

Voluntary and Community Sector

**Water neutral**

The total water use after a development does not
exceed the total water use before development. Water neutrality aims to ensure there is enough water to support new development without requiring additional water resources.

WHO

World Health Organisation

WHO Collaborating Centre for Healthy Cities and Urban Policy

The centre was set up to support the WHO Healthy Cities network of Europe and to promote healthy and sustainable settlements through research, teaching, consultancy, knowledge exchange and publications.
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BRISTOL PARTNERSHIP
HEALTHY CITY GROUP

KNOWLE WEST REGENERATION FRAMEWORK
Building health into our plans from the start

Date: Wednesday 21 July 2010
Venue: Knowle West walk-in Health Centre, Filwood BS4 1WH

Objective

To bring together a multidisciplinary expert group, and use a recognised method (rapid health impact appraisal), with the aim of ensuring that the Knowle West Regeneration Framework is designed with the health of local residents as one of its priorities.

PROGRAMME

9:15  Arrival, Coffee,

9.30  Introductions and briefing for the day (Marcus Grant)

9.45  Knowle West Regeneration Framework (Paul Owens/Conor Moloney)
  • presentation of proposals
  • questions

10:30 Health Needs in Knowle West (Mandy Shute)

10:45 tea/coffee break

11.00 Health Impact Assessment (Hugh Barton)
  • introduction to Spectrum appraisal
  • confirmation of assessment criteria
  • questions

11:30 Group work
  • 4 to 6 small groups for scoring and discussing improvements, about 5 criterion each group

13:00 lunch

13.30 Plenary
  • Grade each criterion and note actions for improvement

15.30 Evaluation of the day/Feedback on process

15.45 Close. Tea/coffee
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BRISTOL PARTNERSHIP
HEALTHY CITY GROUP

KNOWLE WEST REGENERATION FRAMEWORK

“Building health into our plans from the start”

Time: 9:15am - 3:45pm
Date: Wednesday 21 July 2010
Venue: Knowle West walk-in Health Centre, Downton Road, Filwood BS4 1WH

Attendees - 36 people

WHO Collaborating Centre (Marcus Grant, Hugh Barton)
KWRF project team (Paul Owens)
Urban Initiatives (Conor Moloney, Ian Ralph)
BCC Planning and Health (Stephen Hewitt)

Knowle West Project Board (Cllr Gary Hopkins)
Knowle West Residents Planning Group (Mike Primarolo)
Knowle West Health Association (Rebekka Jarvis)
Knowle West Health Park Board (Ken Jones)
Knowle West Media Centre (Carolyn Hassan, Makala Campbell)
Local business representative (Ben Payne - HWV)
BCC Community Learning (Martin Hunt)
PCT Community Development - Health (Mandy Shute, Kate Roberts)

LSP Healthy Urban Team (Angela Raffle)
Active Bristol (Claire Lowman)
PCT Strategic Development (Ben Bennett)

BCC Sustainable City team (Steve Marriott)
BCC Urban Design (Andy Gibbins, Dan Offord)
BCC Housing (Barry Wallen, Kevin Mulvena, Jonathan Mallinson)
BCC Property Services (Jeremy Screen)
BCC Economic Development (Rachel Allbless)
BCC Youth and Play services (Tina Bond)
BCC Health and Social Care (Tracey Williams, Samantha Shantry)

Helen Lease (UWE, WHO Collaborating Centre)
Caroline Bird (UWE, WHO Collaborating Centre)
Sarah Burgess (UWE, WHO Collaborating Centre)
Paul Millar (UWE, WHO Collaborating Centre)
Laurence Carmichael (UWE, WHO Collaborating Centre)
George Stevenson (Knowle West student placement, Cardiff University)
APPENDIX 3 - A BRIEF GUIDE TO THE SPECTRUM APPROACH

1. Introduction to Health Impact Assessment (HIA)

The World Health Organisation (1948) defines health as: “A state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity”, and this definition is used in HIAs. It covers both the factors that support health (the determinants of health) and ill health.

The International Association for Impact Assessment (2006) defines health impact assessments as

- A combination of procedures, methods and tools
- that systematically judges the potential, and sometimes unintended, effects of a policy, programme or project
- on both the health of a population and the distribution of those effects within the population
- HIA identifies appropriate actions to manage those effects

The determinants of health are the focus of HIAs. The diagram below (published in the Lancet, 1995) provides a useful framework, identifying the wide range of determinants that support the health of an individual. They are the social, economic, environmental and cultural factors that indirectly influence health and wellbeing. They include what we eat and drink; where we live and work; and the social relationships and connections we have with other people and organisations. Some, such as gender, age and family history of illness, cannot change or are difficult to change, while others can be changed by policy interventions.

![Diagram showing the main determinants of health](image)

*Figure 2.1* The main determinants of health

*Source: Dahlgren (1995)*
HIAs can be used for plans, projects, policies or proposals. Their strength lies in providing a tool that enables informed policy decisions to be made based on a valid assessment of their potential health impacts, at the same time adding health awareness to policy making at every level. HIA is also underpinned by an explicit value system focussing on equity and social justice. In this context, equity has a moral and ethical dimension resulting from avoidable and unjust differentials in health status, (often termed health inequalities).

HIAs will produce a set of evidence-based practical recommendations that will inform decision-makers on how best they can promote and protect the health and wellbeing of local communities they serve. The purpose of HIA is to assist decision makers by giving them better information. Its purpose is not to make the decision for them.

HIAs should maximise the positive impacts and minimise the negative impacts of the proposals and address health inequalities. They will identify any unintended health consequences that may either lend support to the plan or suggest improvements to it. They will also contain a clear analysis of whether the health of the whole population or just certain sections within the population will be affected.

Ideally, HIAs should be applied prospectively (ie before policy, programme or project implementation) to ensure that adjustments are made at the planning stage to maximise positive health impacts and to minimise the negative effects. HIAs should be seen as an iterative process rather than a one-off event and will normally include the following stages:

- Screening - establish the relevance to health
- Scoping - identify the key issues and important health impacts
- Assessment - identify potential effects, quantify or describe their health impacts (positive and negative) and on different groups.
- Reporting/Feedback - present results, recommendations to improve the plan
- Monitoring/Management - on-going action, how were the recommendations implemented and what was the consequences, carrying out a reassessment of a revised plan and highlight any lessons for future HIAs

The staff (whether in-house or working for or as consultants) undertaking HIA, whether stand-alone HIA or as part of another assessment, need to be trained in HIA.
2. Types of Health Impact Assessment

HIAs range along a continuum of intensity from a very short process using minimal resources to a very extended process using huge resources. Rapid/Mini, Intermediate/Standard and Comprehensive/Maxi merely describe three points along a continuum.

HIAs can be stand-alone or undertaken as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) that can cover a range of issues such as health, environment, equalities, social, economic and regulatory.

Rapid (mini) HIA
A rapid or “mini” HIA, as the name suggests, is done quickly. It may be a “desk top” exercise, reliant on information which is already available already available “off the shelf”, or through a half day or one day workshop with key stakeholders. In either case, there is usually a minimum quantification of the potential health impacts that are identified. It can be very cost effective and give a lot of benefit for a minimum investment of resource. It may highlight the need for or act as a scoping exercise for a more comprehensive HIA

Intermediate (standard) HIA
An intermediate HIA is less intensive than a comprehensive HIA and more substantial than a Rapid HIA. It may combine a workshop with key stakeholders followed by desk-based work to build up a more detailed picture of the potential health impacts than those that would be identified during a rapid or “mini” HIA. It may involve a limited literature search, usually non-systematic (with perhaps proper systematic searches for one or tow areas), and is mostly reliant on routine, readily available data.

Comprehensive (maxi) HIA
A comprehensive or “maxi” HIA is the most detailed and rigorous form of HIA. It involves much more than either a rapid or intermediate HIA. It usually involves the participation of the full range of stakeholders; an extensive literature search; secondary analysis of existing data and the collection of new data; possibly some mathematical modelling and simulation of impacts; commissioning work from relevant subject experts; and widespread participation with focus groups, panels, public consultations and so on. It is likely to involve several people for several months. A maxi HIA can only be undertaken when you have large resources at your disposal.
3. Introduction to the Spectrum Approach to HIA

The Spectrum Approach sits towards the rapid (mini) end of the HIA continuum. It involves a set of agreed health criteria, a colour-coded grading system, a threshold approach and systematic evaluation. The aim of the approach is to enable a quick but holistic overview of a particular development project from a health and the sustainability standpoint.

It is inclusive – professionals and non-professionals working together – and effectively it acts as a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of a project. It does not weight one criterion against another (which implies trade-offs), but rather identifies an acceptable bottom line or threshold in relation to each criterion. It is not about economic viability versus social justice versus environmental sustainability, but about how to find integrated solutions that achieve all three.

Thus it can be useful in informing public and political debate as well as in professional and technical fora. It is useful for:

- Comparing alternative schemes
- Identifying the critical issues
- Measuring progress
- Scoping a comprehensive HIA, EIA, SA or SEA

The essential elements of the technique were published in “Sustainable Settlements” (Barton et al, 1995). The ideas have been refined at the WHO Collaborating Centre for Healthy Cities and Urban Policy at the University of the West of England in collaboration with Enfusion, for the Environment Agency, and in projects in the southwest for SWRDA and in Wales for the Welsh Development Agency.

The Spectrum Approach attempts to be:

- Comprehensive with respect to major health and sustainability issues
- Value-explicit, but without weighting values/criteria
- Clearly discriminating between different issues and levels of impacts.
- Amenable to qualitative and/or quantities measurement
- Simple to understand and manage
- Useful to decision-makers
- Transparent, motivating and educational
4. The steps of the Spectrum Approach

There are three steps in the Spectrum Approach:

1. Setting and agreeing the criteria
2. Detailed analysis of each criterion
3. Final assessment and grading of each criterion

Step 1: Setting the criteria
A set of criteria to assess the impact of the plan, project, policy or proposal needs to be identified and agreed. The Public Health Map (Barton and Grant, 2006) provides a useful framework for organising the criteria.
criteria and divide up others in order to reveal the key issues as they see them.

It is, however, important in the interests of transparency and confidence building with stakeholders that the list of criteria is also agreed and validated by a disinterested party (in this case the WHO Collaborating Centre for Healthy Cities and Urban Policy based at UWE).

**Step 2: Detailed analysis of each criterion**
The current situation needs to be assessed against the criteria to set a baseline or benchmark by which the proposals can be judged against. The proposals themselves are then assessed against each of the criteria. The Spectrum Approach distinguishes five different levels of success or failure, each associated with a colour: blue, green, yellow, orange or red.

As there is normally a time constraint and because of the number of criteria (often twenty or more) it is usually better for sub-groups to each look at a few criteria in depth rather than expect everybody to look at everything.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BLUE:</strong> excellent</th>
<th>The health determinant is fully addressed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A very well-designed policy is backed with realistic action plan and partner backing as appropriate. Delivery is secure and exemplary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For example, in relation to <em>water</em> you might expect autonomy of supply and treatment, with in situ drainage and flood risk effectively managed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GREEN:</strong> good</th>
<th>The health determinant is generally addressed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For example in relation to water there would be demand management, rain water and/or recycled grey water for low grade uses, sustainable drainage systems and effective flood risk management, but not full water autonomy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>YELLOW:</strong> negotiable</th>
<th>The health determinant is partially addressed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are significant areas of doubt. A more successful outcome depends on further work but based on the currently approach taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the water example it might be the absence of any serious strategy of minimising demand or reusing grey water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ORANGE:</strong> problematic</th>
<th>The health determinant is very weakly addressed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A more successful outcome depends on basic changes in, for example, stakeholders, funding or remit. In some cases the criterion is addressed but remains largely aspirational. It is not likely to be satisfactorily fulfilled without major reassessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the case of water the assessment might be <em>orange</em> if development was proposed in an area of water shortage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RED:</strong> an unacceptable level</th>
<th>The health determinant is not being addressed at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is not likely to be satisfactorily fulfilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This might apply, for example, where development is proposed in a major flood plain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 3: Final assessment and grading of each criterion
Each sub-group reports back on all the criteria it has assessed and these are discussed in a plenary session, and all those present are allowed to record their verdict on all the criteria. The final grade is subject to expert validation and independent assessment, in this case by the authors of this report. The grading of the proposal is a matter of careful analysis and informed judgement.

In the interests of transparency and confidence building with stakeholders the whole process is recorded in a report such as this one.

Using the results of the Spectrum approach
Spectrum adopts a threshold approach. All criteria need to reach yellow as a minimum for the plan, project, policy or proposal to be acceptable. Ideally, they should all be blue or green. A good score on one criterion cannot outweigh or compensate for a poor score on another criterion.

The assessment provides a spur to action. Where the scores are yellow or orange there is a need for further work, attempting to overcome the problems. Yellow suggests that problems could be satisfactorily mitigated through further design work or negotiation. Orange suggests the problems are deeper and may require fundamental reappraisal if they are to be overcome.

Clearly the aspiration of everyone involved should be to achieve green or blue across the whole gamut of criteria. However, the key is to achieve the best solution possible in any given situation. So it is essential to compare different options and to compare those options with a “do nothing” or “laissez-faire” situation.

Options with one or more red should normally be excluded from further consideration. Note that it is not primarily a question of how many criteria are compromised, or which are considered most important, but how severely. At this extreme any criteria may be critical.

In assessing the results it is important to recognize that the standards set are high. The key distinction is between a yellow grade and an orange grade. The latter implies that the health criterion is likely to be severely compromised – and it would be difficult (though not impossible) to correct it. The former implies that there remain major uncertainties about how far the criterion will be satisfied, but there are potential strategies that if pursued with vigour have a good chance of success.

It is important to note that a mere statement of intent or aspiration is not enough. The mechanism for fulfilling the aspiration must be explicit and convincing, or the grade is yellow. Where there are significant uncertainties about interpretation or implementation the grading given is normally yellow. We must emphasise that that does not necessarily imply criticism, rather that there is still a lot to play for - though in some cases quite modest modifications could add to the credibility of the proposal and/or the likelihood of achieving the stated goals.
To merit a *green* grade the policies must be at least up to good practice standards (that is good practice in health and sustainable development) and the mechanisms for delivery clear and likely to work. *Blue* is an exemplar, an excellent practice standard, where all facets of the criterion are substantially fulfilled, and the proposal demonstrates that they can be achieved.

The scheme to be assessed has to be seen in context. If there are external constraints (e.g. a requirement in the local plan) that prevent achievement of a satisfactory outcome, then two grades should be shown: one which gives the real, i.e. poor, score; the other which records how good the scheme is if it is accepted it cannot change the external constraint.
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BRISTOL PARTNERSHIP
HEALTHY CITY GROUP

KNOWLE WEST REGENERATION FRAMEWORK

“Building health into our plans from the start”

Facilitator (floating) Marcus Grant (WHO Collaborating Centre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Criteria 1, 5, 10, 14, 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO Collaborating Centre</td>
<td>Sarah Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Collaborating Centre</td>
<td>Paul Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT Community Development - health</td>
<td>Kate Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Community Learning</td>
<td>Martin Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Housing</td>
<td>Barry Wallen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Urban Design</td>
<td>Dan Offord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Health and Social Care</td>
<td>Samantha Shantry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Criteria 2, 6, 10, 15, 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCC Planning and Health</td>
<td>Stephen Hewitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KWRF project team</td>
<td>Paul Owens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business representative</td>
<td>Ben Payne (HWV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle West Media Centre</td>
<td>Makala Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Economic Development</td>
<td>Rachel Allbless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Property Services</td>
<td>Jeremy Screen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Criteria 3, 7, 13, 16, 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO Collaborating Centre</td>
<td>Hugh Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Initiatives</td>
<td>Conor Moloney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle West Health Park Board</td>
<td>Ken Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle West Residents Planning Group</td>
<td>Mike Primarolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Urban Design</td>
<td>Andy Gibbins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Housing</td>
<td>Jonathan Mallinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Sustainable City team</td>
<td>Steve Marriott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Criteria 3, 8, 12, 17, 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO Collaborating Centre</td>
<td>Helen Lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle West Health Association</td>
<td>Rebekka Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT Strategic Development</td>
<td>Ben Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP Healthy Urban Team</td>
<td>Angela Raffle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Housing</td>
<td>Kevin Mulvena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Health and Social Care</td>
<td>Tracey Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle West Project Board</td>
<td>Cllr Gary Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group E</td>
<td>Criteria 4, 9, 11, 13, 18, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Collaborating Centre</td>
<td>Laurence Carmichael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Collaborating Centre</td>
<td>Caroline Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Initiatives</td>
<td>Ian Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Bristol</td>
<td>Claire Lowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT Community Development - Health</td>
<td>Mandy Shute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Youth and Play services</td>
<td>Tina Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowle West student placement,</td>
<td>George Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C &amp; D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>C &amp; E</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 5 - FEEDBACK ON THE WORKSHOP

### 1. The Spectrum process used - did it work, was it relevant for you

- Yes, very good
- It did and I think it was relevant to what I do
- Found this a useful tool. Would have been good to have a summary of the proposals for each criteria listed to make it easier to make a judgement as quite often changed mind when heard more info on what was planned.
- Overall it felt like quite an instinctive process and others in my group didn't have any questions about how to use it. For the most part it was relevant, although there were some items, which we were judging for which we did not have enough information, either from the plans or due to the lack of residents in our group.
- It worked as a process, but some of the questions were not relevant to a spatial framework, more for detailed plans
- This was my first 'live' exposure to Spectrum rather than reading about it and I found it to be a useful and illuminating procedure. It seemed to be easily understood and provided a forum for lively debate. The measure it produced was a good an detailed qualitative appraisal of opinion.

### 2. How the workshop went on the day - timings, the presentations etc

- Again, good
- Well timings were a bit out but I was keen to see it through to the end and I think many others were too and as this was the first time of doing this I think it went well
- Would have been good to split up the feedback section with a break, as it was a long time to give full attention in order to put in vote. A lot of criteria to get through though!
- Good to start the day with presentations and for the plans to be presented by a 'neutral' representative, we could have had a bit more information about the types of consultation that had already taken place with residents.
- Good, although timekeeping could have been better towards the end
- The table's views seemed to reflect puzzlement and confusion over the presentation of the purpose of the process and perhaps a longer introduction and reassurance over the validity of the process would be a good idea for the next outing of this approach. The timing clearly went awry and a less ambitious or longer process is needed to achieve this level of detailed response.

### 3. Venue and catering, administrative arrangements etc

- Good
- Excellent venue and good food
- All good.
- Good size venue and mix of delegates on tables
- Venue was good, catering was nice but not on time
- Good venue, but poor noise control from hard surfaces meant that sometimes conversations were difficult to hear. Catering was very good.
4. Anything else

- 23 points a little too many??? I appreciate you wanted to capture all aspects could it be a little more comprehensive, or just make the day a little longer?
- It would definitely be good to repeat this exercise once proposals for the KWRF are more concrete to see which areas need attention.
- I do not personally like to sit still for long periods of time. It is also bad for my back, and not good in general. I would suggest maybe coloured hoops, that you jump in when you agree etc, anything to make it more movement.
- The only significant concern from participants at the table I was at during the day appeared to be an expression of ethicality or appropriateness of voting on issues the participants knew little about, such as shopping provision, car and cycle use, recycling and the quality of air and water. There was a concern from some participants that only locals should be participating to make the process valid. The morning intervention from the local elected member asking how many people really knew enough to participate disturbed some at the table and led to some participants expressing a desire to abstain from the process in the early stage. There was a fear expressed that their 'expert' votes based on self-confessed little detailed knowledge of the area might bias the outcome of the public consultation and this disturbed them. They found themselves under social pressure to respond despite not wishing to participate in some assessments. Others appeared happy to give verdicts on and vote on, for example, recycling initiatives that turned out to be based on false assumptions. This needs to be addressed in a next outing of the Spectrum approach to make it more meaningful.
- The general debate of each item often appeared to affect personal opinion immediately before a vote, leaving a question as to whether the Spectrum approach was measuring anything more than swaying opinion rather than a measure of participant's reactions to the plan as it was presented in the first session.

5. Overall was it a good, useful day for you

- Yes, interesting process and lessons to be learnt from
- I actually think it was of great value and it was something that was very much needed with KWRF being discussed I was extremely pleased that it was organised and went ahead
- Yes
- Yes I really enjoyed doing something, which felt like it might influence the plans at an early stage.
- I think it was useful for regeneration process
- The day left me with a much better understanding of the Spectrum approach as an HIA social marketing measure. It clearly graded opinion very well. It obviously does not measure a realistic appraisal of a plan's value or real knowledge of a plan's ability to deliver what it hopes to do, but does provide a good means of assessing public mood or beliefs about proposed changes.
Thanks Stephen - I thought the day went surprisingly well, and the participants showed a lot of commitment and stamina! Many of the points (and information) emerging struck me as useful, sometimes salutary. A few reflections:

- We tried to do too much - i.e. both the necessary discussion of criteria, the baseline assessment and the framework proposals assessment. It would be very desirable in the future to do the criteria and baseline in one session, in advance of formal proposals but helping to set the agenda for them. Then the framework (or key options) assessment later.

- It is important to have a rounded report setting the scene or setting out the proposals in advance of the workshop. Obviously for reasons beyond control that wasn't possible this time.

- I think the groups need to be a bit larger and therefore fewer, to try to get greater varied expertise round each table. That implies a longer breakout session to cover more criteria.

- Of course the sheer number of criteria was a problem. The process worked well in terms of distinguishing different issues and people grasped the approach well, but we might consider limiting the range of concerns to the more critical areas - in other words doing a first quick scoping exercise (maybe with everyone) to keep the thing manageable and allow greater depth and discussion.

Very willing to take these (and other thoughts people have) further in advance of setting the next event.

Hi Stephen

Many thanks for a very productive and enjoyable day last week! Some thoughts and feedback on the day:

Firstly, the spectrum methodology (with some deft facilitation) turned what is often perceived as a 'turn off' or menial task into something that was open, enjoyable and very productive, and that on its own is a real achievement. As it happened there was little repetition, and while it required focussed concentration from everyone, there was determination to complete the task. I think it could have been a bit less gruelling if we had provided fuller information. Please accept my apologies for this. Perhaps it would useful to consider what would be a minimum specification of what would be needed to enable the appraisal to function without excessive amounts of additional clarification. Also as was clear, some of the questions could be more tightly framed – but these are very minor points.
Secondly, and more abstractly, it was clear that the whole HIA process was an extremely effective way of engaging health professionals in planning issues, with valuable sharing of information and insights on all sides. I can certainly foresee this method being of real value in our work. We are currently working on a Neighbourhood Plan in DISTRICT X where a new £500m acute hospital is planned for an area directly adjacent. There have been significant institutional and professional barriers in engaging NHS officers in discussion around planning issues, sustainability principles, community benefit – and even general public health issues beyond the 'core mission' of delivering acute health services! This approach could help to translate and interpret between planning and health spheres.

Thirdly, I thought the initial questions on strategic physical and sectoral links were particularly interesting. I wonder could this be expanded to consider, from a service provider's view, what might be an optimal model of service provision for the area in question, against which the plan in question could then be appraised. The question might be: How can residents in this neighbourhood best access services and in what ways can a physical regeneration framework support this? This could also provide an opportunity to clarify the scope of what physical regeneration can actually deliver, and begin the job of translating between health and planning professionals.

Regards