Community Wellbeing in Cities through the Sustainable Affordable Housing

Nor Suzylah Sohaimi[1], Rosfaraliza Azura Ramli[2]

Institute Research for Indonesia, Thailand, and Singapore, Universiti Utara Malaysia[1],
School of Government, Universiti Utara Malaysia[1,2]
Corresponding Author's Email: suzysuhaimi@uum.edu.my

Abstract
The main goal is to elicit more discussion about what we call "being well together" and to increase attention to it. A multifaceted source of occupants' mental health and welfare, housing serves as more than just a physical refuge. The type of housing, the public space, affordability, and the housing itself are all directly related to the resident's mental well-being and physical wellness. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development includes housing as a key element, which is necessary to accomplish several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Having access to affordable housing improves a person's health, educational chances, and employment prospects. This article's goal was to investigate community wellbeing and elucidate the linkage between housing and wellbeing. All required information has been gathered via secondary data from books and journals.
Keywords: Sustainable Affordable Housing, Sustainable Development Goals, Housing Affordability, Wellbeing, Citie

Introduction
Increasing urbanisation and a continuously changing urban environment not only make individuals' everyday lives more convenient, but they also have an adverse effect on the physical and psychological health of residents. Since the fast expansion of urban agglomerations around the world frequently has negative psychological repercussions for city dwellers, mental health and wellbeing are crucial public health priority when constructing livable and harmonious cities. Under the circumstances, constructing a healthier and more habitable eco-city is gaining considerable attention in many countries, particularly in developing countries. It is noteworthy that adequate, affordable, safe, convenient, and

economically mixed housing has a direct and indirect impact on public mental health and wellness. Since these occasionally disregarded aspects of health are essential to achieving the WHO's 2030 Sustainable Development Goals, the UN has committed resources to improving social well-being and mental health (United Nations, 2018). As a result, it is vital to examine the relationship between housing, mental health, and well-being in urban area. Furthermore, housing policy plays a somewhat indirect but major role in boosting the inhabitants' mental health and overall well-being Housing is one of the most basic demands of the urban population. Humans spend more than 90% of their time indoors, and Jackson (1995) claims that a "sense of place" is a concept in public health that has been extensively researched. In a nutshell, a person's mental health and wellbeing can be directly impacted by factors at home. Housing can also have an indirect effect on mental health by modifying psychosocial systems that have established mental health repercussions.

A Review Community Wellbeing

A key component of sustainable development is ensuring good health and fostering wellbeing at all stages of life. Subjective well-being is identical with good mental health. The World Health Organization (2001) defines positive mental health as "a condition of well-being in which the individual recognises his or her own abilities, can endure with the usual stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is capable of contributing to the community to his or her society". The idea of well-being according to this definition encompasses a sense of life being good as well as the lack of mental illness. Well-being extends transcend hedonism and the pursuit of contentment or enjoyable experience, as well as beyond a broad assessment (life satisfaction) to include how well people operate, also known as dispositional, or psychological well-being. Lach et.al (2022) emphasize the changing nature of wellbeing by framing it as a social practice. Wellbeing is defined as a 'emergent pattern of action' acquired and adopted by the collective that results in wellbeing. The experiencing of pleasant emotions including contentment and happiness, as well as the growth of one's abilities, having a certain degree of autonomy over one's life, having a sense of significance, and having meaningful relationships, are all considered to be characteristics of well-being (Huppert, 2009).

Individual Wellbeing (IW) is the increasingly influence of wellbeing and can be widely understood as a person's level of life satisfaction (Atkinson et al., 2017). Individual wellbeing estimates can indeed be made from individuals across individual scale domains using both subjective (e.g., sentiments about life) and objective data (e.g., education level, employment status), and consolidated up to the size of the given community. Subjective Wellbeing (SWB) is a term that describes a person's thoughts and emotions about various elements of their lifestyle. about personal parts of their lives and their feelings about their immediate context and their larger social, political, and physical environment. Objective wellbeing (OWB) evaluations cover aspects for which trustworthy and valid collected results or can be obtained, or which can be reliably reported by an acceptable informant. Again, it is critical to distinguish between evaluations for and at the individual scale (IOWB) and evaluations for the community scale.

CW generally allude to living comfortably together on a community size, in addition to refer to the role that community scale features of life play in supporting local individual wellbeing. As defined by Wiseman and Brasher (2008), CW refers to a range of social, economic, environmental, political and cultural aspects that people and communities recognise as necessary for growth and realising their full potential. Wellbeing could be derived

from interpersonal relationships, interpersonal relationships with place, interpersonal relationships with cultural values and history, and so forth (Atkinson et. al., 2017).

Housing Affordability Concept
The connection between one's ability to buy or rent a home and housing affordability lies at its core. The most frequently utilized definition of affordable housing is the correlation between the cost of housing and income (Abd Aziz et al., 2011; Jewkes & Delgadillo, 2010). Some researchers argued that cost-effectiveness is inextricably linked to monetary considerations (Mulliner & Maliene, 2015; Wilcox, 2003). Instead, affordability goes transcend monetary principle, according to Stone (1993), and to refer to affordability only in terms of monetary principle is to have a superficial knowledge of affordability. According to him, affordability serves as a bridge spanning social and economic conditions without abandoning the most fundamental human needs. Housing affordability can be defined as the ability of a household to secure a standard of living while avoiding unjustifiable burdens (MacLennan & Williams, 1990). If a household faces a constant burden that causes housing stress, the household is deemed to be facing an affordability challenge.

Housing affordability is defined by including non-housing costs. The residual income model (RIM), whereby prioritises additional household expenses as the first priority on household income, is linked to this definition. Housing affordability is defined in this context by the National Housing Strategy of Australia as an appropriate housing cost to income, with adequate income for other essentials such food, healthcare, transportation, and education after settling the housing cost (Australia, 1991). Mattingly and Morrissey (2014), on the other hand, advocated for a more complete definition of home affordability that includes transportation costs. Housing affordability is focused with improving house quality, such as decent, safe, and hygienic conditions, according to (Lerman and Reader, 1987). As a result, Mattingly and Morrissey (2014); Lerman and Reader (1987) characterised home affordability in ways other than monetary terms. In this context, Mattingly and Morrissey (2014) critiqued traditional methods that simply took into account an indicator of housing cost and income. It is immediately clear that a household's ability to afford housing is only one factor in determining housing affordability; other factors include the number of children, the cost of transportation, education, and food and beverages (F&B). In this scenario, the PIR approach might be contested because a household may be able to pay a particular amount for housing costs while omitting other expenditures, which is consistent with the opinion of Linneman and Megbolugbe (1992) that the conventional approach has numerous issues.

In conclusion, there are multiple methods to describe housing affordability, and some scholars also consider the quality of housing, location, and accessibility. Many academics have limited their definition of affordability to financial or economic terms, requiring that a certain portion of income be set over for housing costs.

Relationship between Housing and Wellbeing
CW in the built environment as a dynamic procedure that takes place when residents interact with their physical environs to negotiate understandings of community inside their buildings' common spaces (Wiseman and Brasher, 2008; Atkinson *et al.*, 2017). Housing has consistently been linked to health. Since its inception in 1948, the World Health Organization (WHO) has regarded housing to be a health determinant (Howden et al., 2017). Despite the lack of a universally accepted cross-disciplinary definition of health, since the WHO's (2014, p.1) well-known definition of health as "[...] a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being

andnot merely the absence of disease or infirmity," community well-being and mental health have been recognised as essential and inter-related aspects of health.

Housing Affordability and Wellbeing

Housing affordability does have huge implications for economic security since it affects how much money is left over in household budgets for expenses like food, healthcare, education, and other expenses that have an impact on lifestyle and quality of life. A rising number of research have explored at the association between unhealthy living conditions and housing affordability or frequently referred to as Housing Affordability Stress (HAS). Numerous studies establish correlational evidence of the association between prohibitive housing costs and declining or adverse health, for instance in (Baker et al., 2017; Baker et al., 2014). Another example in US study by Yilmazer et al (2015) discovered that homeowners suffered significant psychological distress because they admitted experiencing trouble making their mortgage payments. Meltzer and Schwartz (2016) discovered that renters who had to bear higher rental costs in New York experienced more adverse health consequences, such as self-rated poor health and postponement of healthcare services. A study in Hong Kong that examined the connection between housing affordability and both mental and physical health found that it was exacerbated by housing affordability. Housing affordability stress continues to independently constitute a threat to both physical and mental health even after accounting for the effects of other sociodemographic, socioeconomic, and lifestyle factors (Chung et al., 2020). The connection with mental health was particularly high.

Housing Type and Wellbeing

The relationship between housing and mental health are frequently intertwined. Difficulties in managing housing-related problems could be exacerbated by poor mental health. Experiencing homelessness or facing difficulties in one's living situation could worsen one's mental health. A wide range of societal elements, including social relationships, antisocial conduct, social networks, a sense of community and belonging, memberships, a sense of control, social cohesion, social capital, and social support, are included in the broad category of CW. According to Barros et al (2019), the term "mental health" mainly includes emotional results such as mood, loneliness, and quality of life, as well as mental disorders such as depression, anxiety, and schizophrenia. These outcomes can be either positively or negatively impacted by living in high-rise buildings.

The physical structure of a housing unit can affect the inhabitants' mental health and overall well-being to some degree. As the demand for high-rise buildings has increased, there has also been a trend towards retrofitting buildings that are associated with problems such as social isolation, crime, negative public perception and poor air quality. An example of this is seen in the case of the Bilmermeer high-rise in Amsterdam (Helleman & Wassenberg, 2004). Evans et al (2003) argue that high-rise, multiple housing can be detrimental to the mental health of both mothers with young children and the children themselves. Many high-rise buildings' facilities and amenities are insufficient for occupants or are placed comparatively far from dwellings. Prior research conducted by Evans et al (2003) have indicated that characteristics of high-rise housing, such as the type of home, floor level, and quality of housing, can impact the mental health of residents. The study also highlighted the importance of considering moderating and mediating factors.

In two of the reviewed research, it was compared if certain social well-being sub-domains acted as steppingstones to mental health and whether living in high-rise residential

structures or other types of housing did (Gibson et al., 2011; Kitchen et al.,, 2012). Based on research, it has been found that living in high-rise apartments negatively impacts social well-being and mental health when compared to other types of housing. Gibson et al. (2011) found that having control over one's surroundings plays a role in mediating mental health and sense of belonging, while Kitchen et al (2012) established a strong correlation between these two variables. Evidence thus supports the need to include several social well-being categories as potential explanatory processes for mental health.

Previous studies by Kearns et al (2012); Kowaltowski et al (2006) demonstrated a connection between floor level and wellbeing, with higher floor levels being persistently associated with positive community impacts. Kowaltowski et al (2006) found that the residential ground level may have some issues related to privacy, safety, and control. However, Kearns et al (2012) discovered that social outcomes, like social cohesion and contact, were more favorable at higher levels of the building.

Housing's Public Space and Wellbeing
In two research Phoon et al (1976); Pojani & Buka (2015), the associations between semi-public areas in high-rise structures and societal well-being were investigated. In contrast to Phoon et al.'s (1976) finding that the bulk of social contacts in high-rises occur in corridors, Pojani and Buka (2015) discovered that tiny, dim staircases and elevators are regions that are more likely to hinder socialising and, hence, the extension of social networks. Gibson et al (2011) contend that common areas snuggled away behind tall buildings have negative social impacts, such as a worsened sense of control and a greater perception of antisocial behaviour. Compared to private gardens of homes, these effects are linked to poor mental health outcomes. In a similar vein, shared entrances were reportedly linked to a lower sense of control, privacy, and safety, which in turn was linked to poorer mental health than private entrances that were inherent to houses (Gibson et al., 2011). Gibson's discovery supports Newman's (1972) contention that problematic physical and spatial arrangements that impede the manifestation of territorial claims and offer little opportunity for surveillance are typically present. The issue of undesirable intruders in dwellings with shared entrances was a recurring topic that was noted as generating significant stress, anxiety, and interrupted sleep. Private entrances, on the other hand, provided owners with defensible space, allowing them to monitor and restrict admission to their property. Increases in privacy and security provided by private entrances increased affective outcomes such as well-being, stress levels, mood, and quality of life through the psychological process of control (Gibson et al., 2011). Furthermore, the enrichment of semi-public areas may have an impact on their sustainability and desirability (Mehta, 2014). Residents enhance the corridor with a feeling of ownership and individuality through actions such as placing potted plants and artworks outside the primary doorway of their living spaces.

Numerous research studies have examined the correlation between open spaces accessible to the general public and the literature related to personal happiness, with a particular focus on the importance of green areas (Francis et al., 2012). For many years, there has been a connection between improved health and green spaces, which is attributed to their ability to provide relaxation and rejuvenation Kaplan & Kaplan (1989) as well as a calming influence (Ulrich et al., 1991). Additionally, the presence of diverse flora and fauna within such ecosystems has been found to have a positive impact (Carrus et al., 2015; Wood et al., 2018; Gidlow et al., 2016). Furthermore, green space typically provides

opportunities for exercise, which may enhance wellbeing (Han et al., 2014; McCormack & Shiell, 2011; Maas et al., 2008; Cohen et al., 2007; Giles-Corti et al., 2005). Finally, other factors that enhance one's well-being in natural environments consist of the chance to experience tranquility and seclusion Adams (2014), engage in physical exercise Cohen et al (2007), and be inspired by the natural environment (Wood et al., 2018)

Sustainable Development Goals and Housing

Goal 1: No poverty is linked to housing due to sufficient and affordable housing increasing resilience and lowering vulnerability to shock and disaster caused by the economy, society, and the environment. A household that spends upwards of 30% of its income on housing would struggle to meet other household necessities, such as transportation, health care, education, and food and beverage. According to Bramley (1990), once a household is able to pay a net housing cost and resides in a particular standard home based on size and household type, it is not considered to be living below the poverty line. A household's capability to obtain other basic needs, such as access to healthy food, healthcare, and better education, depends on having adequate income to meet their monthly housing costs (Australia, 1991). This is due to failing to access education keeps a family trapped in a cycle of poverty. In a nutshell, there is a connection between housing and poverty in that housing costs a large portion of household income and significantly affects living conditions.

How is Goal 5: Gender Equality, related from the perspective of housing? According to United Nations Women, more than 50% of metropolitan women and girls lack access to decent living spaces or long-lasting housing. In a similar spirit, women are frequently thought of as spending a lot of time at home taking care of the family. Therefore, homes are susceptible to illness due to housing shortages and inadequate hygiene, and women are often required to care for the sick. Along with affordable housing for women, the SDGs also emphasise homes for single moms and women living alone. For instance, women are the head of family in 31% of Bolivian homes, with the majority of them residing in subpar housing without a stable land tenure. Since the 1980s, Western nations have considered the housing needs of women, although local perspectives are rarely discussed (Malaysia). By creating and putting into practise rules and regulations, investing in the security and economic viability of public places, and raising awareness of gender equality, successful housing processes for women are planned based on Goal 5.

The purpose of Goal 6: Clean Water and Sanitation is to guarantee the availability and long-term administration of water and sanitation. As safe and adequate housing requires access to clean water and sanitary facilities, this objective is related to housing. UNICEF (2017) reports that 2.1 billion individuals face challenges in accessing safe and clean water, 4.5 billion people do not have access to appropriately maintained sanitation facilities, and 2.1 billion people encounter difficulties obtaining water within their households. In Kibera, Nairobi, for example, low-cost housing or illegal homes were built without consideration for current housing standards, including poor water and bathroom facilities in an effort to keep costs as low as possible or give housing at the most reasonable price (COHRE & SDC, 2008).

Goal 7: Affordable and Clean Energy is a housing system that uses energy-efficient, cost-effective, clean energy to minimize costs, lessen air pollution, and counteract the consequences of climate change. According to UN-HABITAT, having access to affordable, clean energy, cooking and heating fuels, and durable housing that is resistant to adverse weather conditions constitutes sufficient housing. Better circumstances for cities and human

settlements, such as ones that are safe resilient, less polluted, and sustainable, are undoubtedly encouraged by affordable, clean, and efficient energy systems.

Assuring those cities and populated areas are secure, resilient, and sustainable is the purpose of Goal 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities. By 2030, the United Nations Habitat predicts that 60% of the world's population will reside in cities, necessitating the construction of 2 billion new homes. Housing must be affordable and slum settlements must be reduced to achieve safe and sustainable cities.

Conclusion

CW is an umbrella term that encompasses a broad range of factors that contribute to the overall health and satisfaction of individuals within a community. It includes access to basic needs such as safe housing, clean water, healthcare, and education, as well as the availability of social and economic opportunities, cultural resources, and environmental amenities. Sustainable affordable housing is a crucial part of CW, particularly in urban areas where affordable choices for housing are typically limited. Sustainable housing refers to structures that are designed to be economical with energy, environmentally friendly, and socially responsible. Utilizing eco-friendly building materials, energy-saving appliances, and renewable energy sources are frequent components of it. While also improving the lives of its occupants, sustainable housing may decrease its harmful effects on the environment. Housing that is affordable is described as being available to individuals and families with low and moderate incomes. It may be difficult for many families, particularly those who are impoverished, to afford homes in urban areas. The entire quality of life for low and moderate-income households can be improved by easing their financial load by providing them with affordable housing.

CW may gain from sustainable affordable housing in a variety of ways. It can improve the physical and mental health of its residents by providing safe and wholesome living conditions. When people and families have access to affordable and stable housing, which is a fundamental human right, anxieties and stress caused by housing instability can be reduced. In turn, this can strengthen social ties throughout communities, reduce instances of domestic abuse, and lead to better mental health results. Sustainable affordable housing can also aid in the expansion of the economy and the creation of jobs in cities. Additionally, it can lower the cost of housing, freeing up money for other essentials of living. When housing is reasonably priced, people and families have more money to spend on things like food, education, healthcare, training, and business endeavors. As a result, the community's small businesses may expand and the need for a competent labor may increase. The environmental impact of housing can also be lessened with the aid of sustainable affordable housing, resulting in a cleaner and healthier environment for all community members. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions, conserve natural resources, and cut back on trash, for example, to help maintain a sustainable environment in urban areas. It's interesting to note that sustainable affordable housing may help communities preserve their variety and cultural legacy. Creating areas that encourage social interaction and cultural exchange is possible when affordable housing is planned and built with cultural norms and values in mind.

In a nutshell sustainable affordable housing is a crucial element of community wellbeing in urban areas. It can improve people's mental and physical health, support their economic development, promote environmental sustainability, and preserve their cultural heritage and diversity.

References

Adams, M. (2014). Quality of urban spaces and wellbeing. *Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide*, 1–21.

Atkinson, S., Bagnall, A., Corcoran, R., & South, J. (2017). What is community wellbeing? Conceptual review.

Baker, E., Mason, K., Bentley, R., & Mallett, S. (2014). Exploring the bi-directional relationship between health and housing in Australia. *Urban policy and research*, *32*(1), 71-84.

Baker, E., Beer, A., Lester, L., Pevalin, D., Whitehead, C., & Bentley, R. (2017). Is housing a health insult?. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *14*(6), 567.

Barros, P., Fat, L. N., Garcia, L. M., Slovic, A. D., Thomopoulos, N., de Sa, T. H., ... & Mindell, J. S. (2019). Social consequences and mental health outcomes of living in high-rise residential buildings and the influence of planning, urban design and architectural decisions: A systematic review. *Cities*, *93*, 263-272.

Carrus, G., Scopelliti, M., Lafortezza, R., Colangelo, G., Ferrini, F., Salbitano, F., Agrimi, M., Portoghesi, L., Semenzato, P., & Sanesi, G. (2015). Go greener, feel better? The positive effects of biodiversity on the well-being of individuals visiting urban and peri-urban green areas. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 134*, 221–228.

Chung, R. Y. N., Chung, G. K. K., Gordon, D., Mak, J. K. L., Zhang, L. F., Chan, D., ... & Wong, S. Y. S. (2020). Housing affordability effects on physical and mental health: household survey in a population with the world's greatest housing affordability stress. *J Epidemiol Community Health*, *74*(2), 164-172.

Cohen, D. A., McKenzie, T. L., Sehgal, A., Williamson, S., Golinelli, D., & Lurie, N. (2007). Contribution of public parks to physical activity. *American Journal of Public Health, 97*(3), 509–514.

Evans, G. W., Wells, N. M., & Moch, A. (2003). Housing and mental health: a review of the evidence and a methodological and conceptual critique. *Journal of social issues*, *59*(3), 475-500

Francis, J., Wood, L. J., Knuiman, M., & Giles-Corti, B. (2012). Quality or quantity? Exploring the relationship between public open space attributes and mental health in Perth,Western Australia. *Social Science & Medicine, 74*(10), 1570–1577.

Gidlow, C. J., Jones, M. V., Hurst, G., Masterson, D., Clark-Carter, D., Tarvainen, M. P., Smith, G., & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. (2016). Where to put your best foot forward: Psycho-physiological responses to walking in natural and urban environments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 45*, 22–29.

Giles-Corti, B., Broomhall, M. H., Knuiman, M., Collins, C., Douglas, K., Ng, K., Lange, A., & Donovan, R. J. (2005). Increasing walking: How important is distance to, attractiveness, and size of public open space? *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 28*(2), 169–176.

Han, B., Cohen, D. A., Derose, K. P., Marsh, T., Williamson, S., & Raaen, L. (2014). How much neighborhood parks contribute to local residents' physical activity in the City of Los Angeles: A meta-analysis. *Preventive Medicine, 69*, S106–S110.

Howden-Chapman, P., Roebbel, N., & Chisholm, E. (2017). Setting housing standards to improve global health. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 14, 1542.

Huppert, F. A. (2009). Psychological well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied psychology: health and well-being*, *1*(2), 137-164.

Jackson, J. B. (1995). A sense of place, a sense of time. *Design Quarterly*, (164), 24-27.

Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (1989). Toward a synthesis: The experience of nature: A psychological perspective. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lach, N., McDonald, S., Coleman, S., Touchie, M., Robinson, J., Morgan, G., ... & Jakubiec, A. (2022). Community wellbeing in the built environment: towards a relational building assessment. *Cities & health*, 1-19.

Maas, J., Verheij, R. A., Spreeuwenberg, P., & Groenewegen, P. P. (2008). Physical activity as a possible mechanism behind the relationship between green space and health: A multilevel analysis. *BMC Public Health, 8*(1), 206.

McCormack, G. R., & Shiell, A. (2011). In search of causality: A systematic review of the relationship between the built environment and physical activity among adults. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 8*(1), 125.

Mehta, V. (2014). The street: A quintessential social public space. Oxon: Routledge.

Meltzer, R., and Schwartz, A. (2016) Housing affordability and health: Evidence from New York City. Housing Policy Debate, 26(1), 80–104.

Newman, O. (1972). Defensible space: People and design in the violent city. London: Architectural Press.

Pojani, D., & Buka, M. (2015). From camaraderie to detachment: The effect of changing built environment forms on neighborhood relations in a post-communist context. Cities, 49, 66–75.

Ulrich, R. S., Simons, R. F., Losito, B. D., Fiorito, E., Miles, M. A., & Zelson, M. (1991). Stress recovery during exposure to natural and urban environments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 11*(3), 201–230.

United Nations. (2018). Sustainable development goals. Goal 3: Good health. Available from: https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2018/05/mental-health-neglected-issue-but-key-to-achieving-global-goals-say-un-chiefs/>, Accessed date: 15 November 2022.

Wiseman, J., Brasher, K. (2008) Community wellbeing in an unwell world: trends, challenges, and possibilities. Journal of Public Health Policy, 29: 353-366.

Wood, E., Harsant, A., Dallimer, M., de Chavez, A., McEachan, R. R. C., & Hassall, C. (2018). Not all green space is created equal: Biodiversity predicts psychological restorative benefits from urban green space. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 2320.

World Health Organization. (2001). The World Health Report 2001: Mental health: new understanding, new hope.

World Health Organization. (2014). Basic documents (48th ed.). Geneva: World Health Organization1.

Yilmazer, T., Babiarz, P., and Liu, F. (2015) The impact of diminished housing wealth on health in the United States: Evidence from the Great Recession. Social Science and Medicine, 130, 234–241.

Wiseman, J., Brasher, K. (2008) Community wellbeing in an unwell world: trends, challenges, and possibilities. Journal of Public Health Policy, 29: 353-366.

Wood, E., Harsant, A., Dallimer, M., de Chavez, A., McEachan, R. R. C., & Hassall, C. (2018). Not all green space is created equal: Biodiversity predicts psychological restorative benefits from urban green space. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 2320.

World Health Organization. (2001). The World Health Report 2001: Mental health: new understanding, new hope.

World Health Organization. (2014). Basic documents (48th ed.). Geneva: World Health Organization1.

Yilmazer, T., Babiarz, P. and Liu, F. (2015) The impact of diminished housing wealth on health in the United States: Evidence from the Great Recession. Social Science and Medicine, 130, 234–241.