Half of the world’s people now live in cities, by 2030 this proportion will increase to nearly two thirds. In Australia, 75% of people already live in cities with a population of more than 80,000 and 90% live in urban settlements of 10,000 or more. There is growing concern expressed in the media over the possible health-damaging effects of city life, including commentary on the dangers of ‘crowded suburbs’, a facet of modern ‘killer cities’. Cities are a ‘potentially powerful force’ in shaping population health, particularly that of disadvantaged people. The aims of this paper are to review briefly studies linking disadvantaged urban environments with poor mental health and to propose an explanatory model to guide future research.

Cities differ substantially from one another, as do neighbourhoods within cities. Poor health is often ‘highly concentrated’ in a small proportion of neighbourhoods that share health-damaging characteristics: inadequate or ‘substandard’ housing that limits access to shelter, connectedness, and a sense of ‘home’, including pride in one’s home and home as a refuge; poor access to transport, co-location with ‘undesirable land uses’, such as bus depots and busy roads; lack of access to healthy food and overexposure to unhealthy food, alcohol and tobacco; limited access to and poor design of recreational and green spaces; and exposure to the clearly visible symbols of poverty and degradation that send ‘powerful messages’ that nobody cares about the neighbourhood or its residents. These characteristics generate direct health risks, for example, by facilitating the spread of disease and discouraging physical activity, while encouraging negative health behaviours, such as reduced health care-seeking.

While most studies have examined cities and their effects on physical health, some have investigated mental health. Mental health problems have been associated with social disorganisation and living in deprived neighbourhoods. Increasing population density has also been linked to mental health problems, including elevated rates of psychosis and depression. However, density alone does not necessarily determine disadvantage: for example, Potts Point in Sydney and Southbank in Melbourne are densely populated areas associated with advantage rather than disadvantage. More likely, population density is health damaging when it occurs in conjunction with other risk factors in the physical and social environment. These include lack of access to the natural environment and, especially, high levels of socio-economic deprivation, including overcrowding. Prospective studies have concluded that improvements in the built environment are associated with decreasing psychiatric morbidity. In a follow-up of 503 people in Oslo, Norway, mental health problems declined among participants living in an initially poorly functioning neighbourhood that improved over a decade. Relocation can achieve similar results. In the American ‘Moving to Opportunity’ study, families selected at random moved from deprived to non-deprived
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Abstract: Most of the world’s population now lives in cities, with 90% of Australians living in urban settlements of more than 10,000 people. Urban environments help shape population health, particularly among disadvantaged people, where poor health is concentrated. A growing body of research has focussed on the association between cities and mental health. Three hypotheses have been proposed to explain this association: psycho-social stressors; concentrated disadvantage; and social drift. It remains unclear, however, how the characteristics of urban environments are related to each other and to mental health, and what might be the pathways underpinning the experience of different individuals. With one in five Australian adults meeting the diagnostic criteria for a mental disorder each year, investigation of the relationship between urban environments and mental health is urgently needed. This paper briefly reviews recent studies linking disadvantaged urban environments with mental health and proposes a hypothetical model to help guide future research.
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Health-damaging characteristics of urban environments
Built environments may be conceptualised in terms of eco-
logical (neighbourhood) characteristics, such as type of
housing, roads and public places,25 and of individual
dwellings. Disadvantaged neighbourhoods exhibit substan-
dard housing,12 which has been directly linked to poor
mental health,26,27 and ‘physical incivilities’.25 These phys-
ical incivilities include derelict buildings, extensive grafi-
itti, litter, vandalism, excessive traffic, urine, dog faeces, a
small proportion of private gardens (and a correspondingly
higher proportion of shared recreational spaces),25 visibly
deteriorating buildings, external walls, windows, stairs or
lifts, structural fires and dirty streets or pavements.6

Substandard housing is most prevalent in poor neighbour-
hoods25 and among dwellings built since 1970, with deck
access (a means of access to flats above ground level via
stairs or lifts that lead to long corridors onto which resi-
dents’ front doors open directly) or floor-level access. This
type of housing features one or more structural problems:
damp,13 leaking roofs, rot, pests,25 toilet breakdown, non-
functioning kitchens, inadequate heating, repeated heating
breakdown during winter, peeling plaster or paint, internal
leaks,6 overheating in summer13 and lack of affordability.
11,15 People’s perceptions about their housing may be
influenced by their neighbourhood, and negative percep-
tions about both incline people to relocate, increasing res-
idential instability.28 This breaks social ties that promote
mental health.29

Disadvantaged social environments exhibit social incivi-
ties, such as the presence of crime, teen gangs,25 noise (for
example, from trucks and aeroplanes8,10), foul air,27 neigh-
bourhood poverty6 and diminished social capital. Socio-
demographic disadvantages also prevail, including
overcrowding, unemployment, poor education, single par-
eting, ethnicity, renting, no car or van access,25 poverty6
and being an immigrant or refugee.17

The built and social environments and mental health are
entwined.6,25 In a study of 1887 residents of two London
wards, people living with socio-demographic disadvan-
tages, substandard housing and physical incivilities were
more likely to report depression than were their less dis-
advantaged peers.25 Even after adjusting for socio-demo-
graphic characteristics and attributes of individual
dwellings, significant associations remained between
depression and deck access, post 1970s housing and few
private gardens. Similar findings emerged from a study of
depression and the built environment in 59 neighbour-
hoods in New York City.6 Controlling for socio-demo-
graphic factors, substandard housing and physical
incipvilities were significantly associated with elevated
rates of depression.

How do cities influence mental health?
Three explanations for the direct and indirect2 associations
between urban environments and mental health have been
proposed:6 psychosocial stressors, concentrated disadvan-
tage and social drift.

Psychosocial stressors
Pearlin and colleagues31 described ‘the stress process’ as
negative life events creating strain in people’s lives, with
this strain eroding positive self-concepts such as confi-
dence and sense of worth, leaving people psychologically
vulnerable, especially to depression. Exposure to physical
and social incivilities in cities generates psychosocial
stress; both are associated with diminished feelings of
safety and security in one’s home, which is related to
mental health.15

Concentrated disadvantage
The concentrated disadvantage explanation suggests that
the density of city populations concentrates physical and
social problems, intensifying their effects and inflating
pressures on mental health. Consistent with this explana-
tion, physical incivilities, substandard housing, social inci-
vilities and socio-demographic disadvantage are
significantly positively correlated, as are their constituent
components.6,25 The mental health effects of concentrated
disadvantage may be mediated by psychosocial factors,
such as collective efficacy32 and loss of control, social
support, and recreation.27

Social drift
The social drift explanation proposes that the socio-
economic circumstances of people with severe and endur-
ing mental health problems gradually deteriorate,
necessitating relocating into progressively disadvantaged
neighbourhoods and lower quality accommodation.23 This
explanation does not preclude the possibility that disad-
vantaged urban environments might also contribute to
mental health problems. Indeed, while social drift con-
tributes to the concentration of psychosis in disadvantaged
neighbourhoods, urban environment causation seems
more important than selection;19 controlling for individual
income and neighbourhood socio-economic status, a rela-
tionship has been found between the urban environment
and depression.5
Figure 1. Hypothetical model of the relationship between disadvantages in the built environment and mental health, illustrating the concentrated disadvantage, psychosocial stressors and social drift explanations.
Cities and mental health: a conceptual model

While there is evidence that built environments may influence mental health and that mental health problems predispose people to live in disadvantaged environments, it is unclear exactly how environmental and social factors are related and how different explanatory hypotheses might be accommodated within a pathways model that allows for different individual experience. Figure 1 is a conceptual model of how disadvantaged city environments might be linked to mental health problems. The Figure includes only factors for which there is direct empirical evidence for a link with mental health, as summarised in the literature review above.

Constructs (in ellipses) have been presented together with lists of factors (in boxes) that have been empirically associated with the built environment and mental health. Darker arrows denote the direction of relationships among constructs as suggested by the concentrated disadvantage, psychosocial stressors and social drift explanations. Lighter arrows indicate relationships for which there is empirical evidence but which do not feature in the three explanations. The explanations are not mutually exclusive. Instead, they describe different aspects of a bigger picture, which must also take account of the size, density, diversity and complexity of a city’s population and its global, national, political, economic and social contexts.1

Urban environments and mental health: an urgent research priority

One in five Australian adults meets the diagnostic criteria for a mental disorder each year,34 with mental health problems (particularly depression and anxiety35) being the leading cause of non-fatal disease burden.36 The prevalence of mental health problems is increasing.37–39 This trend is likely to continue,40 involving massive costs to healthcare41–45 and Australian society,42,46–52 with profound implications for the intergenerational transmission of mental health problems53–55 and disadvantage.56 Though we live predominantly in cities,30,37 we do not fully understand how cities influence mental health,58 the social environment’s contribution to this relationship remains ‘neglected’ in research as a ‘possible [explanatory] mechanism’.18 The fields of social ecology and community psychology, together with social capital theory, could usefully contribute to filling this gap.

It is essential59 to begin systematic investigation of pathways models that describe how features of the social and built environments of Australian cities may be related to mental health. Urban environments are amenable to modification and, with the potential to affect vast proportions of the world’s population,2 this is urgently needed.11,13 Insufficient investment has been made27 in the challenging task60 of developing sophisticated conceptual frameworks (pathways models) of how the built environment may affect mental health. Frameworks must (i) be theory-based, empirically tested and continuously refined,60 (ii) be constructed within a population health approach, with prevention in mind, and with interventions evaluated via ‘report card[s]’ that are not reliant on primary data collection and are ‘grounded’ in local realities,19 and (iii) include health-promoting features of built environments, such as contact with nature61,62 and easy access to parks and walking.58,60,63
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