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Executive Summary

Aim of report:
Earlier this year, the Royal Society for Public Health (RSPH) published a Health on the High Street report which ranked Grimsby as having the 7th unhealthiest high street in the UK. In light of this finding, this report sought to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the streets in the locality from a health perspective: looking at trends within the locality to assess what areas could be targeted for improvement as well as what the main threats to local high streets seem to be, and attempting to establish whether streets are contributing to local health inequalities.

Methodology:
In order to measure the health impact of streets within the locality, this report records the presence of the 11 types of establishment that were identified by the RSPH as being the ‘best’ (most health promoting) and the ‘worst’ (most detrimental to public health). The RSPH defined health using a Richter scale, which broke health into four areas: encourages healthy lifestyle choices, promotes social interaction, allows greater access to health care services and/or health advice and promotes mental wellbeing; a total Richter score was given to each type of establishment to display the positive/negative health impact of the establishment based across these four areas of health (RSPH, 2015). The RSPH calculated the overall Richter score for a street as an average of the positive and negative Richter scoring outlets falling on that street.

This report follows the RSPH’s system of calculating the Richter score for streets and uses these overall Richter scores as a means of determining the health impact of individual streets. Like the RSPH report, this report also captures the detrimental impact of clustering by the removal of one Richter point from a street for each successive negatively scored outlet on the street once the proportion of that outlet on/surrounding a street surpasses 5% of the total outlets.

However, this report also records establishments outside of these specific categories, such as retail, service and food outlets and community centres, as well as looking at issues such as e-vaping/e-cigarettes shops and at vacancy, in order to provide a broader outline of different issues that can affect streets and the public. Richter scoring is just one means of establishing the health of local streets; it was also deemed useful to look at trends within the locality and within different wards. Each of the 11 establishments identified by the RSPH and their presence in the locality were assessed individually, and where appropriate ward analysis’s were conducted to look at trends and the coverage within different wards. 45 streets were assessed by this report, and Victoria Street South, Grimsby, was then assessed separately due to its proximity to Freshney Place Shopping precinct. An integral part of the RSPH’s definition of a high street is the streets role in serving a local community (RSPH, 2015), and this provided the basis for the inclusion of a street in this report: NELC’s 2012 Local Centres Report was taken as a starting point for what streets to include.

Key findings and suggestions:
- 19 pharmacies were recorded on the streets included in this report; however, three wards did not contain a pharmacy on any of their main streets: Haverstoe, West Marsh, and Scartho (where the pharmacy on Waltham Road is now vacant). These wards would benefit from increased access to community pharmacies.
- It is felt that the locality could benefit from investment in more accessible health clubs, with only five gyms/fitness facilities recorded on local high streets. Distance to an exercise facility has been found to
correlate with the frequency of uptake. However, it is acknowledged that this may not be feasible and that the establishment of a local fitness group similar to Fitmums & Friends in East Yorkshire may be a more feasible, cost-effective alternative for North East Lincolnshire.

- Libraries and museums/art galleries were not generally found on local high streets, meaning that the potential health benefits of these for local communities are not fully obtained. Investment into these could help improve health outcomes, especially amongst deprived communities.

- Pubs and bars are hubs of social interaction and have been shown to be beneficial for mental wellbeing: hence they must be viewed outside of their serving of alcohol. This report found that generally the highest proportion of pubs/bars are located in more deprived areas in the locality (specifically East Marsh, Sidney Sussex and Croft Baker), which is a positive finding in that it suggests good access to social interaction within these areas. However, it must also be noted that regular drinking over the lower risk guidelines increases the risk of suffering more serious health harms; evidence suggests that drinking alcohol is never without risk and that as consumption increases so does the risk of developing an alcohol-related problem (NICE, 2010).

- The proliferation/concentration of fast food takeaways is a locality-wide issue, although it is also true that more deprived areas in the locality do tend to have a higher concentration of fast food takeaways. East Marsh and Sidney Sussex contain the highest percentages of fast food takeaways, and in these wards the concentration of takeaways is not limited to certain streets. However, this report found a high incidence of clustering of fast food takeaways throughout the locality. As this report did not include Freshney Place shopping precinct, tourist areas in Cleethorpes, or residential areas, the actual presence of fast food takeaways is likely to be much greater.

- Pay day loan establishments and bookmakers tend to be located in the most deprived wards: indeed pay day loan establishments were only found in East Marsh, Sidney Sussex, Croft Baker and Yarborough wards. Freeman Street and Hainton Avenue collectively have a high incidence of these establishments, and also contain outlets such as a Cash4Clothes shop (where second hand clothes can be sold for recycling). Establishments such as these reflect poor economic circumstance.

- Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes (Sidney Sussex) is an area that could be targeted for health promotion, whether that be by working with local businesses to help them promote healthier lifestyles or by using local planning controls. Grimsby Road scores the lowest out of the 45 streets assessed by this report when using the RSPH’s system of Richter scoring, and also contains the highest proportion of tanning shops in the locality.

- Tanning shops are a relatively uncommon sight on streets within the locality, with only six independent tanning shops and a further six establishments offering tanning alongside another service recorded by this report. However, tanning shops should be encouraged to switch from sunbeds to spray tans due to the carcinogenic risk posed by UV radiation.

- Victoria Street, Grimsby, assessed separately by this report due to its proximity to Freshney Place shopping precinct, was found to contain a high percentage of bookmakers (six) and pay day loan establishments (three). As this street is visited by a large proportion of people within the locality, this is concerning.

- Haverstoe ward proved surprising in that the two streets assessed for this ward contained no outlets regarded as health promoting, despite the ward being the least deprived according to its 2010 IMD score. Hardys Road in Haverstoe also obtained a Richter score of -4, making it the 10th lowest scoring street out of the 45 recorded streets.

- Due to the loss of a pharmacy in Scartho Fork and due to the high proportion of fast food outlets found here, it may be useful to target health promotion efforts in this area.
High rates of vacancy were found within multiple streets in the East Marsh, and vacant sites were found on 28 streets. These sites could provide the opportunity for the positive development of a street; however, if outlets that are potentially detrimental to public health move into these sites, they could also further increase the detrimental impact of streets to the public. It is therefore important to consider what outlets are allowed to replace vacant sites.

Four e-cigarette/e-vaping shops were found on the streets assessed in this report: these were all located within East Marsh and Sidney Sussex.

In order to tackle the proliferation and health impact of fast food takeaways within the locality, a combination of three approaches could be taken:

1. Regulatory and planning measures could be used; fast food exclusion zones around schools have been successfully implemented by other local authorities and it is also recommended by the Academy of Medical Royal Colleges that planning decisions should be subjected to a health impact assessment. Other regulations such as restricting opening times of takeaways to prevent them targeting their food at school children can also be adopted.

2. As planning measures will not affect existing fast food takeaways, it would also be beneficial to work with the local food industry and local takeaways to help them make their food healthier: there is the potential to expand the work carried out under NELC’s Healthy Choices Award.

3. Likewise, there is also potential to work with local schools to promote healthy lifestyles and eating habits amongst children.

Further research could be carried out to assess areas not covered by this report and to assess the health impact of streets in a broader way: for example, by looking more closely at how individual businesses contribute to local health and by looking at the 10 indicators of a healthy street environment (as identified by Transport for London) (Saunders, 2014).

Additionally, undertaking public consultation exercises would allow the Council to incorporate the views of local residents, community groups and schools into planning decisions.
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1. **Introduction: the importance of High Streets in contributing to local health**

Earlier this year, the Royal Society for Public Health (RSPH) published a Health on the High Street report which placed Grimsby as having one of the 10 unhealthiest high streets in the UK (7th worst). Hence, North East Lincolnshire was identified as having a high concentration of ‘unhealthy’ high street businesses that have potentially detrimental impacts on health (RSPH, 2015).

This is concerning in light of North East Lincolnshire’s health outcomes and deprivation status. North East Lincolnshire is listed by Public Health England (PHE) as being more deprived in terms of its level of socioeconomic deprivation, with 38.10% of its citizens living in the 20% most deprived parts of England (healthierlives.phe.org.uk; RSPH, 2015). The locality also has a worse than national average premature mortality outcome, being ranked 120th out of 150th by PHE for premature mortality (healthierlives.phe.org.uk).

As the RSPH report explains, the ‘high street has a vital role to play in encouraging healthier lifestyles amongst the public’ (RSPH, 2015), so in order to improve health outcomes within the locality, the area’s high streets could prove to be a key area of focus.

2. **Research Objectives**

This report uses the presence of specific outlets that were identified by the RSPH as having the most positive/negative impacts on public health to measure the health impact of streets within the locality on local residents: using the RSPH’s system of Richter scoring. Nonetheless, the report also records outlets outside of these specific categories, such as retail, service and food outlets, as well as looking at issues such as e-vaping/e-cigarettes shops and at vacancy. Above all, in light of the RSPH report published earlier this year, this report seeks to assess the strengths and weaknesses of local streets within the area from a health perspective. It will look at trends within the locality to assess what areas could be targeted for improvement as well as what the main threats to local high streets seem to be, and will attempt to establish whether streets are contributing to local health inequalities. Like the Local Centres Reports that have been undertaken by the council since 2008, the study is also a means of looking at the coverage of the local area and how well different wards are served by different amenities. Hence, this report could hopefully provide a basis for future planning policy to both support and safeguard shopping provision and protect and support local health by preventing the clustering of outlets determined to be detrimental to public health.

3. **Parameters of the report**

3.1 **Outlets recorded**

This report recorded the presence of the 11 establishments that were identified by the RSPH as being either of particular health benefit or as being potentially detrimental. These establishments were assigned Richter scores to reflect this: Leisure Centres (Richter score 7), Health Services (Richter score 6), Pharmacies (Richter score 5), Health Clubs (Richter score 5), Libraries (Richter score 4), Museums/art galleries (Richter score 3), pubs/bars (Richter score 2), tanning shops (Richter score -1), fast food takeaways (Richter score -2), bookmakers (Richter score -2) and pay day loan shops (Richter score -4).
Health services refers primarily to GP surgeries, opticians and dentists; however on occasion this also relates to mental health services. In the case of St. Nicholas Drive, a physiotherapy practice was recorded as a health service and in the case of Grimsby Road, a chiropractors was recorded. Likewise, health clubs refers to gyms/fitness centres. Pubs/Bars also includes men’s social clubs (as in the case of St. Peter’s Avenue). Tanning shops were often found to be operating with another service- often alongside beauty salons- so where this occurs it has been recorded to reflect this.

The heading ‘fast food takeaways’ includes national ‘fast-food’ chains such as McDonalds and Subway, although the term fast-food takeaways generally relates to smaller hot food takeaway establishments (places offering no sit down service/where largely food is eaten out, and where consumers also pay before receiving food). Fish and chip shops have been included as fast food takeaways, even though they often have tables for people to eat in. ‘Pay day loan shops’ has been used to record pawnshops and cheque cashing venues: there was no separation of these.

Alongside these Richter-scored establishments, this high street survey also recorded the presence of retail outlets, food outlets, service outlets, e-cigarettes/e-vaping shops, community centres/outlets, and vacant sites.

Retail outlets refers to those establishments selling goods to consumers in relatively small quantities, for personal use and not for resale, and this definition provided the basis for recording an outlet as retail. However, it must be noted that those establishments selling food (cafés, restaurants, grocers, butchers, bakeries, supermarkets) were recorded separately as food outlets. Travel agents were recorded as retail establishments due to the fact that they sell holiday packages to the public, unlike estate agents (recorded as a service) who sell/advertise homes for buyers and sellers. Outlets recorded as service (those establishments providing a service to a consumer) includes but is not exclusive to driving schools, estate agents, post offices, banks/building societies, hairdressers, computer repair shops and beauty salons.

Those outlets recorded as community centres includes both secular and religiously affiliated community centres, children’s centres, community outreach/drop-in centres, such as North East Lincolnshire Age UK which holds daily activities such as Scrabble, Bingo, Tai Chi, and offers support for those over 50, village halls and buildings for local groups such as Scouts. Cleethorpes Memorial Hall and Caxtons Theatre, local theatre establishments that house local theatre companies and are used for local performances, have also been recorded under this heading: as opposed to Grimsby Auditorium, which was recorded under service.

Outlets recorded as vacant are commercial buildings that were observably either not in use, have fallen into disrepair, or are currently for sale; for example, the vacant site recorded for Sandringham Road is owned by the same people who own the newsagents; however, it is used for storage and is not in use commercially.

The businesses/outlets located on streets were assessed by visiting the streets in question and recording the outlets found there under their respective headings. This was done between 16th July 2015 and 3rd August 2015. Where an outlet fell on a street that was not felt to belong under a specified heading, this was recorded separately (and can be seen in the notes accompanying the data). For example, Cleethorpe Road, Grimsby, contains Grimsby Labour Party’s HQ building, and also a Jehovah’s Witnesses’ centre.
Cultural outlets such as churches/places of worship were not specifically recorded in any section in this report (although church led community centres were recorded under community), nor were schools or nurseries. Nonetheless, it was acknowledged where possible when these fell on a street.

3.2 Streets included

45 streets were analysed in this report. An integral part of the High Street definition, as the RSPH High Street report defined it, is its role in serving a local community (RSPH, 2015), and it is this definition which provides the basis for the inclusion of a street in this report. Thus, the starting point for which streets should be included in this report was the 2012 Local Centres Report, which identified current local centres¹ in the area, including two new centres- Ladysmith Road and Convamore Road. Nonetheless, both Hainton Avenue (East Marsh) and Heneage Road (Heneage), although discounted as local centres by this report due to their proximity to other local centres, were also recorded in this report, as they too serve the local community in their respective areas and can be regarded as significant streets for their respective communities (containing 55 outlets and 20 outlets respectively). Their inclusion also helps to greater establish the health impact of the local shopping streets within wards, and provides a broader overview of streets within the area and their provision. Using streets identified in the last local centres report will also provide means for comparison on vacancy rates within these streets since 2012. Like in the Local Centres Report, the main streets for villages, even when too small to be classed as a local centre, for which the minimum number of outlets is usually five, were included.

In the attempt to establish as inclusively as possible the health impact of local streets on their nearby residents, data was also recorded for the streets surrounding main shopping streets, which are in essence an extension of the provision offered by main streets. This was the case for St Peter’s Avenue (ward Croft Baker) in Cleethorpes, where close by one finds Market Street and Short Street and High Street; as these are in the immediate proximity of St. Peter’s Avenue, one can assume they will most likely be visited alongside this street by residents of Cleethorpes and Croft Baker, and will not be treated differently by the public. It needs noting that St Peter’s Avenue more than any of the other streets recorded in Cleethorpes attracts people from outside its immediate proximity, and as a larger street in the locality, is visited by people outside of Cleethorpes and Croft Baker. However, St Peter’s Avenue is the main shopping street for residents of Croft Baker, and alongside its surrounding streets offers the majority of provision for this ward, and thus it maintains its role of serving its local community and has been included within this report. Due to the unique nature of Market Street/Short Street (primarily, but not exclusively containing food establishments), it cannot be regarded in the same way as the other streets within the report which have a more varied environment, and thus it is not assessed as a lone street. However, its inclusion is useful and is used for ward analysis and helps provide a better outline of the facilities available to residents nearby St. Peter’s Avenue and the likely effect of this.

In essence, the boundaries for streets recorded in this report are also different to those in the 2012 Local Centres Report, due to looking at the clustering of outlets on/surrounding a street (which

¹ A local centre, as defined by the 2012 Local Centres Report for North East Lincolnshire, is ‘a group of five or more shops, in one or more continuous rows, serving a local catchment; largely retail based, including at least one supermarket or convenience store with other retail elements and local services (hairdressers, café etc), typically including a proportion of independent small businesses.’ This definition was waived for villages.
meant including outlets on the corner of/in the immediate proximity of streets) and because of attempting to provide as thorough an outline of the health impact of local streets as possible. Hence, all of Ladysmith Road has been included in this report and not just the section that was newly identified as a local centre in 2012, and Victor Street has been included alongside the newly identified centre on Convamore Road.

When it comes to assessing streets located within Cleethorpes, it is necessary to address the fact that Cleethorpes is unique in the locality as a seaside town and a tourist environment. As a result, it caters for a diverse range of people. A high number of fish and chip shops can be expected in Cleethorpes largely due to the seaside environment (and the seaside tradition of fish and chips) and due to the need to cater for visiting tourists. Likewise, the outlets found here will be influenced by tourism and the tourist clientele they are catering for; more clustering of food establishments can be expected, and a more diverse range of outlets can also be expected due to the need to cater for a large and diverse variety of people. Due to this, Alexandra Road, Cleethorpes, as well as the promenades in Cleethorpes and Kingsway/Kings Road have not been included in this report; these streets are out of the scope of the report. These areas can be regarded as the most ‘touristy’ and do not typically cater for primarily local citizens; hence these streets cannot be regarded in the same light as other streets in this report.

Primarily residential areas (with the exception of village streets where the main shopping streets can often have a lot of housing), and Freshney Place shopping precinct in Grimsby, are also out of scope of this report. Shopping centres are separate to High Streets as they are places people commute to from outside areas and serve a much wider ranging population (RSPH, 2015). However, Kennedy Way, a shopping precinct in Immingham, which is much smaller than Freshney Place and also located just off of Pelham Road, Immingham- the main high street for Immingham- will be assessed in this report. Kennedy Way, as a much smaller establishment than Freshney Place, still maintains a largely local client base, compared to Freshney Place, which is located next to Grimsby Bus Station. Thus, the health impact of Kennedy Way on its local residents, within the scope of this report, is just as key as that of both sections of Pelham Road.

4. Method

4.1 Richter scoring

The RSPH used public and expert opinion, as well as a review of evidence to identify businesses that could be considered the ‘best’ (the most health promoting) and the ‘worst’ (the most detrimental to public health) (RSPH, 2015). They defined health using a Richter scale, which broke health into four areas: encourages healthy lifestyle choices, promotes social interaction, allows greater access to health care services and/or health advice and promotes mental wellbeing (RSPH, 2015). For each category, businesses were given a score ranging from -2 (most negative impact) to +2 (most positive impact) : a score of 0 being given if an outlet was considered neutral in a category or if that category was irrelevant to the outlet in question. The scores given to each outlet were informed by desk-based research, consultations with public health experts and a representative survey of 2,000 members of the public. Based on this feedback and research, the RSPH developed the total Richter scores for the outlets discussed above, to display the positive/ negative health impact of these outlets based across these four areas of health (RSPH, 2015).
The overall Richter score for a street was then calculated as an average of the positive and negative Richter scoring outlets on that street.

This report follows the RSPH’s system of calculating the Richter score for streets- using the Richter scores assigned to different outlets by the RSPH - and uses these overall Richter scores as a means to determine the health impact of streets.

4.2 Clustering

This report, like the RSPH survey, attempted to include clustering within its analysis and Richter scoring, in order to capture the detrimental impact of the clustering of negatively scored establishments (tanning shops, fast food takeaways, bookmakers and payday loans), which undoubtedly limits choice and further encourages the use of such establishments.

Like with the original RSPH report, for each outlet with a negative Richter score, the detrimental impact of clustering has been displayed by the removal of one Richter point from a street for each successive outlet in these categories once the proportion of this outlet in an area hits a threshold of more than 5% of the total outlets. For example, Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes has a total of 120 outlets. Of these, two are tanning shops (Richter score -1), thirteen are fast food takeaways (Richter score -2), one is a bookmakers (Richter score -2) and three are payday loan shops/pawnshops (Richter score -4). The 5% margin means that the number of outlets on a street that would need to be reached for a cluster to occur is six. Thus, Grimsby Road has no clustering of tanning shops, bookmakers or payday loan shops. But there is a cluster of fast food takeaways, and seven Richter points (one for each successive outlet over the margin of six) are removed.

However, unlike in the original report which dealt only with the main high streets in the main retail areas of its towns/cities (RSPH, 2015), this report includes a variety of local streets of different dimensions and sizes. The 5% margin therefore means that clusters, in this report, according to the official Health on the High Street definition, are not always applicable for streets with less than twenty outlets- centres with less than twenty outlets containing negatively scored outlets would otherwise always contain clusters. Therefore, clustering is only recorded for streets with less than twenty outlets when more than one of a specific (negatively scored) outlet is present, and Richter points are removed accordingly.

5. Limitations of report

1. Because Cromwell Road/Dudley Street was recorded as one road, and Cromwell Road is such a long road, the outlets along this street fall in two wards- Yarborough and Park- which complicates ward analysis. Ward analysis for Yarborough ward may be skewed in that two of the streets recorded for this ward actually fall within multiple wards: Bradley Crossroads falls within Yarborough and South (although few outlets here actually fall within South) and Cromwell Road falls within Yarborough and Park. Yarborough ward is generally used to house these streets however, as it is deemed that the majority of outlets on these streets fall within Yarborough, but it must be noted that not all of what is included within Yarborough ward technically falls within Yarborough ward. Likewise, in the case of Cromwell

2 The whole of Cromwell Road actually falls under three wards: Freshney, Yarborough and Park. However, the section of Cromwell Road in Freshney contains only residential housing, and is also much closer to Wingate Parade, a different local centre.
Road, even though the cluster of outlets around Lynton Parade (including the Leisure Centre and outlets at the top of the road in the Willows Estate) falls under Yarborough, those outlets which fall under Park ward will not always be reflected in the ward analysis for Park (with the exception of the analysis of pharmacies and health services when this data was easy to separate).

2. Clustering in this report undoubtedly had to be different in that it was assessed even for smaller streets (owing to the variety of streets included in the report and the desire to assess the impact of clustering for all streets). Therefore, Richter scores generated in this report may not be directly comparable with original RSPH report, which looked only at larger streets.

3. Furthermore, this report looks at all local centres within the area, as well as additional streets which were deemed to also influence health choices of the local population. Thus, this report has the drawback of having a wide array of different streets of different dynamics and sizes, which means that some streets are not directly comparable with each other. Nonetheless, this does not affect the ability of the report to assess the coverage within wards, or the health impact of different streets and trends within the locality.

4. This report does not include residential areas within North East Lincolnshire, which can quite often be in the heart of areas of deprivation. Thus, it does not map or score the health impact of outlets within these areas, even though various outlets can be found in these areas. Wellington Street, located in the East Marsh in Grimsby, is not classified as a local centre or high street: although a few of the streets recorded in this report pass through Wellington Street, meaning that some corner outlets from this area are included. However, in this area there are both negatively scored outlets such as fast food takeaways, and also positively scored outlets that contribute to the health of the community such as Wellington Street Pharmacy. It would be interesting and useful to score or assess areas such as these.

5. The presence and health impact of lone establishments, for example the presence of an odd takeaway/bookmaker in a residential area, is also not acknowledged by this report. Hence, this report cannot be seen as fully inclusive or informed about the number of specific outlets within the locality.

6. Freeman Street Market was also not assessed by this report alongside Freeman Street. Thus, more investigation into the provision of the market is necessary.

7. Problems in definition:
   - Like in original RSPH report, there was no distinguishing between pawnbrokers, payday loan shops or cheque cashing venues (all were recorded as payday loans).
   - In the case of Hainton Avenue and Freeman Street there are various shops that buy and sell second hand goods (for example, in the case of Hainton Avenue, there is a Cash4Clothes shop that buys and recycles clothing). These do not fall under payday loans or pawnbrokers and so were just recorded as retail; however, they reflect poor economic circumstance.
   - This report arguably has a cross-over at times between food and retail, largely due to the fact that establishments selling food such as butchers and supermarkets were recorded as food outlets alongside cafés and restaurants. It is acknowledged that this may be confusing, specifically as supermarkets are included as food and newsagents as retail; however, in general the supermarkets falling on high streets were ‘Lincolnshire Co-operatives/Foodstores’, ‘Heron Foods’ or ‘Iceland’s’, and their primary purpose was deemed to be selling food to consumers.
6. Findings

6.1 Highest and lowest Richter scoring high streets

Using the RSPH’s system of Richter scoring, the highest scoring street was Ladysmith Road, Grimsby (Heneage ward) with a Richter score of 2.71 and the lowest scoring street was Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes (ward Sidney Sussex) with a Richter score of -7.26.

Highest scoring streets

Figure 6.1.1 Highest scoring streets in the locality, using the RSPH system of Richter scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Richter Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ladysmith Road</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Heneage</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Station Road</td>
<td>Habrough</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Station Road</td>
<td>Healing</td>
<td>Wolds</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Seaview Street</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Croft Baker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 St. Peter’s Avenue</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Croft Baker</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Coniston Avenue</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Scartho</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fieldhouse Road</td>
<td>Humberston</td>
<td>Humberston and New Waltham</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Station Road</td>
<td>New Waltham</td>
<td>Humberston and New Waltham</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Station Road</td>
<td>Stallingborough</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 High Street</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Sidney Sussex</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average Richter score of a street in NE Lincolnshire is -2.24, and so Ladysmith Road performs notably better than average. Ladysmith Road is notable for containing multiple health promoting establishments (two gyms, one health service - a GP-, one pharmacy and one pub), and few detrimental businesses. Thus, the street does much in terms of health promotion especially compared to most other local streets. Five of the other highest scoring streets are located in villages; Habrough, a village located in Immingham ward scores second highest. However, these streets are the smallest streets included in the report, containing very few outlets, and so they are not directly comparable to the larger streets in the report, and whilst they have been identified as being amongst the ‘healthiest’ streets as they did not score negatively, their high scores should not be interpreted to suggest that these streets contain a wide array of health promotion/health promoting outlets (with the exception of Fieldhouse Road, which contains two pubs and a pharmacy). The limited number of outlets on the streets recorded in Healing, Stallingborough and Habrough was also reflected by no clustering as there were no repeat outlets: this would most likely not be feasible for such small areas. Larger village streets such as High Street, Waltham and Caistor Road Laceby scored negatively, suggesting that villages do not necessarily tend towards health promotion any more than towns.

Lowest scoring streets

Figure 6.1.2 Lowest scoring streets in the locality, using the RSPH system of Richter scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Richter score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Grimsby Road</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Sidney Sussex</td>
<td>-7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pelham Road (East)</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>-6.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Marsh, South, West Marsh and Sidney Sussex are the four most deprived wards in the locality (according to their 2010 Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) scores), and these wards each contain at least one of the worst scoring streets in the area. It is also worth noting that generally speaking other streets in these areas scored very negatively: Oxford Street, in the East Marsh, received a Richter score of -3 and Chelmsford Avenue, in South ward received a Richter score of -2.63. Thus, it seems that there may be a local correlation between the fraction of ‘unhealthy’ businesses on a street/the health detriment of a street and the deprivation of the area that street falls into.

However, Scartho, Humberston and New Waltham and Haverstoe wards are three of the least deprived wards in the locality (Haverstoe ward is in fact the least deprived according to its 2010 IMD score), and yet these wards each contain very negatively scoring streets. In all these instances, the low scores are largely attributable to the high incidence/clustering of fast food outlets; Scartho Fork, for example, does contain three health services, however it also contains eight fast food takeaways, which make up 20% of its total outlets.

Likewise, streets in Immingham ward, specifically the two halves of Pelham Road in Immingham town, score badly, whilst the villages in the Immingham ward make the top six best scoring streets. This suggests differences between Immingham town and its villages.

Market Street and Short Street, Cleethorpes (Croft Baker) score a Richter score of -6.46; however, as mentioned previously, this is street is a unique environment in comparison to other streets in this report. Unlike other streets in this report whose provision is more varied, Market Street generally, although not exclusively, houses a large amount of food establishments. As aforementioned, it therefore cannot be regarded in the same light as other streets, and so has not been included with the other streets as an independent environment, but is used to give a broader overview of the provision and health impact of streets within the locality and within Croft Baker.

6.2 Clustering

Across all the streets recorded in this report, a total of 85 Richter points were deducted for clustering. If it were not for clustering the average Richter score of streets would be -0.352 as opposed to -2.24. The average Richter score is still negative, but there is a significant improvement in the score, suggesting that clustering is a significant contributing factor to the health of local high streets.
Clustering also explains why streets in the least deprived wards do not score as well as might be expected. An interesting example to consider is the case of High Street, Waltham, (ward Waltham), where there is access on the street to various health promoting establishments; the street contains a pharmacy, library and a pub (all regarded as having positive health implications and being given positive Richter scores). However, the street has a cluster of fast food takeaways (four), which also results in a deduction of three Richter points for clustering from this street.

As has been established therefore, clustering, specifically that of fast food takeaways, is an issue throughout the locality, not just in the most deprived areas, where research shows fast food outlets tend to be concentrated (Macdonald, Cummins and Macintyre, 2007; NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit, 2013; PHE, 2013).

Interestingly, if clustering is discounted, the worst high street is no longer Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes, nor is the best high street Ladysmith Road, Grimsby (although it still comes second, further reinforcing the health promotion offered by this street). This again suggests that clustering has a significant impact on local streets and is also very present within the locality.

Highest scoring streets, not accounting for clustering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Richter Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Cromwell Road/Dudley Street</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Yarborough/Park</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Ladysmith Road</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Heneage</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Station Road</td>
<td>Habrough</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Station Road</td>
<td>Healing</td>
<td>Wolds</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Caistor Road</td>
<td>Laceby</td>
<td>Wolds</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Kennedy Way</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Fieldhouse Road</td>
<td>Humberston</td>
<td>Humberston and New Waltham</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Seaview Street</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Croft Baker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Station Road</td>
<td>New Waltham</td>
<td>Humberston and New Waltham</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  High Street</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Sidney Sussex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cromwell Road/Dudley Street, which scores the most highly without accounting for clustering, contains multiple health services and pharmacies, as well as a leisure centre, and can be considered the street with the most health promoting establishments, although it also contains outlets regarded as potentially detrimental to health- more so than Ladysmith Road.

As is noticeable in the tables above and below, there is also a slight shift in where the high streets with the lowest and highest scoring streets tend to be located.

Lowest scoring streets, not accounting for clustering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Richter score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Corporation Road</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>West Marsh</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health on the High Street- North East Lincolnshire
The worst scoring streets still tend to fall, when clustering is discounted, in deprived areas, specifically the East Marsh (the most deprived ward in the locality according to the 2010 IMD scores).

The fact that without deducting Richter points from streets’ average Richter score for clustering, the worst scoring streets tend to fall in most deprived ward (East Marsh), suggests that deprived areas are more prone to the establishment of negatively scoring outlets (tanning shops, fast food takeaways, bookmakers and pay day loan establishments) and in these areas you find less of a balance between such establishments and more health promoting venues such as pharmacies, health services, health clubs, resulting in an increasingly negative average Richter score.
Nonetheless, all areas seem to be prone to the clustering of negative establishments, as is reflected in the sharp difference between the Richter scores of streets discarding and including clustering (see data in appendices).

It also seems that different wards seem to greater incidences of clustering; Immingham ward falls often in the worst scoring streets when clustering is included, but not at all when clustering is discounted. Likewise, Kennedy Way in Immingham is amongst the best scoring streets when clustering is discounted. Similarly, when clustering is discounted, Scartho Fork’s Richter score rises from -5.93 to 0.0714.

Humberston and New Waltham again scores negatively when clustering is not accounted for, although as will be established later in this report, this ward has one of the highest proportions of fast food takeaways (Richter score -2).

6.3 Leisure Centres

Leisure centres score the highest in terms of their health impact (a Richter score of 7) and so can be seen as the most influential outlet to find on a street. As pointed out by the RSPH, they provide the public with a facility to pursue an array of leisure activities and so fulfil an important role in increasing the levels of physical activity undertaken by local communities: providing access to a range of exercise options and to fitness advice from professionals (RSPH, 2015). Council-run leisure centres are also much more affordable than private health clubs/fitness facilities and are often used as a setting for health promotion campaigns (RSPH, 2015). Locally, leisure centres are run by Lincs Inspire, a partner of NELC. Lincs Inspire help front a variety of health and wellbeing activities such as
a stop smoking campaign, where they offer a free 12-week gym membership at Lincs Inspire for those who attend weekly stop smoking sessions at the leisure centres and successfully stick to a quit date (Lincs Inspire, www.lincsinspire.com). Hence local leisure centres are influential in promoting positive health messages: helping locals ‘quit and get fit’ and promoting the Stop Smoking Service. By offering a crèche and summer holiday activities, as well as a special junior pass, local leisure centres also help to encourage healthy behaviours and active lifestyles amongst families.

However, leisure centres in the area are generally not located on local high streets (the one exception being Grimsby Leisure Centre, located along Cromwell Road in the Willows estate – Yarborough ward). This leisure centre is 915m from the cluster of shops on at the roundabout (Lynton Parade). However, it is worth noting that with Cromwell Road being such a long road, the leisure centre will be more accessible for some residents of Cromwell Road than it will for others. Nonetheless, the outlets on Cromwell Road do not span the whole road and so will not necessarily be regarded as a local centre for all residents of the road.

Scartho Road, leading up to Scartho Fork, has a leisure centre but this is a significant distance (0.8 miles) from Scartho Fork, where all other outlets are concentrated, so it cannot be considered part of Scartho Fork, nor can it be considered accessible for those living near to Scartho Fork.

Henceforth, the locality, although containing multiple leisure centres, perhaps does not receive as much benefit as it could from these due to their location. The most deprived areas after all could benefit significantly from increased availability of affordable exercise facilities.

6.4 Health Services

Healthcare services are valuable assets on high street and provide a variety of medical advice, as well as signposting users to other services such as smoking cessation and healthy eating (RSPH, 2015).

The presence of health services on local high streets makes them more accessible to communities and thus encourages uptake/use of health services; a common barrier to accessing health care is having to travel to services (Neale, Tompkins and Sheard, 2008).

Unfortunately, the majority of the streets assessed within this report were not found to contain a health service: 32 streets or 71.1% did not contain a health service. Access to health services on local streets is also very uneven and varies greatly with high coverage on some streets, and very limited coverage in other areas.

For example, there is very high coverage on Cromwell Road/Dudley Street (Yarborough/Park), which contains seven health services (including the Junction- a mental health service), and very high coverage on Hainton Avenue (East Marsh), which contains three health services (dentists/dental surgeries); although it also worth noting that Open Door, which used to be located on this street, has now moved to the corner of Albion Street (also in the East Marsh). Open Door is an extremely beneficial establishment for the East Marsh and helps to increase access to healthcare for some of the most hard to reach groups within the locality (providing healthcare for those who have been excluded elsewhere). This is extremely beneficial in that it provides access to frontline healthcare (from GPs) which some would otherwise not have access to. Open Door helps to decrease barriers to healthcare and decrease health inequalities.
Likewise, Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes (Sidney Sussex), includes four health services (although one of these is a chiropractors), and so in spite of its faults elsewhere, this street provides residents with access to frontline healthcare. Cleethorpe Road, Grimsby, (East Marsh) contains a further two health services and Scatho Fork (Scartho) also contains three health services.

However, these five streets are the only streets containing multiple health services. The other eight streets containing health services contain only one health service (although in the case of Chelmsford Avenue there is an additional GP practice located relatively nearby), and as aforementioned, the remaining 32 streets are without health services.

Freeman Street (East Marsh), despite neighbouring Hainton Avenue, contains no health services, although there is the argument that coverage is not needed here as there is much available nearby on Hainton Avenue/Albion Street.

Streets not containing Health Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Crossroads</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Yarborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coniston Avenue</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Scartho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convamore Road (including Victor Street)</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>East Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Road</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>West Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebrother Street</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman Street</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>East Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunners Way</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Yarborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heneage Road</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Heneage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littlefield Lane</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>East Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Avenue*</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutcliffe Avenue</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingate Parade</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Freshney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarborough Road</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Yarborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardys Road*</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Haverstoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Sidney Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street and Short Street</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Croft Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlethorpe Road</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Haverstoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Street (Fiveways)</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>East Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Road</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Croft Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaview Street</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Croft Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Road</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Croft Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham Road (Central and West)</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>Habrough</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>Healing</td>
<td>Wolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldhouse Road</td>
<td>Humberston</td>
<td>Humberston and New Waltham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*It is worth noting that whilst Second Avenue (South), does not contain a health service, it is close by to Diana Princess of Wales Hospital and the Family Services Department of the hospital.

Figure 6.4.2 Ward analysis: % of streets in each ward containing at least one health service (wards ordered from most to least deprived according to their 2010 IMD scores).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>% of streets containing at least one health service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Marsh</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Marsh</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Sussex</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heneage</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croft Baker</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarborough</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshney</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scartho</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolds</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberston and New Waltham</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: In the graph above, Cromwell Road/Dudley Street was recorded twice (under Park and Yarborough wards), in order to display the health services falling in both Park and Yarborough ward (there are health services at both ends of Cromwell Road/Dudley Street). Hence, 46 streets are assessed above; likewise, three streets are recorded for Park, whereas elsewhere only two are.

Four wards within the locality did not contain a street with at least one health service: West Marsh, Humberston and New Waltham, Waltham and Haverstoe. However, it must be noted with regards to Humberston and New Waltham and Waltham, the majority of streets within which are located in villages, that the only village with a high street containing access to a health service was Laceby. Villages arguably do not have the populations to make health businesses profitable.
6.5 Pharmacies

The presence of community pharmacies on a high street makes pharmacies more accessible to the public, which in turn gives the public access to a wide range of health support and advice with the added benefit of weekend opening times and the lack of an appointment system (RSPH, 2015).

The table and graph below display the % of streets within each ward (wards are ordered from most deprived to least deprived according to their 2010 IMD scores), that contain at least one pharmacy.

Figure 6.5.1: % of streets within each ward that contain at least one pharmacy (wards are ordered from most deprived to least deprived according to their 2010 IMD scores).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of streets containing at least one pharmacy</th>
<th>Number of streets analysed</th>
<th>% of streets in ward containing at least one pharmacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Marsh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Marsh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Sussex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heneage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croft Baker*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarborough*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshney</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scartho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberston and New Waltham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverstoe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** Due to streets containing multiple pharmacies, fewer pharmacies are acknowledged here than were recorded in total (19 pharmacies were recorded in total). In addition, due to separating Cromwell Road/Dudley Street in this instance, in order to display the pharmacies falling in both Park and Yarborough ward, the total streets assessed appears as 46 streets instead of 45. Likewise, three streets are recorded for Park, whereas elsewhere only two are.

Figure 6.5.2: % of streets within each ward that contain at least one pharmacy (wards are ordered from most deprived to least deprived according to their 2010 IMD scores).

---

* Croft Baker includes Market Street/Short Street, which branches off St. Peter’s Avenue
* Yarborough ward includes Bradley crossroads, which falls under both Yarborough and South ward.
* Whilst normally Cromwell Road/Dudley Street is included within the ward analysis for Yarborough, where the majority of the road falls, in this instance it was easy to separate the two pharmacies on this street into the wards in which they fall. Hence, the pharmacy on Dudley Street is recorded for Park ward, and the pharmacy near the leisure centre is recorded under Yarborough ward.
The three wards within the locality whose assessed streets were not found to contain at least one pharmacy were West Marsh, Scartho and Haverstoe; the lack of a pharmacy in Scartho is largely due to the current vacancy of E.A. Broadburn pharmacy which used to be located on Waltham Road in Scartho Fork and provide coverage for this area.

By contrast, all the streets recorded for Freshney, Wolds and Waltham contained at least one pharmacy, suggesting good access to community pharmacies within these wards. All other wards had at least one street containing one or more community pharmacy; however, only one street out of the six recorded for the East Marsh (16.7% of streets) contained a pharmacy, suggesting that more access to community pharmacies on key streets in this ward could be beneficial.

Figure 6.5.3 Ward analysis: % of total pharmacies in each ward; wards are ordered according to their 2010 IMD scores from most to least deprived.
When looking at the % of the total pharmacies falling in each ward, it is noticeable that the five most deprived wards (with West Marsh recording no pharmacies) house a smaller percentage of pharmacies than the remaining wards: access to community pharmacies on key streets in these wards seems to be more limited. Only one pharmacy was recorded for the East Marsh and this was found on Freeman Street, likewise only one pharmacy was recorded for South ward (found on Chelmsford Avenue, out of 3 streets recorded for this ward). Surprisingly, only one pharmacy was found in Sidney Sussex, despite Sidney Sussex containing one of the biggest streets recorded within the locality (Grimsby Road, which contains 120 outlets), and one pharmacy was found within Heneage ward (located on Ladysmith Road). It is important to note however the presence of Wellington Street pharmacy in East Marsh. This most likely is a very beneficial presence for the East Marsh, and anecdotally this seems to be one of the busiest pharmacies in the locality, which also fronts the Freelance Needle Exchange\(^6\). Additionally, many of the larger supermarkets in the locality (such as the Asda supercentre on Holles Street in the East Marsh) also contain pharmacies.

In the graph above, Croft Baker has a higher percentage than might be expected; however, whilst Croft Baker contains three pharmacies (more than any other ward), these are all located down St. Peter’s Avenue and are not spread out throughout the five streets recorded for this ward (see Figure

---

\(^6\) The Needle Exchange provides access to clean needles for drug-injecting individuals in the locality, and encourages the return of contaminated injecting equipment, thus helping to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS which spread through the sharing of needles.
As aforementioned, surprisingly Haverstoe, despite being least deprived ward, contains no pharmacy on either of its two main streets (Hardys Road and Middlethorpe Road).

Both of the pharmacies recorded for Immingham ward were located within Immingham town; there are no community pharmacies in Stallingborough or Habrough, whereas both the villages within the Wolds ward (less deprived than Immingham) contain a pharmacy- although Healing’s pharmacy shares a building with the local newsagents.

Nonetheless, whilst coverage appears to be unequal, and generally tends to increase in wards with lower indices of multiple deprivation, there is arguably generally good coverage in the locality in that 19 pharmacies were recorded on the streets included in this report. However, three wards seem to require more access to community pharmacies- Haverstoe, West Marsh, and Scartho (to replace the now vacant pharmacy on Waltham Road).

### 6.6 Health Clubs

Five Health clubs in total were recorded on the streets recorded in this report. Two martial arts training centres/fitness centres were located on Freeman Street in the East Marsh (Samurai Hearts Martial Arts and Fitness Centre and Grimsby Martial Arts Academy), and a further gym (Spartana Health Club) was located on Cleethorpes Road (East Marsh). Two gyms were also located on Ladysmith Road (Heneage). Surprisingly, East Marsh therefore seems to have the best coverage with regards to health clubs. Although it must be noted that only two of the streets in the East Marsh contained access to health clubs out of a total of six recorded streets, so this coverage is not absolute throughout the East Marsh. Additionally, there is generally not a great coverage within the local area with regards to accessible health clubs. As noted in the RSPH Health on the High Street report, environmental factors play a large role in healthy behaviours, and research has shown that reduced access to fitness facilities is associated with decreased physical activity and increased likelihood of being overweight (RSPH, 2013). Likewise, a study undertaken in 2006 to evaluate the effect of distance on the likelihood of initiating and maintaining use of a fitness programme (amongst a group of seniors) found that participants living closer to health clubs (unstructured-program sites) attended more frequently than those farther away (Berke et al, 2006). Therefore, as part of efforts to encourage healthier lifestyles and to increase physical activity, investing in local, accessible, health clubs/fitness facilities could prove beneficial.

Nonetheless, with the current funding cuts to local authorities and public health teams, it is acknowledged that investment in health clubs may not be feasible. In East Yorkshire, Fitmums & Friends, a voluntary fitness group organised by a group of voluntary leaders and coaches and supported by East Riding of Yorkshire Council, offers friendly, supportive running and walking clubs, not just for mums but for men and women of all ages and abilities (they have a specific Fitmums Junior Section for children aged over five as well as buggy sessions for mums and their babies). Fitmums also offers various social events as well as a post natal depression support group and they are affiliated with England Athletics, allowing members discounted race entry fees (http://www.fitmums.org.uk). The establishment of a similar local fitness group could be a more feasible, effective alternative for North East Lincolnshire.
6.7 Libraries

Only two libraries were recorded on the 45 streets included in this report (found on High Street, Waltham and Kennedy Way, Immingham). Libraries in the locality are found generally in more central areas, and serve larger sections of the local community. The area’s main library, Grimsby Central Library, is located in the immediate proximity of Freshney Place, and Cleethorpes main library, Cleethorpes Library, is found down Alexandra Road, near Cleethorpes seafront. This is admittedly close to St. Peter’s Avenue; however, Alexandra Road primarily contains outlets targeted towards tourists. Thus, generally speaking libraries in the locality are located away from local shopping streets and local communities, and are more central enterprises.

Having more accessible libraries within the locality, specifically within deprived areas, could help to provide access to learning and promote literacy within these communities, which would in turn have positive implications for the public’s health: low-levels of literacy are associated with a variety of adverse health outcomes, including increased mortality, hospitalisation, and in some cases poorer control of chronic health conditions (Pignone and DeWalt, 2006).

Indeed, in recent years libraries in the locality have also been affected by funding cuts which has seen a reduction in library services: Grimsby Central Library now only operates across two floors, and no longer contains the public toilets and café that used to be found on its upper floor. This is potentially detrimental in that libraries have the potential to improve the health and wellbeing of large amounts of people.

6.8 Museums and art galleries

Only one museum was recorded on the streets assessed for this report; Immingham Museum, and again this was located in the Kennedy Way precinct just off Pelham Road- not strictly speaking a high street, but a shopping area in Immingham serving local residents. One of the buildings down St. Peter’s Avenue used to be an art gallery, however this is now vacant. There is an argument to be made that local streets could benefit from investment into museums/galleries. Museums provide educational opportunities where families can learn together and art galleries, as well as being stimulating environments for the community to consider artwork, would also provide the opportunity for local residents to showcase their artistic talents/works.

The area does have multiple museums; however, these are largely located in the centre of Grimsby, in the area surrounding Freshney Place Shopping Precinct (for example the Time Trap Museum in Grimsby Town Hall and the National Fishing Heritage Museum), and are not found amongst local communities.

6.9 Pubs/Bars

2,000 people were asked by the RSPH in a public consultation exercise for their opinions on the health impact of pubs/bars. Almost two thirds (59%) believed that they discourage healthy choices. However, three quarters believed that they support social interaction and one third felt that they have a positive effect on mental wellbeing (RSPH, 2015).
Hence, pubs/bars can be both a positive and a negative occurrence on a high street in terms of their effect on public health, although they are deemed to be more beneficial than they are detrimental, and it is important to view them outside of their serving of alcohol.

Pubs and bars are hubs of social interaction, often hosting events that bring together the community, for example, pub quizzes, bingo, live music and sports screenings. Social interaction has been shown to boost wellbeing, whereas social isolation has long been regarded as a key trigger for mental illness (ESRC, 2013). Likewise, a study undertaken by the Medical Research Council (MRC) which focused on men aged 30-35 who drank in groups in pubs, found that men drinking with friends in pubs reported positive effects on their mental wellbeing and that this experience allowed them to open up and talk about their emotions (Deadline, 2014).

This report found that generally the highest proportion of pubs/bars are located in more deprived areas (East Marsh, Sidney Sussex, Croft Baker), which is a positive finding in that it suggests good access to social interaction within these areas. Indeed, seven pubs/bars were recorded down Freeman Street (East Marsh), out of a total of 47 recorded within the whole locality (14.9% - the highest proportion of pubs down any street).

The other streets with the highest proportions of pubs/bars were High Street in Sidney Sussex (containing six), and Market Street and Short Street in Croft Baker (containing five). The unique nature of these streets should be noted in that they are also centres for local nightlife, and hence these streets are in some respects anomalies. Nonetheless, Sidney Sussex and Croft Baker generally had high coverage within their wards with respect to pubs/bars: nine pubs were recorded in Croft Baker and nine in Sidney Sussex.

As can be seen on the chart below, the streets recorded within West Marsh and Haverstoe were not found to contain a pub/bar. It must be noted that Freshney Place shopping precinct is located within the West Marsh, and the streets surrounding this contain numerous pubs/bars; however, Haverstoe’s streets again do not perform well in this area of analysis.

Figure 6.9.1 Ward analysis: % of total pubs/bars within each ward; wards are ordered according to their 2010 IMD scores, from most to least deprived.

![Bar chart showing % of total pubs/bars within each ward, with wards ordered according to their 2010 IMD scores, from most to least deprived. The chart shows that Haverstoe has the lowest percentage of pubs/bars, followed by Waltham and Humberston and New Waltham.]
Nonetheless, it must be noted that whilst pubs can be beneficial environments for mental wellbeing, regular drinking over the lower risk guidelines increases the risk of suffering more serious health harms such as cancer of the throat, oesophagus or larynx, heart disease or an irregular heartbeat, high blood pressure, a stroke, liver disease such as cirrhosis and liver cancer, pancreatitis and reduced fertility (www.nhs.uk/Change4Life/). Indeed whilst 76% of the population are estimated to drink alcohol at a level that is unlikely to cause risk to themselves or others (NICE, 2010), most people who have alcohol-related health problems aren’t alcoholics and are simply people who have regularly drunk more than the recommended levels for some years (www.nhs.uk). Overall, evidence suggests that drinking alcohol is never without risk and that as consumption increases so does the risk of developing an alcohol-related problem (NICE, 2010). Likewise, as highlighted by the Chief Medical Officer in his 2008 annual report alcohol can affect not only the person drinking but those around them: including their families and the wider population (NICE, 2010).

6.10 Tanning shops

In 2009, the World Health Organisation listed UV radiation as a group 1 carcinogen (Mogensen and Jemec, 2010). Using sunbeds before the age of 35 has been proven to increase the risk of cancer by 59%: yet in spite of this more than a quarter of million 11-17 year olds have used a sunbed (Cancer Research UK). Whilst sunbeds have been licensed throughout many parts of the UK, meaning that in England, Scotland and Wales under-18s are now prevented from using sunbeds, their presence on high streets still presents risks: an added risk to our locality being that unmanned/unsupervised sunbeds are not yet banned in England as they are in Wales and Scotland (Cancer Research UK).

This report found that tanning shops, although a relatively uncommon sight on North East Lincolnshire’s streets, are much more common on certain streets. In Sidney Sussex ward, Grimsby Road and Grimsby Road South collectively have the greatest amount of tanning shops. Whereas, no other street was found to have more than one tanning shop, and indeed often tanning shops were found to be operating as a joint enterprise with another service/shop (usually with hairdressers or beauty salons), Grimsby Road contains two independent tanning shops. Grimsby Road South has another tanning shop, meaning that out of a total of twelve tanning shops found on the streets analysed in this report, three (or a quarter) were located down Grimsby Road and Grimsby Road South (in Sidney Sussex). This is concerning in that Grimsby Road also received the lowest Richter score, so it seems that much must be combatted to make Grimsby Road a more health promoting street and to minimise the risks it poses to its nearby residents.

Two tanning shops were recorded in Yarborough ward: Bradley Crossroads contains a joint tanning shop/hairdressers and Gunners Way contains an independent tanning shop. In the East Marsh, Freeman Street contains a bookmakers that also functions as tanning shop, and in Croft Baker, St. Peter’s Avenue also contains a dual bookmakers and tanning shop. In South Ward, Second Avenue has a dual tanning studio/hairdressers and in Immingham ward, Pelham Road (Central and West) has a nail and beauty salon that also offers sunbeds. The least deprived ward, Haverstoe, also contains a dual salon/tanning shop down Middlethorpe Road. In Scartho, Scartho Fork contains an independent tanning studio and in Freshney Ward, St. Nicholas Drive contains an independent tanning studio.

The occurrence of two dual bookmakers/tanning shops within the locality is worrying in that these establishments are promoting two detrimental services and thus have more extensive potential detrimental outcomes on the public’s health.
Nevertheless, tanning shops are a relatively uncommon sight on high streets within the locality, with only six independent tanning shops recorded, and a further six establishments offering tanning alongside another service. No streets within Wolds, West Marsh, Heneage, Park, Humberston and New Waltham or Waltham were found to contain tanning shops: although it must be noted that the area surrounding Freshney Place shopping precinct in the West Marsh contains an additional tanning shop.

6.11 Fast food takeaways

The birth and exponential growth of fast food restaurants and the fast food industry has been found to almost parallel the obesity epidemic, certainly in the Western World (Fraser and Edwards, 2010). Fast food is often energy dense, high in saturated fat and salt, is known to have a low micronutrient content and its consumption is associated with other poor food choices, such as low vegetable and milk intake (Fraser, Edwards, Cade and Clarke, 2013; PHE, 2013). Consumption of fast food is also associated with an increased BMI (Body Mass Index) and obesity (Fraser and Edwards, 2010), and whilst there is not yet irrefutable evidence of a direct link between obesity and the over-concentration/proximity of fast food takeaways, there is more evidence in support of this than there is against it (London Healthy Urban Development Unit, 2013). The proliferation of fast food outlets is additionally concerning due to the realisation of an ‘obsogenic environment’ in modern societies, where the widespread availability of fast food and the lack of availability of leisure facilities/green spaces is promoting sedentary lifestyles. (Fraser and Edwards, 2010; London Healthy Urban Development Unit, 2013).

The High Street survey found a high presence of fast food takeaways on the streets in the local area, and in most instances if clustering occurred on a high street, it was due to a high density of fast food takeaways. This High Street survey recorded 143 fast food takeaways, out of 1,235 total outlets recorded on the streets included within this report, meaning that fast food takeaways accounted for 11.7% of all the outlets recorded in this report. This figure only accounts for the takeaways on/around the 45 streets that were included within this report; it does not account for fast food takeaways within/surrounding the main shopping centre in the area (Freshney Place, Grimsby), nor does it include takeaways in residential areas, or those in the ‘touristy’ areas of Cleethorpes. Thus, the actual presence of fast food takeaways in the area is likely to be considerably greater. In addition, whilst fast food takeaways are recorded by this report, the presence of ‘junk food’ on streets (sold by checkouts or shops) was not recorded; although the presence of a sweet shop down Second Avenue was noted.

The high density of fast food outlets, specifically of fish and chip shops, may be attributable in part to the nature of the locality; the area is well-known for its fishing industry, and is also the home of a seaside town. However, as aforementioned, due to this, the streets in Cleethorpes most likely to be affected by this have not been included in this report/analysis.

Figure 6 11 1 Ward analysis: % of total fast food outlets with each ward; wards are according to their 2010 IMD scores, from most to least deprived
Research suggests that nationally there is a strong association between areas of deprivation and the proliferation of fast food takeaways (Macdonald, Cummins and Macintyre, 2007). The National Obesity Observatory (NOO) found a strong association between deprivation and the density of fast food outlets with more deprived areas having more fast food outlets per 100,000 of the population (London Healthy Urban Development Unit, 2013). There is also a strong relationship between socioeconomic deprivation (as measured by 2010 IMD scores) and obesity prevalence in children (PHE, 2013; London Healthy Urban Development Unit, 2013), so improving access to healthier food in deprived communities may contribute to reducing health inequalities (PHE, 2013).

In this study, of the 143 fast food takeaways recorded, almost 20% were found in the East Marsh - the most deprived ward. Likewise, Sidney Sussex (fourth most deprived ward) was also found to contain a large percentage (11.2%) of fast food takeaways. In this respect, this study supports the national link between fast food takeaways and deprivation.

However, as is notable from the chart, Humberston and New Waltham is noteworthy for containing a high percentage of fast food takeaways in the locality despite being one of the least deprived wards. Likewise, every ward in the locality contained at least three fast food takeaways, with a high proportion of fast food takeaways often accounting for a streets low Richter score (as in the case of Scartho Fork and High Street, Waltham), displaying that the proliferation of fast food takeaways is a locality-wide issue and is not limited to certain wards.

This reflects national research that suggests that the proliferation of fast food takeaways is increasing. As pointed out by Healthy Places, ‘Over half of British adults have experienced an increase in the number of fast food shops on their nearest high street since they started living there’ (Healthy Places, 2014). Indeed, a recent study undertaken in Tower Hamlets, East London, found that
97% of residents live within a ten-minutes radius of a fast-food outlet and that there were 42 junk food outlets per school (London Healthy Urban Development Unit, 2013). Thus, the proliferation of fast food takeaways in the area and the likely health impact of this is notable and concerning.

However, it must be noted in the case of Scartho ward that eight of the nine fast food outlets occurring in this ward were located around Scartho Fork; hence there are areas within the locality where the proliferation of fast food outlets is a greater issue and is of greater concern. This can be seen in more detail on the map below, which plots the takeaways recorded by this report on their respective streets/in their respective wards.

Figure 6 11 2 Fast Food Takeaway Locations, North East Lincolnshire

The map above reinforces that the two wards with the highest amounts of fast food takeaways are East Marsh and Sidney Sussex: here fast food takeaways are concentrated throughout the wards.
However, fast food takeaways are prominent in specific areas of other wards: as aforementioned, there is a high density of fast-food takeaways around Scartho Fork (Scartho), High Street, Waltham (Waltham), Humberston Road and North Sea Lane, Humberston (Humberston and New Waltham), Bradley Crossroads, Cromwell Road and Yarborough Road (Yarborough), St. Nicholas Drive and Wingate Parade (Freshney), Chelmsford Avenue and Second Avenue (South), Market Street and Short Street (Croft Baker) and Middlethorpe Road and Hardys Road (Haverstoe).

Indeed, only three of the streets recorded (Station Road, Habrough, Station Road, Stallingborough and Seaview Street, Cleethorpes) did not contain a fast food takeaway, and two of these are small village streets.

6.12 Bookmakers

Whilst gambling occasionally can have a positive impact on an individual’s wellbeing, providing a leisure option and entertainment value, the introduction of gambling into an area has been shown to increase ‘problem gambling’ and its related problems (bankruptcy, divorce, suicide) (Williams, Rehm, Stevens, 2011). Indeed, the most common social impact across all forms of gambling is considered to be increased problem gambling, increased crime (to a small extent), increased socioeconomic inequality (those with lower incomes tend to gamble a higher proportion of their income) and more negative attitudes towards gambling (Williams et al, 2011).

The majority of bookmakers recorded by this high street survey were found in the East Marsh (31.0%). By contrast, Haverstoe, Wolds and Park were not found to contain any bookmakers, and only one was found in Humberston and New Waltham and one in Waltham, suggesting a local link between bookmakers and deprivation. This supports national research that the distribution of gambling machines in Great Britain is disproportionately higher in areas of socio-economic deprivation (Wardle, Kelly, Astbury and Reith, 2014) and that problem gambling is also highest in deprived areas (Wardle, Orford, Griffiths, Sproston and Erens, 2009). This is worrying due to the potential impacts of problem gambling on the wellbeing of the most deprived communities and its potential to increase socioeconomic inequality.

Croft Baker (sixth most deprived ward) also contained a high percentage of bookmakers, although most bookmakers in this ward were found on St. Peter’s Avenue and Seaview Street, and were not necessarily spread throughout the ward.

Worryingly, it is necessary to note the presence of a large amount of bookmakers around Freshney Place shopping precinct (on Victoria Street): hence the actual number of bookmakers in the locality is greater than displayed here.

Figure 6.12.1 Ward analysis: % of total bookmakers located in each ward; wards are ordered according to their 2010 IMD scores from most to least deprived
Pay day loans are very expensive with very high rates of interest, and problems for a borrower start to build up quickly if he or she cannot in fact repay the loan as planned, and it gets extended, or rolled over. The interest then builds up rapidly and can soon swamp the size of the original loan. In early 2013, the Office of Fair Trading warned that there was widespread irresponsible lending in the industry (BBC, 2013) and according to research by a debt charity, loans are being granted to borrowers when they are not in a position to pay them back (Guardian, 2013). This is highly concerning when one considers the implications of debt on health and wellbeing: indebtedness is associated with deteriorating mental and physical health, including increased risk of suicide and depression (Turunen, and Hiilamo, 2014).

This report found that there is a high concentration of pay day loan vendors and/or pawnbrokers collectively on Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes (three) and Grimsby Road South (one) (Sidney Sussex). Two are also found on Freeman Street (East Marsh) and two on Hainton Avenue (East Marsh), as well as one on Bradley Crossroads (Yarborough) and one on St. Peter’s Avenue (Croft Baker). There are a total of ten on the streets analysed within the whole locality. None of these establishments fall in the least deprived wards; the majority are in the East Marsh (most deprived ward) and Sidney Sussex (fourth most deprived ward). This shows a strong association in the area between deprivation and pay day loan establishments. Pay day lender’s own research displays that the majority of people applying for its short-term loans are amongst the nation’s lowest earners (with the majority having salaries of less than £20,000) (thisismoney.co.uk, 2013) and research by CAP (Christians Against
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This report found that there is a high concentration of pay day loan vendors and/or pawnbrokers collectively on Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes (three) and Grimsby Road South (one) (Sidney Sussex). Two are also found on Freeman Street (East Marsh) and two on Hainton Avenue (East Marsh), as well as one on Bradley Crossroads (Yarborough) and one on St. Peter’s Avenue (Croft Baker). There are a total of ten on the streets analysed within the whole locality. None of these establishments fall in the least deprived wards; the majority are in the East Marsh (most deprived ward) and Sidney Sussex (fourth most deprived ward). This shows a strong association in the area between deprivation and pay day loan establishments. Pay day lender’s own research displays that the majority of people applying for its short-term loans are amongst the nation’s lowest earners (with the majority having salaries of less than £20,000) (thisismoney.co.uk, 2013) and research by CAP (Christians Against
Poverty) found that often people taking out these sort of loans were “hungry, worried about keeping warm and becoming homeless.” (Guardian, 2013)

It is also important to note that in the case of Freeman Street, there are shops that also buy and sell second hand goods, and in the case of Hainton Avenue, there is a Cash4Clothes shop, which buys clothes from people for recycling. These have been recorded as retail, as unlike with pawnbrokers a consumer does not buy back their items with interest; however, these establishments undoubtedly reflect poor economic circumstance.

6.14 Vacancy

Transport for London identified 10 indicators of a healthy high street; a whole street approach to delivering healthy high streets (Saunders, 2014). One of the indicators identified was ‘Things to see and do’: ensuring street environments are stimulating and engaging and maintaining public spaces to ensure health benefits (Saunders, 2014). High rates of vacancy on a street contradict this indicator, make streets less inviting and stimulating and also potentially reduce the opportunities available to residents in their local area.

The table below displays the streets which were found to have vacant sites, the percentage of the sites down these streets that were vacant, and the streets’ Richter scores. 28 streets were found to contain vacant sites.

Figure 6.14.1 Vacancy rates within streets found to contain vacant sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of outlets</th>
<th>Number of vacant sites</th>
<th>% of sites that are vacant</th>
<th>Richter score (with clustering)</th>
<th>Richter score (without clustering)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Crossroads</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Yarborough</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>-6.17</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleethorpe Road</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>East Marsh</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convamore Road (including Victor Street)</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>East Marsh</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Road</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>West Marsh</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromwell Road/Dudley Street7</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Yarborough/Park</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>-0.0625</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebrother Street</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman Street*</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>East Marsh</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>-0.0833</td>
<td>-0.0833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Cromwell Road/Dudley Street - Whilst only one vacant site is recorded, there were also an additional seven offices/spaces to let down the road, although the buildings containing these still appeared to be in use in some regard commercially, thus only 1 vacant site was recorded. The volume of offices to let suggests Cromwell Road is an area of potential for businesses/services.
Freeman Street - the high vacancy down Freeman Street is attributable in part due to the planned demolition of a large section of buildings on one side of the road, and the consequential moving and cordoning off of buildings. However, there are still a large number of vacant buildings that are not affected by this.

Three of the streets containing the highest % vacancy rates were located in the East Marsh, whereas no vacant sites were recorded in Haverstoe, suggesting commercial vacancy amongst streets may be more common in deprived areas. However, vacancy was found on streets with a wide range of...
Richter scores; and there does not appear to be a particular correlation between a street’s Richter score and its rate of vacancy.

Nonetheless, the presence of vacant sites in deprived areas (and indeed, any area) is important to note. These sites could provide the opportunity for the positive development of a street; however, if outlets that are potentially detrimental to public health move into these sites, they could also further increase the detrimental impact of streets to the public. Therefore, it is important to consider what outlets are allowed to replace vacant sites.

6.15 E-cigarettes/e-vaping

Introduced in 2005, e-cigarettes are an increasing presence on UK high streets, and whilst less harmful than cigarettes, their use is not without risk (RSPH, 2015). There are also concerns that instead of being viewed as an aid to quit smoking, their usage is being viewed as a lifestyle choice (RSPH, 2015).

According to the recent HSCIC (Health and Social Care Information Centre) survey on smoking prevalence amongst 15 year olds, in North East Lincolnshire, 24.7% of 15 year olds have ever smoked, with 6.9% of boys currently smoking and 13.1% of girls currently smoking (HSCIC, 2015). Their national figures on e-cigarettes suggest that nationally 18% of 15 year old girls and 19% of 15 year old boys have ever tried e-cigarettes, with 2% of girls and 3% of boys currently using them. Their figures also suggest that those from the most deprived areas are more likely to use e-cigarettes, with 3% of 15 year olds in the most deprived areas currently using them compared to only 2% in the least deprived areas. Likewise, it showed that 21% of those from the most deprived areas had ever tried them, compared to only 15% of those in the least deprived areas (HSCIC, 2015).

This report found that there were four e-cigarette shops/e-vaping shops within the 45 streets recorded. One e-cigarette/e-vaping shop was located on High Street, Cleethorpes, (Sidney Sussex), one was located on Grimsby Road (Sidney Sussex), and two were located on Freeman Street (East Marsh). Thus the two wards in the locality which contain e-cigarettes shops on their main streets are Sidney Sussex (fourth most deprived ward) and the East Marsh (most deprived ward). This supports HSCIC’s survey which suggests that e-cigarettes are most prevalent in more deprived areas, and is also potentially reassuring in that these two wards have high smoking prevalence: e-cigarettes could potentially be an aid to help people in these wards quit smoking.

However, the presence of these shops in deprived areas could potentially encourage young people to use e-cigarettes and/or make e-cigarettes more attractive to young people, so their presence must be acknowledged.

6.16 Community centres

25 community centres were recorded by this report. The majority (13, or 52%), were located within the East Marsh (the most deprived ward); this is a reassuring finding in that community centres provide opportunities/venues for people to meet friends and socialise and thus they support communities and social interaction. Community services/drop-in centres are also places offering support/outreach for local residents so they too are beneficial sights on a high street.
Indeed, community centres are important to consider when looking at the health of a street due to the wide array of opportunities they can provide local people. The Ice House, located on Victor Street (East Marsh) is extremely beneficial in that the centre contains multiple facilities, including a library as aforementioned, libraries are advantageous due to their promotion of literacy and the positive health implications of this (poor literacy is associated with negative health outcomes). Hence, the good coverage within the East Marsh in terms of community centres could prove to have positive health implications for residents who use these facilities.

It is also worth noting that the street with the highest proportion of community centres is Freeman Street (East Marsh) which contained six such outlets (24%).

Freeman Street has scored negatively elsewhere in this report, especially with regards to vacancy, and it is important to stress that not all is negative with regards to this street and indeed the East Marsh: there are positive outlets working within this street and this ward whose work will have a positive impact.

However, this report also found that West Marsh Community Centre, located on Corporation Road, is now vacant, which arguably has left a gap in West Marsh in terms of places for community interaction and support.

6.17 Victoria Street, Grimsby

This section of the report is tailored towards looking at Victoria Street (a shopping street located directly outside Freshney Place) whose presence is not acknowledged elsewhere in this report. Being located next to the main shopping precinct for the locality, it cannot be regarded in the same light as the other streets in this report; like Freshney Place, Victoria Street will serve a far wider array of people. However, it is useful to consider the health impact of this street as it is arguably the main street for Grimsby and will therefore impact many people within the locality, not just those in specific wards; it can also be compared to St. Peter’s Avenue in Cleethorpes and other larger streets within the locality.

Victoria Street South (including Old Market Place) contains 76 outlets, Victoria Street West at the top of this street (by the Riverhead Exchange bus station) contains a further 21 outlets. Collectively these two streets contain six bookmakers, three pay day loan/pawning establishments and five fast food takeaways. In one instance (in Old Market Place) there is a debt management service located next to a pay day loan establishment, which is reassuring in that those struggling with debt potentially are signposted to services that can help. However, it is notable that this street contains an abnormally high number of pay day loan establishments and bookmakers, both of which have potentially negative economic circumstances to their customers and can prove detrimental to a user’s health. Indeed no other street contained more than three bookmakers, and in total only 29 were recorded on all the other streets; however, Victoria Street South and West contained double the amount of bookmakers as Freeman Street (East Marsh) - six as opposed to three- and 6.2 % of Victoria Street West and South’s outlets are bookmakers.

Eight pubs/bars and two health services were found along Victoria Street South and West, and hence the street is most likely positive in supporting social interaction and the street also contains limited access to health services (in this case to opticians).
Likewise, considering its size, the street does not contain an excessive amount of fast food takeaways. This is reassuring considering the proliferation of fast food takeaways throughout the locality. However, this street does contain a high percentage of negatively scoring outlets (14.4%), specifically those with the potential to affect a consumer’s economic circumstance, and thus the street is one of concern.

7. Conclusions and Suggestions

Haverstoe ward proved surprising in that the streets assessed for this ward, despite the ward being the least deprived according to its 2010 IMD score, contained no positively scoring outlets, and although its streets were not the ‘unhealthiest’ streets located within the locality, both the streets in Haverstoe contained multiple fast food outlets, and Hardys Road obtained a Richter score of -4, making it the 10th lowest scoring street out of the 45 recorded streets.

Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes (Sidney Sussex) was determined to be the ‘unhealthiest’ street within the locality according to its Richter score, and so is a street that could be targeted for health promotion and improvement: an abnormally high incidence of tanning shops was also found on this street, meaning much could be addressed here.

Scartho Fork may also be a good area to target due to the loss of a pharmacy here which lessens the access to community pharmacies within Scartho ward, and due to the high proportion of fast food outlets found here. It would be useful therefore to increase the promotion of healthy lifestyles within this area.

Areas determined to have high vacancy rates must also be observed to prevent detrimental establishments from forming in place of vacant sites. The vacancy in these areas, if replaced by health promoting businesses/services could help reduce health inequalities by improving access to healthcare and promoting healthy behaviours in communities with poor health outcomes: often vacancy occurs in the most deprived wards. Freeman Street would be a key area to target in this respect as it is located in the East Marsh and has high levels of vacancy.

This report also found that locally there is a link between deprivation and the proliferation of fast food outlets, bookmakers and payday loan establishments. The proliferation of such outlets could be a key area to address and combatting this could help to reduce local health inequalities, improve the health impact of local streets and make local streets more health promoting, especially in those communities with the worst health outcomes. Fast food takeaways were found to be prevalent throughout the locality and tackling these in an attempt to promote healthier choices and healthier eating could be an area for universal target.

7.1 Tackling the proliferation of fast-food takeaways on local streets

Approach 1- Using regulatory and planning measures to address the proliferation of fast food takeaways

The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that local planning authorities have a responsibility to promote healthier communities and gives clear advice that local planning authorities should ‘work with public health leads and organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population...including expected changes, and any
information about relevant barriers to improving health and wellbeing.’ (PHE, 2013). Likewise, NICE guidance PH25 ‘Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease’ recommends restricting planning permission for takeaways and other food outlets in specific areas, for example, within walking distance of schools (NICE, 2010).

It is recommended by the Academy of Medical Royal Colleges that local authority planning decisions should be subject to a health impact assessment (PHE, 2013), and hence in order to address the proliferation of fast food takeaways, it would be useful to use health as a requirement for planning permission: hopefully preventing the establishment of new fast food takeaways in areas where there is already a significant presence. Proximity to schools and health impact is used a criterion by St. Helen’s Council, who also cover issues such as over-concentration and clustering, highway safety, cooking smells and litter, and many local authorities have used a 400m boundary for a fast food exclusion zone surrounding schools (PHE, 2013).

Alongside planning policies, there are other regulatory measures available to help decrease the impact of the proliferation of fast food, including but not exclusive to, restrictions on opening times (useful to prevent fast food being targeted at school children), policies to ensure that menus provide healthier options and street trading policies to restrict trading from fast food vans (such as ice-cream vans) near schools (PHE, 2013).

Nonetheless, as is mentioned in this report, fast food takeaways are of growing prevalence both nationally and within the locality, with increasing numbers of people now using fast food as a substitute for home cooking and with more people now eating meals outside of the home (RSPH, 2015; PHE, 2013). Thus, limiting the establishment of fast food takeaways on streets and their use may prove difficult. Likewise, new planning measures will also not affect existing businesses and it should also be noted that before 2005, when the 1987 Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) were amended, fast food takeaways may have been given planning permission under either Use Class A3 or Use Class A5. In addition, A3 premises can have subsidiary A5 use and whilst planning permission is currently required for change of use to a different category, it is not required for change of use within the same category (PHE, 2013).

**Approach 2- Working with takeaway businesses and the food industry to make food healthier**

It may instead be beneficial, as suggested by the RSPH, Public Health England and the London Healthy Urban Development Unit, to instead work with local fast food establishments to help them make their food healthier: this could be by helping establishments to reduce portion sizes, use healthier cooking methods (including healthier frying methods) and by encouraging them to provide nutritional information about the food they serve (RSPH, 2015; London Healthy Urban Development Unit, 2013; PHE, 2013).

Tower Hamlets Council have adopted a scheme called Food for Health Awards, which recognises restaurants, cafés, convenience stores and market traders that have made healthy changes to the food they cook and sell. Businesses that are part of this scheme are able to take part in a number of free training sessions offered by the council under the scheme, including the Charter Institute of Environmental Health Level 2 food safety catering course, free of charge (www.towerhamlets.gov.uk).
North East Lincolnshire Council already run a Healthy Choices Award, which works with educational establishments, workplaces and communities to promote healthy lifestyles and gives establishments access to accredited and non-accredited health related training courses (www.nelincs.gov.uk). Thus, there is already provision for this kind of work with local fast food takeaways, to help local fast food establishments help their consumers to make healthier choices and to provide them with healthier food. This could be an area of intensified focus.

**Approach 3- Working with schools to promote healthy eating habits amongst children**

The promotion of initiatives such as Change4Life (which is promoted already within some local schools), helps to promote healthy lifestyles and eating habits amongst children: helping children make changes for a healthier future (www.nhs.uk/Change4Life). ‘Stay on site’ policies within local schools could also reduce opportunities for the purchasing of junk food (London Healthy Urban Development Unit, 2013), and it is recommended by PHE that government buying standards for food and catering services should provide the basis for school food procurement (PHE, 2013). However, whilst a study published in 2008 found that secondary school pupils got more food from ‘fringe’ shops (including takeaways and convenience stores) than from their school canteen, research has also indicated that the most popular time for purchasing food from shops is after school (London Healthy Urban Development Unit, 2013). Hence, working with schools cannot be the only approach in tackling the consumption of fast-food.

**7.2 Other actions to be taken**

AS pointed out by the RSPH, encouraging tanning shops to switch from sunbeds to spray tans would ensure that people who find tanning aesthetically important would receive a tan without exposure to UV radiation (RSPH, 2015).

Additionally, as the RSPH report mentions, health can be used as a condition for the licensing of all types of businesses and planning controls can be used to prevent the proliferation of betting shops and pay day lenders: planning controls can be put in place so that councils, in line with their local development plans, can reject planning applications for payday loan shops or bookmakers (RSPH, 2015). This would be especially useful in the case of Victoria Street where there is already a high proportion of bookmakers and pay day loan establishments. Considering the large amount of people within the locality who are likely to come into contact with Victoria Street, the potential impact of such establishments here on the health and wellbeing of the locality are intensified.

In conclusion, whilst local centres are defined as being largely retail based, this is not necessarily the wish of a healthy high street. A healthy high street, as envisioned by the RSPH, would be one providing ‘opportunities for health optimisation’, with businesses that enable basic needs (such as affordable healthy food and financial services) and actively promote healthy choices (RSPH, 2015).

**8. Suggestions for further research**

1. Undertake a public consultation exercise to assess the public’s perceptions of the health of local streets and the effect of certain outlets, such as fast food takeaways. This would allow the Council to incorporate the views of local residents, community groups and schools into planning decisions.
2. Look at the ten indicators of a healthy street environment (as identified by Transport for London) (Saunders, 2014), to help assess what could be improved on local streets and provide a broader overview of the positives and negatives of local streets.

3. Map the location of fast food takeaways in relation to schools in the locality- the proximity of takeaways and the number surrounding different schools. This could be done by mapping the outlets found within a 400m radius of the schools in the area- Edge Avenue, for example, could be looked at.

4. Like with local centres report, it would be beneficial to record each individual establishment and its exact service/function as this would provide a more detailed overview of that establishment’s likely effect on the public’s health. Looking at the health of the streets of NE Lincs could be a branch of research/analysis that could be added onto local centres reports? This would mean the health impact of local streets would be continuously reviewed.

5. The high street survey could be expanded to include residential areas in target/disadvantaged areas. Likewise, it would also be useful to assess the health impact of Freshney Place.

6. It would also be beneficial to look in greater detail at how individual businesses in the local area are contributing to health in a broader way: are businesses promoting/signposting to health services? Are employees engaging in healthy conversations? Are outlets offering health checks or outreach activities? These were all things discussed by the RSPH as contributing to the health of high streets (RSPH, 2015). This would also be useful to determine in the instance of pubs/bars, as whilst these establishments are viewed positively in terms of their promotion of social interaction, it is likely each pub is different in terms of the extent to which this occurs.

9. Glossary

Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD): The Indices of Multiple Deprivation are assigned based on seven domains: income, employment, health deprivation and disability, education, skills and training, barriers to housing and services, crime, and living environment. Higher scores indicate greater area deprivation.

Premature mortality: death before the age of 75, the four main causes of which in the UK are heart disease and stroke, lung disease, liver disease and cancer.

Use Classes (A3 and A5): The 1987 Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) puts uses of land and buildings into various categories known as ‘Use Classes’. Use Class A3 refers to restaurants and cafés (for the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premise), whereas Use Class A5 refers to hot food takeaways (for the sale of hot food for consumption off the premises).
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