

Are the health impacts likely to generate cumulative and/or synergistic impacts?	Yes		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		No	
Community												
Is the population affected by the initiative more than 1000 people?	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	Re-procurement, continue with the current contract until expiry in Dec 2017		Re-procurement with early severance of the existing contracts		Cease providing leisure services		Assets transfer through sale		Asset transfer through long lease, 99 years		Extension of existing contract with GLL for five years	
	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIZ	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIZ	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIZ	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIZ	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIZ	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIZ
Are any socially excluded, vulnerable, or disadvantaged groups likely to be affected? Or, more affected by potential negative impacts?	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Are there public or community concerns about any potential impacts?	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	No
Initiative												
Is the cost of the initiative high?	Yes		Yes		No		No		Yes		Yes	No

Is the nature and extent of the disruption caused by the initiative likely to be major? Or difficult to remedy? Or have an irreversible impact?	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes			No
Organisation												
Is the initiative a high priority OR important for the organisation/ partnership?	Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes		Yes	
SPA STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES, would the objectives below be contributed to by the options:												
i. To deliver an environment conducive to physical activity in a manner that is as cost neutral as possible to the public purse - providing the facilities, open spaces, and community and transport infrastructure that allows and encourages residents of all ages to be active.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes			No
i. To strengthen organisations and partnerships - increasing the number and quality of volunteers,	Yes		Yes		No		No		No		Yes	

From your knowledge and/or in your judgement (please circle the appropriate Yes/ ?/ No answer)	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA
Health impacts				
Will the initiative/proposal affect physical or mental health or wellbeing?	Yes / ?		Yes - as the new contract will incorporate PH objectives with an intention to have good effect on physical and mental health of the individuals.	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>social</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (community networks, culture, lifestyles, fear of crime)	Yes / ?		Yes - as the new contract will incorporate PH objectives they will have positive impact on the lifestyle and community networks	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>economic</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (employment, access to training & education, benefits)	Yes / ?		Yes / ?the proposal will lead to redevelopment of the current facilities which will have an economic impact e.g. the majority of potential suppliers are used to providing sports development officers as part of modern leisure services contracts. This will have a positive impact on employment and access to training for the local community.	
Will the proposal have impact on <i>environmental</i> living conditions that would indirectly affect health? (land, water, air pollution, transport, housing conditions, land use)	Yes / ?		Yes - As the proposal will lead to redevelopment of the current facilities, it will have an initial impact on the environmental conditions that could indirectly affect health e.g. transport disruption, noise and air pollution during the reconstruction phase.	
If 'No' to the above 4 Qs à Answer 'No' to 'Proceed with HIA?'				
Are there any potentially serious negative health impacts associated with the initiative that you currently know of?	Yes / ?		Yes - if the new contract involves redevelopment of the sites then these can lead to increased noise, traffic congestion, road closures, rerouting and land digging for updating utility services. The effect will be more severe for the neighbouring communities during the reconstruction phase	
Is further investigation necessary because more information is required on the potential health impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes - to understand the full impact of redevelopment of the current sites as part of the re-procurement	
Is there an 'evidence-base' to support a HIA?		No	There is some evidence to support the establishment of leisure services, these are focussed on the likely benefits of providing leisure in specific locations and or the benefits or re-orientating a facility to meet specific needs. There is no specific evidence to relate to this option	
Are the potential health impacts well-known and is it straightforward to suggest effective ways in which beneficial effects are maximised, and harmful effects minimised?		Yes / ?		Yes/? - to a certain degree though it would require further feasibility study

Will the proposal affect an individual's ability to improve their own health & well-being?	Yes / ?		Yes - As the new proposal will incorporate PH objectives. Also there is an expectation that the local providers will be engaged in delivering these. Both these will have a positive health impact.	
Will there be a change in demand for, or access to, health & social care services?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - There is an expectation that as the new proposal will incorporate PH outcomes, there will be a decrease in demand for health and social services?	
Do you (or others) judge the identified health impacts as being small in effect?	No / ?		No / ? - The proposal will have a large as continuation of the current contract that does not incorporate PH objectives i.e. further 3 years of no PH outcome provision	
Are the health impacts likely to generate cumulative and/or synergistic impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? As discussed above	
Community				
Is the population affected by the initiative more than 1000 people?	Yes / ?		Yes - based on the current level of usage of the these facilities by the surrounding communities	
Are any socially excluded, vulnerable, or disadvantaged groups likely to be affected? Or, more affected by potential negative impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? There is a possibility of negative impact on the vulnerable or disadvantaged groups during the redevelopment phase. Any continued disadvantages though minimal will require feasibility studies.	
Are there public or community concerns about any potential impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - There is likely to be a public response to the above option	
Initiative				
Is the cost of the initiative high?	Yes / ?		Yes - the initial cost is expected to be high, however, there are suggestion to sign longer contract where the potential supplier commit to their own capital investment. The council's financial modelling has assumed that zero subsidy will be achieved form the start date (January 2018) of the new contract.	
Is the nature and extent of the disruption caused by the initiative likely to be major? Or difficult to remedy? Or have an irreversible impact?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - as the new contract will lead to redevelopment of the sites, there will be major disruption to local communities and business during this time 12-18 months. Some existing sites will remain open during the redevelopment.	
Organisation				
Is the initiative a high priority OR important for the organisation/ partnership?	Yes		Yes - the proposal will incorporate PH outcomes and hence is a high priority initiative. Similarly, by providing long term contract, it will strengthen the partnership with the providers.	Total Yes: 16 Total No: 1

	Option Two		Brief details	
	Re-procurement with early severance of the existing contracts		Payoff the current provider and renew the contract earlier by incorporating the public health priorities and objectives. The estimated timeframe for cancelling and renewal of the contract would be nine months earlier than the above option.	
From your knowledge and/or in your judgement (please circle the appropriate Yes/ ?/ No answer)	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA
Health impacts				
Will the initiative/proposal affect physical or mental health or wellbeing?	Yes		Yes - as the new contract will incorporate PH objectives with an intention to have good effect on physical and mental health of the individuals.	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>social</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (community networks, culture, lifestyles, fear of crime)	Yes		Yes - as the new contract will incorporate PH objectives they will have positive impact on the lifestyle and community networks	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>economic</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (employment, access to training & education, benefits)	Yes		Yes / ? the proposal will lead to redevelopment of the current facilities which will have an economic impact e.g. the majority of potential suppliers are used to providing sports development officers as part of modern leisure services contracts. This will have a positive impact on employment and access to training for the local community.	
Will the proposal have impact on <i>environmental</i> living conditions that would indirectly affect health? (land, water, air pollution, transport, housing conditions, land use)	Yes		Yes - As the proposal will lead to redevelopment of the current facilities, it will have an initial impact on the environmental conditions that would indirectly affect health e.g. transport disruption, noise and air pollution during the reconstruction phase.	
If 'No' to the above 4 Qs à Answer 'No' to 'Proceed with HIA?'				
Are there any potentially serious negative health impacts associated with the initiative that you currently know of?	Yes		Yes - if the new contract involves redevelopment of the sites then these can lead to increased noise, traffic congestion, road closures, rerouting and land digging for updating utility services. The effect will be more severe for the neighbouring communities during the reconstruction phase	
Is further investigation necessary because more information is required on the potential health impacts?	Yes		Yes - to understand the full impact of redevelopment of the current sites as part of the re-procurement	
Is there an 'evidence-base' to support a HIA?		No	There is some evidence to support the establishment of leisure services, these are focussed on the likely benefits of providing leisure in specific locations and or the benefits or re-orientating a facility to meet specific needs. There is no specific evidence to relate to this option	

Are the potential health impacts well-known and is it straightforward to suggest effective ways in which beneficial effects are maximised, and harmful effects minimised?		Yes		Yes/? - to a certain degree though it would require further feasibility study
Will the proposal affect an individual's ability to improve their own health & well-being?	Yes		Yes - As the new proposal will incorporate PH objectives. Also there will be an expectation that local providers will be engaged in delivering these.	
Will there be a change in demand for, or access to, health & social care services?	Yes		Yes / ? - there is an expectation that as the new proposal will incorporate PH outcomes, there will be a decrease in demand for health and social services?	
Do you (or others) judge the identified health impacts as being small in effect?	No		No / ? - The proposal will have a large impact as the current contract does not incorporate PH objectives i.e. further two and half years of no PH outcome provision	
Are the health impacts likely to generate cumulative and/or synergistic impacts?	Yes		Yes / ? As discussed above	
Community				
Is the population affected by the initiative more than 1000 people?	Yes		Yes - based on the current level of usage of the these facilities by the surrounding communities	
Are any socially excluded, vulnerable, or disadvantaged groups likely to be affected? Or, more affected by potential negative impacts?	Yes		Yes / ? There is a possibility of negative impact on the vulnerable or disadvantaged groups during the redevelopment phase. Any continued disadvantages though minimal will require feasibility studies.	
Are there public or community concerns about any potential impacts?	Yes		Yes / ? - There is likely to be a public response to the above option	
Initiative				
Is the cost of the initiative high?	Yes		In this option the new contract starts on 1 st April 2016, nine months before the end of the current contract. The severance fee would be; £1,037,534.25.	
Is the nature and extent of the disruption caused by the initiative likely to be major? Or difficult to remedy? Or have an irreversible impact?	Yes		Yes / ? - as the new contract will lead to redevelopment of the sites, there will be major disruption to local communities and business during this time 12-18months. Some existing sites will remain open during the redevelopment.	
Organisation				
Is the initiative a high priority OR important for the organisation/ partnership?	Yes		Yes - the proposal will incorporate PH outcomes and hence is a high priority initiative, however, early severance would be costly for the organisation and may have an impact on the organisation's partnership with the providers.	

				Total Yes: 16 Total No: 1 (Similar to Option 1)
--	--	--	--	---

	Option three	<i>Brief detail</i>		
	Cease providing leisure services	<i>Council stops providing its leisure facilities in the borough and the current sites are sold. The closure of the facilities can take up to six months and will result in staff redundancies.</i>		
From your knowledge and/or in your judgement (please circle the appropriate Yes/ ?/ No answer)	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA
Health impacts				

Will the initiative/proposal affect physical or mental health or wellbeing?	Yes / ?		Yes - Closure of facilities will have a negative impact on the physical and mental health of the local population	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>social</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (community networks, culture, lifestyles, fear of crime)	Yes / ?		Yes - Closure of facilities will have a negative impact on social conditions that could indirectly affect health e.g. (loss of community networks, culture, lifestyles)	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>economic</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (employment, access to training & education, benefits)	Yes / ?		Yes - closure of facilities will have a negative impact in the shape of job losses and lack of access to training facilities.	
Will the proposal have impact on <i>environmental</i> living conditions that would indirectly affect health? (land, water, air pollution, transport, housing conditions, land use)		No		No - however, the sites when sold may be used for residential development by the purchasing organisation. In this situation it will have both short and long term impact on the environmental conditions that would indirectly affect health e.g. transport disruption, noise and air pollution and land usage.
If 'No' to the above 4 Qs à Answer 'No' to 'Proceed with HIA?'				
Are there any potentially serious negative health impacts associated with the initiative that you currently know of?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - The proposal will not be able to meet the PH outcomes and will have a negative health impact on the population currently using these facilities.	
Is further investigation necessary because more information is required on the potential health impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes - further investigation would be necessary to access the full impact of this proposal on the health of local community	
Is there an 'evidence-base' to support a HIA?	Yes / ?		Yes	
Are the potential health impacts well-known and is it straightforward to suggest effective ways in which beneficial effects are maximised, and harmful effects minimised?	No / ?		No - Although the potential impact of loss of leisure facilities is well known, it is not straightforward to suggest effective ways of minimising the harmful effects.	
Will the proposal affect an individual's ability to improve their own health & well-being?		No		No - the proposal will remove the facilities linked with individuals to improve their own health.
Will there be a change in demand for, or access to, health & social care services?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - With the cessation of leisure facilities there can be an increase in the demand for health and social services.	

Do you (or others) judge the identified health impacts as being small in effect?	No / ?		No - the identified health impacts would be large as cessation of leisure facilities would stop any involvement of work towards PH objectives.	
Are the health impacts likely to generate cumulative and/or synergistic impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes - the negative health impacts would be cumulative.	
Community				
Is the population affected by the initiative more than 1000 people?	Yes / ?		Yes - based on the current level of usage of the these facilities by the surrounding communities	
Are any socially excluded, vulnerable, or disadvantaged groups likely to be affected? Or, more affected by potential negative impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes - there is a possibility that the cessation of leisure facilities will disadvantage the health of vulnerable or disadvantaged groups	
Are there public or community concerns about any potential impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - There is likely to be a large public response to the above option	
Initiative				
Is the cost of the initiative high?		No		No - the cost of the initiative is not high, however, there could be an indirect increased future cost related with negative health impacts on the local population due to closure of leisure facilities.
Is the nature and extent of the disruption caused by the initiative likely to be major? Or difficult to remedy? Or have an irreversible impact?	Yes / ?		Yes - the disruption caused by the initiative is likely to be major, difficult to remedy and may have a negative and irreversible impact on the health of local population in the long term. Similarly, ceasing the provision of leisure services are against the PH interventions.	
Organisation				
Is the initiative a high priority OR important for the organisation/ partnership?		No		No - It is not high priority as the serious negative health impacts of this initiative on the council's strategic PH objectives means it will be difficult to take it forward at this stage.

	Option four		Brief detail	
	Assets transfer through sale		<i>The sale of the current leisure facilities by April 2016 with no influence in the future development and services provision.</i>	
From your knowledge and/or in your judgement (please circle the appropriate Yes/ ?/ No answer)	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA	Bias towards HIA	
				Bias against HIA

Health impacts				
Will the initiative/proposal affect physical or mental health or wellbeing?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - The sale of assets means that the council will lose control of the sites and hence would not have an influence in future development of these facilities. This means that there would be a missed opportunity to incorporate PH objectives into the leisure facilities. The absence of PH objectives from the future proposals may lead to negative impacts on the physical or mental health of the local population.	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>social</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (community networks, culture, lifestyles, fear of crime)	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - The sale of assets will not only remove council's control of the facilities, it will also miss the opportunity to incorporate PH objectives in future development of these facilities. This would have a negative impact on the social conditions and hence could indirectly affect health	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>economic</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (employment, access to training & education, benefits)	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - The absence of PH objectives from the future proposals may have a negative impact on the economic condition that would indirectly affect health e.g. loss of employment.	
Will the proposal have impact on <i>environmental</i> living conditions that would indirectly affect health? (land, water, air pollution, transport, housing conditions, land use)	Yes / ?		Yes - As the proposal will lead to redevelopment of the current facilities, it will have an initial impact on the environmental conditions that would indirectly affect health e.g. transport disruption, noise and air pollution during the reconstruction phase.	
If 'No' to the above 4 Qs à Answer 'No' to 'Proceed with HIA?'				
Are there any potentially serious negative health impacts associated with the initiative that you currently know of?	Yes / ?		Yes / - the proposal will not be able to meet the PH objectives and will have a negative health impact on the population currently using these facilities. Similarly, if the new contract involves redevelopment of the sites then these can lead to increased noise, traffic congestion, rerouting, redirection of the utility services for the neighbouring communities during the reconstruction phase	
Is further investigation necessary because more information is required on the potential health impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - further investigation will be necessary to assess the full impact of this proposal on the health of local community	
Is there an 'evidence-base' to support a HIA?	Yes / ?	No	There is some evidence to support the establishment of leisure services, these are focussed on the likely benefits of providing leisure in specific locations and or the benefits or re-orientating a facility to meet specific needs. There is no specific evidence to relate to this option	
Are the potential health impacts well-known and is it straightforward to suggest effective ways in which beneficial effects are maximised, and harmful effects minimised?		Yes		Yes/? - to a certain degree though it would require further feasibility study

Will the proposal affect an individual's ability to improve their own health & well-being?		No		No - the proposal may remove the current facilities linked with individuals to improve their own health especially as council would not have control on incorporating PH objectives in redevelopment of these facilities.
Will there be a change in demand for, or access to, health & social care services?	Yes / ?		Yes - in the absence of PH objectives and loss of assets, there will be an increase in the demand for health and social services.	
Do you (or others) judge the identified health impacts as being small in effect?	No / ?		No / ? The identified health impacts would be large as council's loss of control via asset transfer would cease the delivery of PH objectives.	
Are the health impacts likely to generate cumulative and/or synergistic impacts?		No		No
Community				
Is the population affected by the initiative more than 1000 people?	Yes / ?		Yes - based on the current level of usage of the these facilities by the surrounding communities	
Are any socially excluded, vulnerable, or disadvantaged groups likely to be affected? Or, more affected by potential negative impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes - there is a possibility that the asset transfer with no further control by the council may disadvantage the health of vulnerable or disadvantaged groups	
Are there public or community concerns about any potential impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - There is likely to be a public response to the above option	
Initiative				

Is the cost of the initiative high?		No		No - the cost of the initiative is not high, however, there could be an indirect increase in the future cost related with negative health impacts on the local population in the absence of PH objectives as part of the contracts with the leisure facilities.
Is the nature and extent of the disruption caused by the initiative likely to be major? Or difficult to remedy? Or have an irreversible impact?	Yes / ?		Yes - the disruption caused by the initiative is likely to be major, difficult to remedy and may have an negative and irreversible impact on the health of local population in the long term. Similarly, ceasing the provision of leisure services are against the PH interventions.	
Organisation				
Is the initiative a high priority OR important for the organisation/ partnership?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - the initiative is high priority as any asset transfer without future control by the council's would stop meeting council's PH objectives.	Total Yes: 13 Total No: 5

	Option five		Brief detail	
	Asset transfer through long lease, 99 years		Council will maintain the freehold ownership of the facilities and may achieve nil cost by Sept 2016 with a subsequent rental income. The market is not used to this kind of large scale leases and it is not known how attractive it would be to them. It is likely that the more restrictive the lease conditions the more unattractive it will seem. No long term prospect of increasing income and a public health provider might have to be sourced separately. There is a likelihood of early severance fee.	
From your knowledge and/or in your judgement (please circle the appropriate Yes/ ?/ No answer)	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA
Health impacts				
Will the initiative/proposal affect physical or mental health or wellbeing?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - The transfer of assets through long lease would maintain council's freehold ownership of the facilities and the potential to add PH objectives as lease clauses in the development of future leisure facilities.	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>social</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (community networks, culture, lifestyles, fear of crime)	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - The proposal will retain council's control and an opportunity to incorporate PH objectives in the future development of these facilities. This can lead to positive impact on the social conditions that can indirectly affect health.	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>economic</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (employment, access to training & education, benefits)	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - The proposal will retain council's control and an opportunity to incorporate PH objectives in the future development of these facilities. This can have a positive impact on the social conditions that can indirectly affect health.	
Will the proposal have impact on <i>environmental</i> living conditions that would indirectly affect health? (land, water, air pollution, transport, housing conditions, land use)	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - The proposal can lead to re-development of the facilities and hence will have an impact on the social conditions that can indirectly affect health.	
If 'No' to the above 4 Qs à Answer 'No' to 'Proceed with HIA?'				
Are there any potentially serious negative health impacts associated with the initiative that you currently know of?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - As the sale and lease extension will involve redevelopment of the sites then these can lead to increased noise, traffic congestion, rerouting, redirection of the utility services for the neighbouring communities during the reconstruction phase	
Is further investigation necessary because more information is required on the potential health impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes - further investigation will be necessary to understand the full impact of the above proposal on health of the local community.	
Is there an 'evidence-base' to support a HIA?	Yes /	No	There is some evidence to support the establishment of leisure services, these are focussed on the likely benefits of providing leisure in specific locations and or the benefits or re-orientating a facility to meet specific needs. There is no specific evidence to relate to this option	

Are the potential health impacts well-known and is it straightforward to suggest effective ways in which beneficial effects are maximised, and harmful effects minimised?		Yes		Yes/? - to a certain degree though it would require further feasibility study
Will the proposal affect an individual's ability to improve their own health & well-being?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - With the assumption that the redevelopment of the sites with PH objectives as part of the sale and lease extension clauses and the and the corporation and engagement of local providers in delivering these objectives	
Will there be a change in demand for, or access to, health & social care services?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - there is an expectation that the proposal would be able to incorporate PH objectives in the running of future leisure facilities which would decrease the demand for health and social services?	
Do you (or others) judge the identified health impacts as being small in effect?	No / ?		No / ? - the proposal will have a large impact if PH objectives are added into the lease clause as a condition for sale. Similarly, sale of the sites with an extended lease would generate income stream for the council with a potential to have zero subsidy and the new provider expected to be responsible for the day to day running and management of the facilities.	
Are the health impacts likely to generate cumulative and/or synergistic impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes / ?	
Community				
Is the population affected by the initiative more than 1000 people?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - based on the current level of usage of the these facilities by the surrounding communities	
Are any socially excluded, vulnerable, or disadvantaged groups likely to be affected? Or, more affected by potential negative impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? There is a possibility of negative impact on the vulnerable or disadvantaged groups.	
Are there public or community concerns about any potential impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - There is likely to be a public response to the above option	
Initiative				
Is the cost of the initiative high?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - Only if the early severance of the current contracts. Otherwise the proposal has a potential to get to zero subsidy from the start of the proposal.	
Is the nature and extent of the disruption caused by the initiative likely to be major? Or difficult to remedy? Or have an irreversible impact?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - as the proposal would lead to redevelopment of the sites, there could be major disruption to local communities and business during this time 12-18months.	
Organisation				

Is the initiative a high priority OR important for the organisation/ partnership?	Yes / ?		Yes - the proposal is high priority as it has a potential to incorporate PH objectives, zero subsidy and income stream from start of the lease.	Total Yes: 16 Total No: 1
---	---------	--	---	------------------------------

Option six		Brief Details		
Extension of existing contract with current provider for five years		Brief detail: The current contract is extended by five years i.e. 2018-2023 without any further upgrading of the facilities by either the council or the provider. It is estimated that this option could be cost neutral to the council from the start. The contract cannot be substantially changed though so little improvements expected in public health objectives.		
From your knowledge and/or in your judgement (please circle the appropriate Yes/ ?/ No answer)	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA	Bias towards HIA	Bias against HIA
Health impacts				
Will the initiative/proposal affect physical or mental health or wellbeing?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? Current contract does not incorporate PH objectives, its' extension would have a negative impact on the physical and mental health of the local population.	
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>social</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (community networks, culture, lifestyles, fear of crime)		No		No - the extension of contract will not disturb the current state and hence would not have any +ve or -ve influence on social conditions that could indirectly affect health.
Will the proposal have an impact on <i>economic</i> conditions that would indirectly affect health? (employment, access to training & education, benefits)		No		No - the proposal will not lead to any investment or redevelopment of the facilities and hence will not have any affect on the economic conditions that could indirectly affect health.
Will the proposal have impact on <i>environmental</i> living conditions that would indirectly affect health? (land, water, air pollution, transport, housing conditions, land use)		No		No - the proposal will not lead to any investment or redevelopment of the facilities and hence will not have any affect on the environmental conditions that could indirectly affect health.
If 'No' to the above 4 Qs à Answer 'No' to 'Proceed with HIA?'				
Are there any potentially serious negative health impacts associated with the initiative that you currently know of?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - the proposal will not be able to incorporate PH objectives and hence will have a negative health impact on the population currently using these facilities.	
Is further investigation necessary because more information is required on the potential health impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes - further investigation would be necessary to access the full impact of this proposal on the health of local community	
Is there an 'evidence-base' to support a HIA?	Yes / ?	No	There is some evidence to support the establishment of leisure services, these are focussed on the likely benefits of providing leisure in specific locations and or the benefits or re-orientating a facility to meet specific needs.	No

			There is no specific evidence to relate to this option	
Are the potential health impacts well-known and is it straightforward to suggest effective ways in which beneficial effects are maximised, and harmful effects minimised?		Yes		Yes/? - to a certain degree though it would require further feasibility study
Will the proposal affect an individual's ability to improve their own health & well-being?		No		No - As the proposal does not incorporate PH objectives, there will be no or minimal affect on the individuals' ability to improve their own health and wellbeing.
Will there be a change in demand for, or access to, health & social care services?	Yes / ?		Yes /? - without the PH objectives in this proposals there can be an increase in the demand for health and social services.	
Do you (or others) judge the identified health impacts as being small in effect?	No / ?		No - the extension of contracts without PH objectives would have a large negative health impact.	
Are the health impacts likely to generate cumulative and/or synergistic impacts?		No		No
Community				
Is the population affected by the initiative more than 1000 people?	Yes / ?		Yes - based on the current level of usage of the these facilities by the surrounding communities	
Are any socially excluded, vulnerable, or disadvantaged groups likely to be affected? Or, more affected by potential negative impacts?	Yes / ?		Yes - there is a possibility that the proposal will disadvantage the health of vulnerable or disadvantaged groups	
Are there public or community concerns about any potential impacts?		No		No - There is unlikely to be a public response to the above option as the extension of contracts without any changes would hardly be noticed.
Initiative				
Is the cost of the initiative high?		No		No - It is expected that this option would be cost neutral for the council from 2018
Is the nature and extent of the disruption caused by the initiative likely to be major? Or difficult to remedy? Or have an irreversible impact?		No		No - as there will no investment or redevelopment in this proposal, there will be no disruption.
Organisation				
Is the initiative a high priority OR important for the organisation/ partnership?	Yes / ?		Yes / ? - The initiative is high priority as it will be cost neutral for the council from 2018.	

				Total Yes: 8 Total No: 8
--	--	--	--	--------------------------

Appendix X Rapid appraisal of option 1 and 2 for their impact on the health of local population - SCORING

Option 1- Re-procurement at the end of current contract - continue with the current contract until expiry in Dec 2017 and renew it with better contract (10 years or longer) that incorporates public health priorities and objectives and is cost neutral / income generating for the council

Option 2 - Re-procurement with early severance of the existing contracts - Payoff the current provider and renew the contract earlier by incorporating the public health priorities and objectives. The estimated timeframe for cancelling and renewal of the contract would be 9 months earlier than the first option.

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x(b)x (c)x(d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
1. Social & economic environment	Employment: paid/ unpaid opportunities for individuals and/or communities	2	+ve	2	2	2	+ 16		The proposal is aimed at the design, build, operate and maintenance (DBOM) of the three leisure facilities which can lead to employment opportunities for the local population which has a positive impact on the health.	
	Income: creation & distribution of income and/or wealth	2	+ve	2	2	2	+ 16		As above income creation and wealth are related with employment opportunities and provision of services.	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x(b)x (c)x(d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Education & skills: lifelong learning & training opportunities, knowledge & skills held in the community	2	+	3	2	2	+ 24		The proposal also aims to add PH objectives at the heart of new procurement which will lead to a positive impact on the health of the local population including better learning and training opportunities.	
	Family cohesion: levels of family contact, family support	0					0			
	Social cohesion: levels of community interaction & support, neighbourliness, opportunities for meaningful social contact, spiritual participation	2	+	3	2	2	+ 24		Facilities will also provide opportunities for social and cohesion which have a positive health impact.	
	Community safety: crime or fear of crime, actual or perceived personal	0					0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x(b)x (c)x(d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
& property safety										
	Access to affordable healthy food: quality, supermarkets, local shops	0					0			
	Housing: chance to live in decent affordable home	0					0			
	Discrimination	2	+ve	3	2	2	+24		The proposal will remove discriminate against individuals in the priority groups and will provide them with opportunities to engage in healthy	
2. Physical environment	Appearance of the area (real or perceived differences in characteristics)	0					0			
	Sites/locations which have	2	+ve	3	1	1	+6			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a)	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b)	No. of people affected (c)	Severity of impact (d)	TOTAL	Differential exposure or susceptibility?	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
		0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive		1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	1=Fewer 2=Many	1=Minor 2=Major	(a) x(b)x (c)x(d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure		
	significance in people's lives									
	Air quality (in buildings or externally) & pollution	2	- ve	2	2	2	-16		The redevelopment work would lead to poor air quality in the neighbouring area and hence will have a negative impact on the health.	
	Water quality & pollution	1					0			
	Built Environment: quality and/or use	2	+ ve	3	2	2	+ 24		Re-procurement will lead to redevelopment of three sites i.e. Finchley, Church Farm and Copthall. The new facilities will incorporate PH objectives focused on the health benefits of the users.	
	Land use: availability/ quality of open space & environmental	0					0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x(b)x (c)x(d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? <i>Which groups?</i> Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	3. Lifestyle-related variables, & personal experiences	amenity								
Noise		2	- ve	2	2	2	- 16			
Safety: accidental injuries, physical safety & security		0					0			
Working conditions		2	+ve	3	1	1	+6		The proposal would improve the working condition of the employees and would indirectly benefit their health.	
Transport: accessibility, mobility, accidents		0					0			
3. Lifestyle-related variables, & personal experiences	Diet & eating habits	0					0			
	Exercise & physical activity	3	+ ve	3	2	2	+ 36		The option will increase the opportunities for participation into exercise	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x(b)x (c)x(d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
									and physical activity which has a direct positive affect on the health and wellbeing of local population in all age groups.	
	Recreation: chances for leisure activities & experiences, leisure & cultural amenities	3	+ve	3	2	2	+ 36		The proposal will provide a platform to mingle with different cultural groups and participate in activities which bring social cohesion and have a indirect but positive health impact on the population.	
	Substance abuse: tobacco, alcohol, drugs	1	+ve	3	1	1	+3		The proposal will provide individuals with opportunities to engage in healthy lifestyles and may have a indirect but positive health impact by	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x(b)x (c)x(d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
4. Access to (location/ disabled access/ costs), quality & use of (changes in contacts with) services									discouraging substance misuse.	
	Risk-taking (sexual) behaviour	0					0			
	Individuals' feeling of control over their own lives, or ability to influence their lives & locality	1	+ ve	3	2	2	+ 12			
	Feelings of anxiety, fear or distress; stress at home/ work	0					0			
4. Access to (location/ disabled access/ costs), quality & use of (changes in contacts with) services	Health care services	0					0			
4. Access to (location/ disabled access/ costs), quality & use of (changes in contacts with) services	Child care services	0					0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x(b)x (c)x(d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? <i>Which groups?</i> Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
		Social services	0					0		
	Voluntary services	0					0			
	Housing services	0					0			
	Leisure facilities	3	+	3	2	2	+ 36		The proposal will lead to improved leisure facilities (encouraging participation) and will have a positive health impact on the local population.	
	Adult education	0					0			
	Police	0					0			

Appendix X: Rapid appraisal of option 3 and 4 for their impact on the health of local population SCORING

Option 3: Cease providing leisure services - Council stops providing its leisure facilities in the borough and the current sites are sold.

Option 4: Assets transfer through sale

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? <i>Which groups?</i> Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
1. Social & economic environment	Employment: paid/ unpaid opportunities for individuals and/or communities	3	- ve	3	2	2	-36		The proposal will lead to redundancies and loss of opportunities for the local population. This will have a negative impact on the mental health of local population.	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Income: creation & distribution of income and/or wealth	3	-ve	3	1	2	-18		As above income creation and wealth are related with employment opportunities and provision of services. Removal of income creation will lead to deprivation and hence will have a negative health impact.	
	Education & skills: lifelong learning & training opportunities, knowledge & skills held in the community	2	-ve	2	2	2	-16		The proposal will deprive the community from learning opportunities and will have a negative impact on the health of the local population.	
	Family cohesion: levels of family contact, family support	0					0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Social cohesion: levels of community interaction & support, neighbourliness, opportunities for meaningful social contact, spiritual participation	2	- ve	3	2	2	- 24		The proposal will remove opportunities for social cohesion which would have a negative impact on the health of local population.	
	Community safety: crime or fear of crime, actual or perceived personal & property safety	1	- ve	3	1	2	- 6			
	Access to affordable healthy food: quality, supermarkets, local shops	0					0			
	Housing: chance to live in decent affordable home	0					0			
	Discrimination	3	- ve	3	2	2	- 36	Priority groups as mentioned in	The proposal will discriminate individuals in the priority groups and would decrease the	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
								the report	opportunities for them to engage in healthy behaviour.	
2. Physical environment	Appearance of the area (real or perceived differences in characteristics)	0					0			
	Sites/locations which have significance in people's lives	3	-ve	3	2	2	- 36		Based on the usage of the leisure facilities, it is evident that their closure will have a significant negative impact on the health of local population.	
	Air quality (in buildings or externally) & pollution	2	-ve	2	2	2	-16		Selling the current leisure sites may lead to redevelopment of these sites into future private leisure sites or other developments. These	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
									activities will lead to poor air quality in the neighbouring area and hence will have a negative impact on the health.	
	Water quality & pollution	0					0			
	Built Environment: quality and/or use	0					0			
	Land use: availability/ quality of open space & environmental amenity	0					0			
	Noise	2	-ve	2	1	2	- 16		Only if the current sites are redeveloped with building work carrying out at the sites.	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Safety: accidental injuries, physical safety & security	0					0			
	Working conditions	0					0			
	Transport: accessibility, mobility, accidents	0					0			
3. Lifestyle-related variables, & personal experiences	Diet & eating habits	0					0			
	Exercise & physical activity	3	-ve	3	2	2	-36		The option will remove the opportunities for participation into exercise and physical activity and will have a direct negative affect on the health and wellbeing of local population in all age groups.	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Recreation: chances for leisure activities & experiences, leisure & cultural amenities	3	- ve	3	2	2	- 36		The proposal will remove opportunities for recreation and leisure and will have a direct negative affect on the health of local population.	
	Substance abuse: tobacco, alcohol, drugs	1	- ve	3	1	1	- 3		The proposal will remove opportunities to seek healthy and active life style and may have a negative impact on a small population by engaging into substance misuse.	
	Risk-taking (sexual) behaviour	0					0			
	Individuals' feeling of control over their own lives, or ability to influence their lives & locality	2	-ve	3	1	2	- 12		The proposal will have a negative health impact by removing facilities that can	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
									improve individual's health	
	Feelings of anxiety, fear or distress; stress at home/ work	2	-ve	3	2	2	-24		Use of leisure facilities and exercise are linked with decreasing anxiety and stress. Hence the proposal will have a negative impact on the health of the population by adding stress and anxiety.	
services	Health care services	0					0			
services	Child care services	0					0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a)	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b)	No. of people affected (c)	Severity of impact (d)	TOTAL	Differential exposure or susceptibility?	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
		0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive		1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	1=Fewer 2=Many	1=Minor 2=Major	(a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure		
	Social services	0					0			
	Voluntary services	0					0			
	Housing services	0					0			
	Leisure facilities	3	-ve	3	2	2	-36		The proposal will lead to closure leisure facilities (encouraging participation) and will have a direct negative health impact on the local population.	
	Adult education	0					0			
	Police	0					0			

Appendix F: Rapid appraisal of option 5 for its impact on the health of local population - SCORING

Option 5: Asset transfer through long lease, 99 years

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? <i>Which groups?</i> Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
1.Social & economic environment	Employment: paid/ unpaid opportunities for individuals and/or communities	2	+ ve	3	2	2	+ 16		The proposal will retain the current leisure facilities and once PH objectives are added as a clause in lease extension, these may lead to further employment opportunities for the local population which will have a positive impact on their health.	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? <i>Which groups?</i> Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Income: creation & distribution of income and/or wealth	2	+ ve	3	2	2	+ 16		As above income creation and wealth are related with employment opportunities which will have a positive mental health impact on the local community.	
	Education & skills: lifelong learning & training opportunities, knowledge & skills held in the community	3	+ve	3	2	2	+ 36		The proposal will aims to add PH objectives at the heart of lease extension which will lead to a positive impact on the health of the local population including better learning and training opportunities.	
	Family cohesion: levels of family contact, family support	0					0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Social cohesion: levels of community interaction & support, neighbourliness, opportunities for meaningful social contact, spiritual participation	2	+ ve	3	2	2	+24		The proposal will enhance opportunities for social cohesion which would have a positive impact on the health of local community.	
	Community safety: crime or fear of crime, actual or perceived personal & property safety	0					0			
	Access to affordable healthy food: quality, supermarkets, local shops	0					0			
	Housing: chance to live in decent affordable home	0					0			
	Discrimination	3	+ve	3	2	2	+ 36	Priority groups as mentioned in	The proposal will remove discriminate against individuals in the priority groups and will provide	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
								the report	them with opportunities to engage in healthy behaviour.	
2. Physical environment	Appearance of the area (real or perceived differences in characteristics)	0					0			
	Sites/locations which have significance in people's lives	1	+ve	3	2	2	+12		Based on the usage of the leisure facilities, it is evident that retaining these sites will have a significant positive impact on the health of local community.	
	Air quality (in buildings or externally) & pollution	2	-ve	2	2	2	-16		Only if the current sites are redeveloped with building work carrying out at the sites.	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? <i>Which groups?</i> Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Water quality & pollution	0					0			
	Built Environment: quality and/or use	0					0		Proposal will lead to redevelopment of the current sites. The new facilities will incorporate PH objectives focused on the health benefits of the users.	
	Land use: availability/ quality of open space & environmental amenity	0					0			
	Noise	2	-ve	2	1	2	- 16		Only if the current sites are redeveloped with building work carrying out at the sites.	
	Safety: accidental injuries, physical	0					0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
3. Lifestyle-related variables, & personal experiences	safety & security									
	Working conditions	1	+ve	3	1	2	+6		The proposal would improve the working condition of the employees and would have an indirect benefit on their health.	
	Transport: accessibility, mobility, accidents	0						0		
3. Lifestyle-related variables, & personal experiences	Diet & eating habits	0					0			
	Exercise & physical activity	3	+ve	3	2	2	+36		The option will provide the opportunities for participation into exercise and physical activity and will have a direct positive affect on the health and wellbeing of local population in all age	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
									groups.	
	Recreation: chances for leisure activities & experiences, leisure & cultural amenities	3	+ve	3	2	2	+36		The proposal will provide opportunities for recreation and leisure and will have a direct positive affect on the health of local population.	
	Substance abuse: tobacco, alcohol, drugs	1	+ve	3	1	1	+ 3		The proposal will provide individuals with opportunities to engage in healthy lifestyles and may have a indirect but positive health impact by discouraging substance misuse.	
	Risk-taking (sexual) behaviour	0					0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Individuals' feeling of control over their own lives, or ability to influence their lives & locality	2	+ ve	3	1	2	+ 12		The proposal will have a positive health impact by retaining facilities that can improve individual's health	
	Feelings of anxiety, fear or distress; stress at home/ work	3	+ ve	3	2	2	+ 36		Use of leisure facilities and exercise are linked with decreasing anxiety and stress. Hence the proposal will have a positive impact on the health of the population by removing stress and anxiety.	
4. Access to (location/ disabled access/ costs), quality & use of (changes in contacts with) services	Health care services	0					0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? <i>Which groups?</i> Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
services	Child care services	0					0			
	Social services	0					0			
	Voluntary services	0					0			
	Housing services	0					0			
	Leisure facilities	3	+ ve	3	2	2	+36		The proposal will retain the current leisure facilities (encouraging participation) and will have a positive health impact on the local population.	
	Adult education	0					0			
	Police	0					0			

Appendix X: Rapid appraisal of option 6 for its impact on the health of local population - SCORING

Option 5: Extension of current contract for another five years *(without adding PH objectives and without any further upgrading of the facilities)*

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? <i>Which groups?</i> Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
1.Social & economic environment	Employment: paid/ unpaid opportunities for individuals and/or communities	0					0		The proposal will not create any further employment opportunities for the local population which will not have any substantial health impact.	
	Income: creation & distribution of	0					0		The proposal will not have any affect on creating	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	income and/or wealth								income opportunities and will not have any substantial health impact.	
	Education & skills: lifelong learning & training opportunities, knowledge & skills held in the community	1	- ve	2	2	2	- 8		The proposal will retain the current arrangements but in the absence of PH objectives will not create any additional learning and training opportunities. This will have a small negative health impact.	
	Family cohesion: levels of family contact, family support	0						0		
	Social cohesion: levels of community interaction & support, neighbourliness, opportunities for meaningful social contact, spiritual	2	+ ve	3	2	2	+24		The proposal will retain current opportunities for social cohesion which would have a positive impact on the health of	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	participation								local community.	
	Community safety: crime or fear of crime, actual or perceived personal & property safety	0					0			
	Access to affordable healthy food: quality, supermarkets, local shops	0					0			
	Housing: chance to live in decent affordable home	0					0			
	Discrimination	2	+ ve	2	2	1	+ 8	Priority groups as mentioned in the report	The proposal is only extended for five years and though it will remove discriminate by providing facilities to those in the priority groups, the positive health impact is	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts	
									small.		
2. Physical environment	Appearance of the area (real or perceived differences in characteristics)	0					0				
	Sites/locations which have significance in people's lives	1	+ve	2	2	1	+ 8		Based on the usage of the leisure facilities, it is evident that retaining these sites will have a significant positive impact on the health of local community.		
	Air quality (in buildings or externally) & pollution	0						0			
	Water quality & pollution	0						0			
	Built Environment: quality and/or use	0						0			

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Land use: availability/ quality of open space & environmental amenity	0					0			
	Noise	0					0			
	Safety: accidental injuries, physical safety & security	0					0			
	Working conditions	0					0			
	Transport: accessibility, mobility, accidents	0					0			
3. Lifestyle-related variables, & personal experiences	Diet & eating habits	0					0			
	Exercise & physical activity	3	+ ve	3	2	2	+ 36		The option will provide the opportunities for participation into exercise and physical activity and will have a direct positive	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
									affect on the health and wellbeing of local population in all age groups.	
	Recreation: chances for leisure activities & experiences, leisure & cultural amenities	3	+ve	3	2	2	+ 36		The proposal will provide opportunities for recreation and leisure and will have a direct positive affect on the health of local population.	
	Substance abuse: tobacco, alcohol, drugs	1	+ve	3	1	1	+ 3		The proposal will provide individuals with opportunities to engage in healthy lifestyles and may have a indirect but positive health impact by discouraging substance misuse.	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
	Risk-taking (sexual) behaviour	0					0			
	Individuals' feeling of control over their own lives, or ability to influence their lives & locality	2	+ ve	2	1	1	+ 4		The proposal will have a positive health impact by retaining facilities that can improve individual's health. Though this impact is small as PH objectives would be absent and there will be no redevelopment of the sites.	
	Feelings of anxiety, fear or distress; stress at home/ work	2	+ ve	3	2	2	+ 24		Use of leisure facilities and exercise are linked with decreasing anxiety and stress. Hence the proposal will have a positive impact on the health of the population by removing stress and anxiety.	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
4. Access to (location/ disabled access/ costs), quality & use of (changes in contacts with) services	Health care services	0					0			
services	Child care services	0					0			
	Social services	0					0			
	Voluntary services	0					0			
	Housing services	0					0			
	Leisure facilities	3	+ ve	2	2	2	+ 24		The proposal will retain the current leisure facilities (encouraging participation) and will have a positive health impact on the local	

Determinants of health	Specific influences	Likelihood of impact on health? (a) 0=Not likely 1=Speculative 2=Probable 3=Definitive	If yes, will the impact be (+) or (-)?	Length of time people may be affected (b) 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long	No. of people affected (c) 1=Fewer 2=Many	Severity of impact (d) 1=Minor 2=Major	TOTAL (a) x (b) x (c) x (d) =Health Impact AND +ve / -ve	Differential exposure or susceptibility? Which groups? Yes/No/Unsure	Comments	Suggestions to enhance +ve and minimise -ve impacts
									population.	
	Adult education	0					0			
	Police	0					0			