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Triple-helix approach!

Policy
Practice
Science
A Dutch problem: can IA effectively address resident’s health concerns?

- Regulations for environment, those are assessed in EIA
- Resident engagement in EIA is minimal
- Many health issues, although important for residents, are overlooked in EIA
- Stand-alone HIA is not mandatory
- Experts and lay people do not understand each other well: conflict instead of consensus
An experiment: Vught

• Piloting a new way to engage residents AND other stakeholders in health impact scoping
• Will we get a more comprehensive view of health issues at stake?
• Will stakeholders reach consensus about these issues?
Meet Vught!

- 26,000 inhabitants
- Southern Netherlands
- Lively community!
• EIAs finalized
• Noise impact...
• Suggested solution: 26 km sound screens
→ problem solved?
WILLEN WE DIT?

www.samenvoorvught.nl

TOTAAL 600 TREINEN PER ETmaal
GEEN VEILIGHEID VOOR ONZE KINDEREN
EEN MUUR VAN 6 METER HOOG EN 26 KM LANG

WORD LID VAN SAMEN VOOR VUGHT!
Two scoping workshops

- Participants: residents, local organizations, municipality, province, national governmental body

- Part I: What is health? What is a healthy environment?
  → Development of a joint vision for Vught

- Part 2: how does this vision relate to the infrastructural plans?
The basics

• Positive health: assets! not just problems...
• Broad model of a healthy environment: the Egan wheel

We’re all experts!

Chatham House Rule
Vught vision: health is promoted by

- Trust, transparency and participation and intersectoral cooperation
- High quality, green, open living environment
- Accessibility and connectivity for all
- Cherishing local care institutes and Small & Medium Enterprises
- Safe transport routes and good disaster response system
Results:

• Broader inclusion of health issues
• Resident views acknowledged
• Advice to planners: railway cutting – plans adapted!
Evaluation

- Pre- and post workshop questionnaires
- Interviews
- Focus on consensus, based on theoretical framework (including social, personal, institutional factors)
- Analysis using Atlas.ti
Results: health views broadened

Health defining elements used by the number of participant on health definition

- Environmental interaction
- Free of disease and risk exposure
- Sense of wellbeing
- Others
- Autonomy
- Health is totality
- Health is subjective
- Physical condition
- Mental condition
- Social condition
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Results: perceived factors creating consensus

- The process: quality workshop, trusted facilitators, safe environment
- Information sharing (we are all experts)
- Trust and respect (Chatham House Rule), trust in the municipality
- Health as a common interest
Results: perceived factors hindering consensus

- Different mindsets
- Different interests
- Distrust (distrusting national actors)
- Process: group composition was changed and group was too small
Results: perceived consensus, yet disagreements persist underneath

All interviewees confirmed that consensus was (largely) attained!
Results: perceived consensus, yet disagreements persist underneath.

Elements indicated as agreed or disputed among the participants during the stakeholder gatherings by the number of participant on healthy living environment in Vught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Disagreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport and connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and built environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature and environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and commercial service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of participants indicated as agreed or disagreed.
Discussion

- Stakeholder engagement in 2 steps = effective way to address multiple health relevant issues
- Commitment to a joint vision

BUT:

- How ‘real’ is the consensus reached?
- How important is that?
- Respect and ‘agreeing to disagree’ as a valuable outcome?
Discussion

1. Barrier encountered: disturbed relation between residents and national stakeholders
2. Facilitator encountered: value-driven approach
3. Take a step back: Health as a connecting value!
4. Process is as important as procedures or solutions!
Questions please?

l.geelen@ggd-bureaugmv.nl
Lea.den.broeder@rivm.nl
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