

Understanding the impact of the residential built environment design on inhabitants' wellbeing

Hameda Janahi¹, and Shibu Raman², Gabriela Zapata-Lancaster³

¹Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom

²Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom

³Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT: An increasing body of evidence suggests that some of the contemporary forms of the physical environment have a negative influence on the wellbeing of its inhabitants. This paper presents a literature review on the impact of the built environment on the inhabitants' wellbeing in the residential context. The paper reviews recent literature from various interconnected fields such as psychology, physiology, and sociology in the built environment context. Previous research has shown that the characteristics of the built environment can influence all aspects of human life. The effect of the built environment on the physical and psychological wellbeing is extensively investigated. However, there is limited research on the relationship between the residential built environment and social wellbeing, as measured by social integration and cohesion which suggests the need for more exploration, particularly in the context of the Middle-East. The lack of understanding results in a disconnection between the local communities' socio-cultural needs and actual design and supply of housing.

The broader aim of this research is to identify indicators that evaluate wellbeing, dwellings, and neighborhoods. These indicators can be used by researchers, architects, urban planner and policymakers to study and design neighborhoods.

KEYWORDS: Wellbeing, Residential built environment, Indicators.

INTRODUCTION

Human beings spend a considerable amount of time in and around the built environment, and they form an essential aspect of an individuals' daily life consequently they act as an influence to the wellbeing of people (Brasche and Bischof 2005; Davies-Cooper, Burton, and Cooper 2014). Wellbeing broadly has been a focus for many countries; moreover, governments have invested in measuring and quantifying their nations' wellbeing. It is believed that the origin of this research interest traces back to ancient Greek philosophers. Like wellbeing, many other terminologies such as quality of life, life satisfaction, and happiness are found in the ancient philosopher's writings (Stoll and Laura 2014; Wadi and Furlan 2017). However, the literature shows an obvious overlap in meaning, indicators, and measures of these concepts. The relationship between housing and wellbeing is complex and multidimensional. Moreover, behavioral, biological, cultural, social, physical and political factors are variables that affect this relationship. Quality of life, happiness, life satisfaction, sustainability and wellbeing are some theories and concepts that study the relationship between physical environments and users. A review of previous methods and indicators used to measure and evaluate wellbeing and the quality of the residential built environment, organized to aid architects and planners to predict the impact of their designs on the wellbeing of users.

The paper begins with a brief background and describing the research gap. The next sections focus on definitions of wellbeing, introducing theories and concepts of wellbeing. Later, current research on built environment and wellbeing, in addition to methods of assessment is included in this paper.

1.0 DEFINITION OF WELLBEING

Wellbeing was developed throughout history in different phases; each was characterized by a different theme. Starting with Ancient Greece, philosophers described wellbeing as happiness and pleasure. Later, it was the Enlightenment era, philosophical happiness turned into scientific wellbeing that could be measured. During the next couple of centuries, the sociologists, psychologists, and political philosophers entered this research area. The subjective wellbeing measurement was improved later in the second half of the twentieth century (Stoll and Laura 2014).

The World Health Organization (WHO) identified wellbeing as "Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." Hartig and Lawrence (2003) agreed that health has several facets, involving personal characteristics, behavioural aspects, and socio-physical environment features. On the other hand, sociologists defined social wellbeing as a combination of five dimensions includes coherence, integration, actualization, contribution, and acceptance. Social cohesion and integration were discussed in an urban context (Keyes 2016). Keyes (2016) argues that social wellbeing

correlates with other indicators of life satisfaction, happiness, and dysphoria. However, residents describe community wellbeing as availability of attractive setting, social offering, and different cultures acceptance (Kruger 2011). Kostas (2017) believes that social wellbeing in the residential context can be influenced by the social capital, sense of community, neighbours ties, and the social interaction. His literature suggests that subjective wellbeing is affected by good relationship like having friends, spending time with family members, and marriages and romantic relationships.

2.0 THEORIES AND CONCEPTS OVERLAP

There have been numerous people interested in studying the built environment, users health and behaviour, and other issue caused by the manmade environments. Therefore, concepts like quality of life, quality of space, liveability, residential evaluation, satisfaction, and sustainability have emerged and usually are used as synonyms since their meanings overlap (Kamp et al. 2003). Furthermore, some of these terminologies are used to define each other. In this context, it is claimed that these notions are not original as anything can fit. The origin of these notions can be traced in multiple research studies into health, safety, wellbeing, residential satisfaction, and urban physical environment (Kamp et al. 2003). Kostas (2017) argue that these concepts come from subjective wellbeing perspectives including; hedonic, eudemonic, and life satisfaction. Moreover, his literature shows a confirmed distinction between different terms by many researchers as; hedonic wellbeing (psychological wellbeing), life satisfaction (prudential happiness), and eudemonic (perfectionist happiness).

3.0 Current research on the built environment and wellbeing

There are multiple dimensions for wellbeing in the built environment context: some have looked at social wellbeing and the built environment (Ellaway 2014; Brown and Lombard 2014; Miles, Coutts, and Mohamadi 2011; Allin 2014). Others looked at psychological wellbeing influenced by the built environment (R. Mitchell 2012; Evans 2003; R. J. Mitchell et al. 2015; White et al. 2013; Miles, Coutts, and Mohamadi 2011). While a large volume of research were found to focus on the health and the lifestyle association to the design of the built environment (Coombes, Jones, and Hillsdon 2010; Thompson Coon et al. 2011; Fraser and Lock 2011; Klepeis et al. 2001; Townshend 2014). The built environment relationship to wellbeing was explored on the national scale as well (R. J. Mitchell et al. 2015; Hartig and Lawrence 2003; Wiedmann, Salama, Ibrahim 2016).

The literature on wellbeing and the physical built environment can be narrowed down into two ways; category of wellbeing, and typology of the built environment. Yet, wellbeing perspectives overlap and influence each other (Helliwell and Putnam 2004), thus all types of wellbeing were considered in the initial phase of this research. As for the built environment, this research explore the residential context which includes the dwelling and the neighbourhood scales.




Figure 1: Illustration of wellbeing and built environment relation. Source: (Author 2018)

While studying wellbeing in the built environment, researchers defined their relation differently (Figure) It has been proven that buildings have an enormous influence on many aspects of peoples' wellbeing in direct and indirect ways (Evans 2003). Similarly, it is believed that there are two approaches to wellbeing; objective and subjective wellbeing (Western and Tomaszewski 2016). The direct impact of built environment affect the objective wellbeing of the inhabitants, for example the physical wellbeing is influenced by the toxic building materials (Lawrence, 2012). This kind of relation can be measured through the quality of life or actual physical wellbeing measurements as external, tangible indicators. On the other hand, the indirect influence of the built environment on the inhabitants impact their subjective wellbeing which includes two types of internal wellbeing. The first is long-term wellbeing which is functioning well (eudemonic wellbeing) to do with purposeful, meaning

in life and self-realization. The second is short-term wellbeing seen in feeling good (hedonic wellbeing)(Steemers 2015).

3.1 The dwelling scale of the residential built environment

The section on the dwelling will discuss research undertaken to study three types of wellbeing: social, physical, and psychological. The purpose of the work is to identify the connections between quality of dwelling and wellbeing found in the literature.

3.1.1. Social impact of the dwelling

In the social wellbeing research, Cooper (2014) proved that children's wellbeing is influenced by many aspects of the built environment such as density, lack of privacy, lack of green and play areas. Moreover, he assigned safety, availability of public areas, and the condition of house maintenance as major indicators of adults' social wellbeing. It is believed that different housing typologies have unlike effects on the inhabitants' wellbeing. Professor Burton (2014) explains that the local characteristics of buildings and neighbourhood better assist wellbeing as they increase the sense of belonging and attachment, especially in children. It has been found that apartment buildings reduce social networking, which accordingly results in more loneliness for women as well as restricting children from playing outside the residential unit (Evans 2003). Further studies have identified spatial arrangement as a variable which can influence the inhabitants' wellbeing. Professor Elizabeth believes that the gradual transition between public and private through buffer zones helps to maintain the privacy of the household and reflect on the wellbeing of people. Additionally, the house's capacity to control the space of contact with others sustains a positive social psychological process (Lawrence 2012). As some behaviours require privacy, controlling the interaction between the people inside and outside the house is essential. Failing to do this may influence the psychological and social wellbeing of the inhabitants (Hartig and Lawrence 2003). Another issue while studying spatial arrangement and wellbeing is overcrowding. This influences social wellbeing since it increases the tension between adults and children (Cooper 2014).

3.1.2. Physiological impact of the dwelling

As for the research on physiological wellbeing, it has been found that high population density increase the chance of infection which influences pregnant women and the unborn children (Cooper 2014). Due to design problems and peoples' behaviour, wellbeing and health states of inhabitants is affected. Smoke from tobacco or wood-fire for heating or cooking, emissions from gas, and exposure to pollutants have very harmful effects on the health (Lawrence 2012 ; Hartig & Lawrence 2003 ; Cooper 2014). A significant volume of research evidences the influence of noise, light levels, access to natural views, air quality, and crowded spaces on the physical and psychological wellbeing of adults (Coombes, Jones, and Hillsdon 2010; Thompson Coon et al. 2011; Fuller et al. 1993a). Cooper (2014) investigated seniors' wellbeing in the built environment and found that the sleep patterns and agitation are influenced by the ability to see nature , as well as noise and light levels. In another dimension, maintenance is one of the most significant issues when looking into physical conditions of the house. It has been proved by Lawrence (2012) that mould growing in the house poses risks to the inhabitants' health. It can cause many problems such as asthma, chronic bronchitis, nasal allergies, and eczema. Maintenance include sewage and solid waste disposal as it can cause infectious diseases (Lawrence, 2012). Another danger on occupants' wellbeing is the safety of the physical conditions of the house. In the European region, more deaths are recorded from accidents inside or around the house than on the roads.

3.1.3. Psychological impacts of the dwelling

Evan (2003) claims that some genetic features make some people more likely to be affected mentally by the built environment. Also, he argued that high-rise housing units negatively impact the mental health of both housewives and children. Crowding - the number of people per room - in the home reduces privacy which results in psychological distress which is more common in some demographic groups like young women (Cooper 2014). Others argue that crowding affects people psychologically which consequently results in physical health problems (Fuller et al. 1993b). The indoor environmental quality is another concern for many researchers. Air quality, for example, is essential for good health, and it is associated with toxic building materials, heating or cooking. Cooper (2014) related psychological distress to air pollution, and the rates increase among people who have adverse life events. Noise prevents inhabitants from using their houses as an emotional retreat: if they suffer from noise, they will spend their leisure time outside the house (Hartig & Lawrence, 2003). Even more- ten percent of adults in Europe suffer from chronic sleep disturbance and need treatment (Lawrence, 2012). Although different age groups respond to lighting levels differently, poor daylight in the house causes poor mental health for the human being (Lawrence, 2012). Beside this, learning in early life can be affected by light quality and quantity (Cooper, 2014).

3.2 Neighbourhood scale of the residential built environment

3.2.1. Social impact of the neighbourhood

The larger context of housing is the city and urban planning impacts on how well the people are. It is advised to integrate different public gathering spaces into the street fabric; it could be parks, squares or public buildings. It has been found that such places impact different aspects of social wellbeing of various age groups (Brown and Lombard 2014; Cooper 2014; Qawasmeh 2014). Independence and accessibility of the neighbourhood are crucial specially for seniors' social wellbeing (Oswald et al. 2007). Ismail (1993 p 582) concluded in his socio-anthropological research that the change in the urban form of the neighbourhoods in Doha has resulted in a superficial and shallow relationship between inhabitants. Relationships of interest, and caution replace relations of affection, trust, and social solidarity. Furlan (2016) concluded that modern planning in Doha's built environment had neglected the liveability aspect. Bertha (2011) investigated the effect of the social network in neighborhoods on the wellbeing. The findings confirmed that living near to extended family members or with an ethnic group helped in reducing stress, encouraged people to interact, avoided isolation and loneliness. Although the research did not quantify proximity, people in this circumstances reported receiving emotional support, material support, household maintenance, and child welfare (Ochieng 2011). Judith (2013) proofed that by having good social life, mental wellbeing is improved consequently. Schoolers debated neighborhoods density. However in the western context, higher densities seems to be best for social interaction, personal relationships, widen the network and enable frequent socializing which considered as social support components (Mouratidis 2017; Montford 2013) Judith (2013) suggest that some characteristics in the building scale increase the interaction between neighbors such as the spatial arrangement, function and physical distance, multi-user and multi-purpose spaces.

3.2.3. Physical impact of the neighbourhood

No one can deny that walking in the neighbourhood promotes social as well as physical wellbeing. Researchers claim that a good mixture of uses within walkable distance promotes physical activity (Handy et al. 2002; Cooper 2014). It has been noticed that some design features of the neighbourhood may influence people's activity routines such as distances to destinations, direct routes, sidewalk situation, and availability of attractions along the roads (Townshend 2014). The design and location of facilities such as shops, leisure facilities, and residential areas impact not only peoples' general wellbeing or physical behaviours, but also diet and health (Cooper, 2014). A robust body of evidence supports the positive relationship between health, physical activity and, sequentially, the built environment. Research shows that insufficient physical activity causes death (1 in 6 deaths) and long-term diseases which increases the cost on the government (Lee et al. 2017). Research reported a positive relationship between the amount, **proximity**, of natural environment around the house and physical activities (Fraser and Lock 2011; Coombes, Jones, and Hillsdon 2010; Thompson Coon et al. 2011; Saeed and Furlan 2017).

3.2.4. Psychological impact of the neighbourhood

Alternatively, psychological wellbeing is linked to the design of the neighbourhood. Numerous surveys support better mental health as a result of exposure to greenery. The results vary according to socio-economic status, age, and gender (White et al. 2013). Further research was conducted to study the quantity and quality of the urban parks and its effect to the mental health of residence (Mitchell 2013; McEachan et al. 2016; Van Dillen et al. 2012; Cooper, 2014). As for the density, it was proved that higher housing density reduces depression symptoms among inhabitants. However, this result is not the same when the ratio of car usage to the land area increases, as noise exposure effect mental wellbeing (Miles et al. 2011).

4.0 Methods of assessing wellbeing and the built environment

4.1. Built environment assessment

To assess housing **quality** Hartig and Lawrence (2003) suggested mapping different layers that influence wellbeing. Measurements can be structured as: physical features of the house, location of the housing, landscape features and other land uses, distance to services, support for social contact, access to the house etc. To measure design or construction of the house and its impact on the health of residents, Hartig and Lawrence (2003) advise following the housing standards that describe the minimum qualities of the home required to satisfy physical and psychological wellbeing. Other researchers used computational tools to do the assessment of the built environment such as space syntax (Al-Jokhadar and Jabi 2017). Table 1 show indicators and tools used to assess the built environment.

Table 1: Built environment indicators used in previous research. Source: (Author 2018)

Physical environment factor	Indicators	Assessment of the evidence	Source
Hierarchy of spaces	Spatial arrangement	AGraph	(Al-Jokhadar and Jabi 2017)
Social interaction	Spatial arrangement, Amount of living spaces	AGraph , VGA	
Visual privacy	Spatial arrangement	Syntax2D, VGA	
View to the exterior	Openings location	VGA	
Greenery	Quality and quantity of greenery	GIS analysis: greenery per dwelling. Quantity and quality of greenery was assessed by observations.	(van Dillen et al. 2011)
Natural environment	Type of environment: natural, other type of environments.	Estimate the proportion of land cover in a respondent's area of residence that is green space.	(Mitchell 2012)
Green urban areas	Percentage of LSOA land cover	Data were derived from the Generalised Land Use Database	(White et al. 2013)
Common areas	Interaction in green areas	Site observation and analysis In-depth interviews	(Saeed and Furlan 2017)
Quality of Urban Life	residents' perception of the physical environment, the social and perceptual factor	Site visits, observation Walk through assessments In-depth interviews with residents	(Wadi and Furlan 2017)
Quality of Urban Life	Residents real interaction and relationship with their living built environment	Interaction and urban activity Residential satisfaction and attachment	(Qawasmeh 2014)
Crowding	Subjective housing quality measures Objective crowding measures	Interviews Satisfaction surveys	(Fuller et al. 1993b)(Qawasmeh 2014)(Qawasmeh 2014)(Qawasmeh 2014)
Housing density	Data were provided by the ABS	Dwelling density per hectare	(Badland et al. 2017)
Housing quality	Structural quality, clutter and cleanliness, hazards, indoor climate, and privacy/crowding	Walk-through rating	(Rollings et al. 2017; Poortinga et al. 2017)

4.2. Wellbeing assessment

Modern governments and policymakers were interested in wellbeing. The level of happiness of countries are evaluated by the United Nations (UN) using six different indicators; freedom, generosity, health, social support, income and trustworthy governance (Helliwell, Layard, and Sachs 2017). Some research was found to use the gross domestic product (GDP) as an indicator of happiness and wellbeing of people. Paul argues that the GDP is a less reliable indicator since it gives a partial picture of social progress, quality of life, and the environment states. Growth matters but we cannot ignore other factors such as our families, relationships, and community in which we live. The social indicators movement was initiated against one-sided focus on economic security (Kamp et al. 2003). Table 2 show methods used to assess different types of wellbeing.

Table 2: Indicators of wellbeing used in previous research. Source: (Author 2018)

Wellbeing perspective	Indicators	Assessment method	Source
Social	Social interaction	Content analysis, site observations, walking tour assessments	(Eissa et al. 2015)
Social	Affordable housing, density, and tenure.	Review urban planning documents Neighbourhood spatial measures. VicHealth Indicators Survey Survey community satisfaction	(Badland et al. 2017)
General health	General health.	Self-reported health questionnaire (N.1641), Short-Form 36, (MHI-5).	(van Dillen et al. 2011)
Mental	General mental health status Internal environment control Design, maintenance, noise, density and escape	Postal survey: SF36 subscales for mental health (MH) and vitality (V).	(Guite, Clark, and Ackrill 2006)

Mental	Urban form : housing density, green spaces, density of auto commuters	Validated measure of depressive symptoms	(Miles, Coutts, and Mohamadi 2011)
Mental	Social environment		
Mental	Environments grouped as natural or non-natural	General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) Warwick Edinburgh Mental health and Wellbeing Score (WEMWBS)	(R. Mitchell 2012)
Mental	Distance to urban green spaces	Short-form, 12-item GHQ	(White et al. 2013)
Mental	Neighbourhood characteristics or services	Global life satisfaction survey	
		WHO-5 scale	(R. J. Mitchell et al. 2015)
		Interviews	
		2012 European Quality of Life Survey (EQOLS)	
Psychological	Household crowding	Survey on depression and anxiety	(Fuller et al. 1993b)
Psychological	Dwelling quality	Rutter Child Behaviour Questionnaire	(Rollings et al. 2017)
	Neighborhood quality and stability	Youth and Adult Self Report Scales	

CONCLUSION

It is not surprising that wellbeing research is getting more attention, as many of the residential built environments are prototyped and pre-fabricated, yet norms and cultures are marginalized. This literature review shows some dimensions of residential built environment impact on inhabitants' wellbeing. Furthermore, it forms a starting point for future investigation in this subject. The paper attempt to clarify briefly and distinguish overlapped terminologies used in wellbeing and built environment research. The lack of knowledge in this matter has resulted in miss-use and mixture of parameters. It is important to clarify these terms by comparing their definitions and their measures. It has been noticed that some of the objective wellbeing indicators like the quality of life are influencing the subjective wellbeing dimensions. This paper shows a great need for expansion of exploration on the impact of residential built environment on inhabitants' wellbeing beyond the Western region.

REFERENCE

- Al-Jokhadar, Amer, and Wassim Jabi. 2017. "Qualitative Representation and Spatial Reasoning in a Rule-Based Computational Design Model." eCAADe Education and Research in Computer Aided Architectural Design in Europe, Brussels and the Welsh School of Architecture, Cardiff University, Wales, United Kingdom.
- Allin, Paul. 2014. *Measuring Wellbeing in Modern Societies. Wellbeing. Vol. III.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell035>.
- Badland, Hannah, Sarah Foster, Rebecca Bentley, Carl Higgs, Rebecca Roberts, Christopher Pettit, and Billie Giles-Corti. 2017. "Examining Associations between Area-Level Spatial Measures of Housing with Selected Health and Wellbeing Behaviours and Outcomes in an Urban Context." *Health and Place* 43 (June 2016). Elsevier:17–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2016.11.003>.
- Brasche, Sabine, and Wolfgang Bischof. 2005. "Daily Time Spent Indoors in German Homes - Baseline Data for the Assessment of Indoor Exposure of German Occupants." *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* 208 (4):247–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2005.03.003>.
- Brown, Scott C, and Joanna Lombard. 2014. "Neighborhoods and Social Interaction." In *Wellbeing*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell059>.
- Burton, Elizabeth. 2014. *The Pursuit of Happiness*. <https://youtu.be/SzyPsg0RoyU>.
- Coombes, Emma, Andrew P. Jones, and Melvyn Hillsdon. 2010. "The Relationship of Physical Activity and Overweight to Objectively Measured Green Space Accessibility and Use." *Social Science and Medicine* 70 (6):816–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.11.020>.
- Cooper, Rachel. 2014. "Wellbeing and the Environment." In *Wellbeing*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell055>.
- Davies-Cooper, Rachel, Elizabeth Burton, and Cary L Cooper. 2014. *Wellbeing : A Complete Reference Guide. Volume II, Wellbeing and the Environment. Wellbeing and the Environment*. Chichester : Wiley-Blackwell.
- Dillen, Sonja M E van, Sjerp de Vries, Peter P Groenewegen, and Peter Spreeuwenberg. 2011. "Greenspace in Urban Neighbourhoods and Residents' Health: Adding Quality to Quantity." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 66 (6):e8–e8. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2009.104695>.
- Eissa, Bassma, Rana Awwad, Reem Awwad, and Raffaello Furlan. 2015. "Neighborhoods and Social Interactions : The Case of Al-Najada Area in Doha" 5 (4):119–33. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.sociology.20150504.03>.
- Ellaway, Anne. 2014. "The Impact of the Local Social and Physical Local Environment on Wellbeing." In *Wellbeing*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell057>.

- Evans, Dr Gary W. 2003. "The Built Environment and Mental Health." *Journal of Urban Health* 80 (4):536–55. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jurban/jtg063>.
- Fraser, Simon D.S., and Karen Lock. 2011. "Cycling for Transport and Public Health: A Systematic Review of the Effect of the Environment on Cycling." *European Journal of Public Health* 21 (6):738–43. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckq145>.
- Fuller, Theodore D, John N Edwards, Santhat Sermsri, and Sairudee Vorakitphokatorn. 1993a. "Housing , Stress , and Physical Evidence" 36 (li):1417–28.
- . 1993b. "HOUSING , STRESS , AND PHYSICAL EVIDENCE" 36 (li):1417–28.
- Guite, H. F., C. Clark, and G. Ackrill. 2006. "The Impact of the Physical and Urban Environment on Mental Well-Being." *Public Health* 120 (12):1117–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2006.10.005>.
- Handy, Susan L., Marlon G. Boarnet, Reid Ewing, and Richard E. Killingsworth. 2002. "How the Built Environment Affects Physical Activity: Views from Urban Planning." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 23 (2 SUPPL. 1):64–73. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797\(02\)00475-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(02)00475-0).
- Hartig, Terry, and Roderick Lawrence. 2003. "The Residential Context of Health." *Journal of Social Issues* 59 (3):455–73. [papers2://publication/uuid/EDDB0560-D3ED-4AE1-9F31-FDD0EB643471](https://doi.org/10.1023/a:102311111111111111).
- Helliwell, John F, Richard Layard, and Jeffrey D Sachs. 2017. "World Happiness Report Executive Summary." *New Directions for Youth Development*, no. 120:7–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.282>.
- Helliwell, John F, and Robert D Putnam. 2004. "The Social Context of Well-Being." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 359 (1449):1435 LP-1446. <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/359/1449/1435.abstract>.
- Ismail, Farouk. others. 1993. *Social Map of the City of Doha: A Socioanthropological Study*. Doha: University of Qatar, Center for Documentation and Humanities.
- Kamp, Irene Van, Kees Leidelmeijer, Gooitske Marsman, and Augustinus Hollander. 2003. "Urban Environmental Quality and Human Well-Being Towards a Conceptual Framework and Demarcation of Concepts ; a Literature Study." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 65:5–18.
- Keyes, Corey L E M. 2016. "Social Well-Being" 61 (2):121–40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1991.tb02674.x>.
- Klepeis, N., W. C. Nelson, W. R. OTT, J. P. ROBINSON, A. M. TSANG, P. SWITZER, J. V. BEHAR, S. C. HERN, and H ENGELMANN, W. 2001. "National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): Use of Nationwide Activity Data for Human Exposure Assessment The National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): A Resource for Assessing Exposure to Environmental Pollutants," no. July.
- Lawrence, R. 2012. *Health and Housing. International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*. Vol. 2. Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-047163-1.00544-0>.
- Miles, Rebecca, Christopher Coutts, and Asal Mohamadi. 2011. "Neighborhood Urban Form, Social Environment, and Depression." *Journal of Urban Health* 89 (1):1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-011-9621-2>.
- Mitchell, Richard. 2012. "Is Physical Activity in Natural Environments Better for Mental Health than Physical Activity in Other Environments?" *Social Science & Medicine* 91. Elsevier Ltd:130–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.04.012>.
- Mitchell, Richard J., Elizabeth A. Richardson, Niamh K. Shortt, and Jamie R. Pearce. 2015. "Neighborhood Environments and Socioeconomic Inequalities in Mental Well-Being." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 49 (1). Elsevier:80–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2015.01.017>.
- Montford, Judith E. 2013. "Mental Wellbeing and the Built Environment."
- Mouratidis, Kostas. 2017. "Built Environment and Social Well-Being: How Does Urban Form Affect Social Life and Personal Relationships?" *Cities* 74 (October 2017). Elsevier:7–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2017.10.020>.
- Ochieng, Bertha M N. 2011. "The Effect of Kin, Social Network and Neighbourhood Support on Individual Well-Being." *Health and Social Care in the Community* 19 (4):429–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2524.2011.00992.x>.
- Oswald, F. H.-W. Wahl, O Schilling, C Nygren, A Fänge, A Sixsmith, J Sixsmith, Z Széman, S Tomsone, and S Iwarsson. 2007. "Relationship between Housing and Healthy Aging in Very Old Age." *The Gerontologist* 47 (1):96–107. <http://gerontologist.oxfordjournals.org/>.
- Poortinga, Wouter, Tatiana Calve, Nikki Jones, Simon Lannon, Tabitha Rees, Sarah E. Rodgers, Ronan A. Lyons, and Rhodri Johnson. 2017. "Neighborhood Quality and Attachment: Validation of the Revised Residential Environment Assessment Tool." *Environment and Behavior* 49 (3):255–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916516634403>.
- Qawasmeh, R. 2014. "Identification of the Quality of Urban Life Assessment Aspects in Residential Neighbourhoods in Doha" 191:391–402. <https://doi.org/10.2495/SC140331>.
- Rollings, Kimberly A., Nancy M. Wells, Gary W. Evans, Amanda Bednarz, and Yizhao Yang. 2017. "Housing and Neighborhood Physical Quality: Children's Mental Health and Motivation." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 50. Elsevier Ltd:17–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.01.004>.
- Saeed, Mahmoud H Al, and Raffaello Furlan. 2017. "Strategies for the Enhancement of Users ' Interactions

- in Al Mirqab Al Jadeed Street in Doha , State of Qatar” 7 (3):69–83.
<https://doi.org/10.5923/j.arch.20170703.02>.
- Steemers, Koen. 2015. *Architecture for Wellbeing and Health*.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6CdiA5tLk-M>.
- Stoll, Laura, and Laura. 2014. “A Short History of Wellbeing Research.” *Wellbeing* 5 (1):1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.WBWELL098>.
- Thompson Coon, J, K Boddy, K Stein, R Whear, J Barton, and M H Depledge. 2011. “Does Participating in Physical Activity in Outdoor Natural Environments Have a Greater Effect on Physical and Mental Wellbeing than Physical Activity Outdoors? A Systemic Review.” *Environmental Science and Technology* 45:1761–72. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es102947t>.
- Townshend, Tim G. 2014. “Walkable Neighborhoods.” In *Wellbeing*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell063>.
- Wadi, Rana, and Raffaello Furlan. 2017. “The Quality of Urban Life (QOUL) of New-Salata ’ s Neighborhood in Qatar.” *American Journal of Sociological Resea* 7 (1):14–22.
<https://doi.org/10.5923/j.sociology.20170701.03>.
- Western, Mark, and Wojtek Tomaszewski. 2016. “Subjective Wellbeing, Objective Wellbeing and Inequality in Australia.” *PLoS ONE* 11 (10):1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0163345>.
- White, Mathew P., Ian Alcock, Benedict W. Wheeler, and Michael H. Depledge. 2013. “Would You Be Happier Living in a Greener Urban Area? A Fixed-Effects Analysis of Panel Data.” *Psychological Science* 24 (6):920–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612464659>.
- Wiedmann, Salama, Ibrahim, Hatem. 2016. “The Impact of Affordable Housing Developments on Sustainability in Gulf Cities.” *Open House International*. 41 (4). Eindhoven, the Netherlands : Stichting Architecten Research:31–38.