THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Variation in experiences of nature across gradients of tree cover in compact and sprawling cities

Citation for published version:
Shanahan, DF, Cox, DTC, Fuller, RA, Hancock, S, Lin, BB, Anderson, K, Bush, R & Gaston, KJ 2017, 'Variation in experiences of nature across gradients of tree cover in compact and sprawling cities' Landscape and Urban Planning, vol. 157, pp. 231-238. DOI: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.07.004

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):
10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.07.004

Link:
Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:
Landscape and Urban Planning

Landscape and Urban Planning 157 (2017) 231–238

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Landscape and Urban Planning

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/landurbplan

Variation in experiences of nature across gradients of tree cover in compact and sprawling cities

D.F. Shanahan[a,1], D.T.C. Cox[b,*,1], R.A. Fuller[a], S. Hancock[b], B.B. Lin[d], K. Anderson[b], R. Bush[c], K.J. Gaston[b]

[a] School of Biological Sciences, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Brisbane 4072, Australia
[b] Environment & Sustainability Institute, University of Exeter, Penryn, Cornwall TR10 9EZ, UK
[c] School of Public Health, University of Queensland, Herston, Brisbane 4006, Australia
[d] CSIRO Land & Water Flagship, PMB 1, 107-121 Station Street, Aspendale, Victoria 3195, Australia

HIGHLIGHTS

- We examine how nature experiences and attitudes vary with neighbourhood tree cover.
- Public and private green space use was higher in greener neighbourhoods.
- City resident's orientation towards nature was higher in greener neighbourhoods.
- We found highly similar patterns for both sprawling and compact city designs.
- Maintaining nature close to home is vital for providing daily experiences of nature.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 1 February 2016
Received in revised form 31 May 2016
Accepted 1 July 2016
Available online 27 July 2016

Keywords:
Connection to nature
Extinction of experience
Green spaces
Human well-being
Nature relatedness
Urban ecology

ABSTRACT

Urban environments are expanding globally, and by 2050 nearly 70% of the world's population will live in towns and cities, where opportunities to experience nature are more limited than in rural areas. This transition could have important implications for health and wellbeing given the diversity of benefits that nature delivers. Despite these issues, there is a lack of information on whether or how the experience of nature changes as green space becomes less available. We explore this question for residents of two case study cities of varying urban designs, sprawling (Brisbane, Australia) and compact (three English towns, U.K). Second, we examine how people's feelings of connection to nature (measured using the Nature Relatedness scale) vary across this same gradient of nature availability. Despite climatic and cultural differences we found substantial similarities between the two locations. Lower levels of neighbourhood tree cover were associated with a reduced frequency of visits to private and public green spaces, and a similar pattern was found for the duration of time spent in private and public green spaces for Brisbane. Residents of both urban areas showed similar levels of nature relatedness, and there was a weak but positive association between tree cover and Nature Relatedness. These results suggest that regardless of the style of urban design, maintaining the availability of nature close to home is a critical step to protect people's experiences of nature and their desire to seek out those experiences.

1. Introduction

With nearly 70% of the global population predicted to live in cities by 2050 (United Nations, 2014), there is growing concern that urbanisation is driving a broad-scale 'extinction of experience' with the natural world, ultimately resulting in a disconnection between people and nature (Miller, 2005; Pyle, 1978; Soga & Gaston, 2016). This trend is particularly important given the growing body of evidence demonstrating the link between interactions with nature and positive physical, psychological and social wellbeing outcomes (Hartig, Mitchell, de Vries, & Frumkin, 2014; Keniger, Gaston, Irvine, & Fuller, 2013; Shanahan, Lin, Bush et al., 2015). The extinction of experience has two fundamental components; a physical decline in the quantity or quality of nature in cities (i.e. the 'intensity' of nature experiences; Shanahan, Fuller, Bush, Lin, & Gaston, 2015a), and changes in human behaviour associated with urban life-styles

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: danielleshanahan@gmail.com (D.F. Shanahan), dan.t.cox@googlemail.com (D.T.C. Cox), r.fuller@uq.edu.au (R.A. Fuller), stevenhanock@gmail.com (S. Hancock), brenda.lin@csiro.au (B.B. Lin), karen.anderson@exeter.ac.uk (K. Anderson), cphcrobert@gmail.com (R. Bush), k.j.Gaston@exeter.ac.uk (K.J. Gaston).
[1] Joint first authorship, contributed the same amount.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.07.004

(including reduced frequency and duration of nature experiences; Lin, Fuller, Bush, Gaston, & Shanahan, 2014; Miller, 2005; Shanahan, Fuller et al., 2015).

The physical impact of urbanisation on biodiversity has received considerable attention from urban ecologists, with studies documenting significant variation in species richness and abundance across different urban forms, but with a general decrease relative to natural habitat (e.g. Catterall, 2009; McKinney, 2002). Furthermore, whether a city has a sprawling or compact design is also known to influence the availability of nature around people's homes (Soga, Yamaura, Koike, & Gaston, 2014), as sprawling designs generally ensure ready access to relatively large private gardens, while in contrast compact city designs can reduce wider biodiversity loss and deliver greater accessibility to public green spaces (Sushinsky, Rhodes, Possingham, Gill, & Fuller, 2013). However, few studies have explored the behavioural component of the extinction of experience of nature; specifically, how does the frequency or duration of experiences with nature vary with variation in availability of nature? Does this differ for cities with sprawling and compact designs?

The behavioural component of the extinction of experience of nature is likely to be driven by many complex and interacting factors. For example, urban residents spend greater periods of time indoors or engaged in recreational activities that are not nature-based (Juster, Ono, & Stafford, 2004; Sigman, 2012). Furthermore, variation in the availability of nature within cities could conceivably affect people's ability and inclination to engage with it. For example, people may more actively seek out nature (both within public and private spaces) as it becomes less available in their day-to-day living environment, perhaps motivated by the potential wellbeing benefits (Home, Hunziker, & Bauer, 2012). However, other research suggests that patterns of green space use simply reflect its availability (Gong, Gallacher, Palmer, & Fone, 2014; Kaczynski et al., 2014), with some influence of interacting factors such as gender, age or socio-economic advantage (Jones, Hillsdon, & Coombes, 2009; McCormack, Rock, Toohey, & Hignell, 2010). As such, characteristics of urban form, such as whether a city is sprawling or compact could influence nature interactions (Gaston, Warren, Thompson, & Smith, 2005; Lin et al., in preparation). Exploration of these potential patterns warrants considerable attention. Whether or not people alter their behaviour to compensate for a lower availability of nature in their living environment will have important implications for how cities are designed to accommodate the rapidly growing urban population.

Ultimately, variation in exposure to nature may not only affect urban residents' wellbeing, but also their attitudes and behaviours towards nature itself (Miller, 2005; Pyle, 1978; Soga & Gaston, 2016). There is some evidence, for example, that experiences with nature as a child correlate with environmental activism or environmental career pathways in adult life (e.g. Wells & Lekies, 2006), and wilderness experiences appear to influence a person's world-view (Kaplan & Kaplan, 1989). This has potential implications for the support of nature conservation by urban residents (Miller, 2005; Pyle, 1978); how can people value what they do not experience or understand? However, a key unresolved issue is whether the availability of nature in the local environment is associated with people's orientation towards nature.

This study explores whether the availability of nature is related to nature experience and orientation towards nature for urban residents. Specifically, we first examine the association between urban residents' frequency and duration of nature interactions across a gradient of percentage neighbourhood tree cover. Second, we scrutinise whether people's levels of connection to nature (measured using the Nature Relatedness scale) vary across that same gradient. We address these questions for two case-study locations of contrasting urban design; specifically Brisbane, Australia, with sprawling urban development around a central business district, and the 'Cranfield Triangle', U.K., which is a cluster of three compact urban centres.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study locations

This study was undertaken in Brisbane, Australia (27°27′S 153°01′E, population 1.1 million people), and the Cranfield Triangle, United Kingdom (52°07′N, 0°61′W, Milton Keynes, Luton and Bedford, population c.524 000 people; Fig. 1). Brisbane is a subtropical sprawling city with considerable amounts of public green space distributed rather evenly both spatially and socio-economically (Shanahan, Lin, Gaston, Bush, & Fuller, 2014), and a population density of approximately 1200 people per km^2. The urban centres of the Cranfield Triangle are located in a temperate region with compact urban form and a denser population (around 3100 people per km^2), surrounded by open countryside. There are climatic differences between the locations; in the survey period the Cranfield Triangle had a maximum temperature of 18.7 °C and minimum 9.0 °C with 39.6 mm rainfall, and the Brisbane maximum was 34.4 °C, minimum 14.1 °C, with 116.8 mm rainfall (Bureau of Meteorology, 2015). Properties in the Cranfield Triangle have a lower average residential plot size (278 m^2 vs 769 m^2 in Brisbane). Both locations are primarily English speaking, but there are likely to be a range of cultural differences between the sites.

2.2. Population surveys

We conducted an urban lifestyle survey during late spring on 1538 respondents in Brisbane and 519 respondents in the Cranfield Triangle (Brisbane, November 2012; Cranfield Triangle, May 2014), approximately 0.1% of the population for both locations. The survey was delivered online over a two-week period through market research companies (Brisbane, Q&A Market Research Ltd.; UK, Shape the Future Ltd.) to a subset of adults (18 years +) enrolled in their survey databases. We collected several socio-demographic and personal circumstance variables that could influence exposure to nature including age, gender, the primary language spoken at home (an indicator of ethnicity), personal annual income and highest formal qualification (Table S1 shows the classifications within these groups for analysis purposes, and Appendix B in Suppementary material includes the full survey). The demographic and socio-economic survey group was comparable for the two locations (Table S2). Participants were requested to provide their address, or their approximate address if they preferred for privacy reasons.

Survey respondents provided a measure of their orientation to nature using the Nature Relatedness scale (Nisbet, Zelenski, & Murphy, 2009). The scale has been shown to correlate with environmental attitudes, and also differentiates between groups of nature enthusiasts and those who do not engage in nature experiences (Nisbet et al., 2009). Respondents rated a set of 21 statements using a five-point Likert scale ranging from one (disagree strongly) to five (agree strongly), and these responses were aggregated according to Nisbet et al. (2009). Collectively the components of the scale measure the affective, cognitive, and experiential relationship with the natural world, with a higher score indicating a stronger orientation towards nature. We also separated the nature relatedness scale into three established components (Nisbet et al., 2009): NR-Self, which can be thought of as the ecological self, or how strongly people identify with the natural environment; NR-Perspective, which is an indication of how a person's personal relationship with the environment is manifested through attitude and behaviour; and



Fig. 1. The study locations in Australia and the UK, showing percentage tree cover ≥2 m and average tree height across each urban centre within 500 m × 500 m grid cells. The area surveyed within Brisbane was 936 km^2 in Brisbane and 166 km^2 in the Cranfield Triangle. The canopy cover was 49.9% in Brisbane (average height 17.9 m) and 26.7% in the Cranfield Triangle (average height 5.9 m).

NR-Experience, which reflects the physical familiarity and attraction people have to nature.

2.3. Nature dose frequency and duration

For each respondent we generated two measures of nature dose (frequency and duration) for both private gardens and public green spaces, two settings in which experiences with nature are common. Frequency was estimated based on the respondent's self-reported usual frequency of use of their private garden or of visits to public green spaces, and duration was estimated based on self-reported total time spent within each location during the week of the survey. Given the more frequent use of private gardens indicated from preliminary survey outcomes, more categories were used at the finer time scale (Table S3 provides details on the categories that could be selected for both public and private spaces). For all duration measures, the mid-points of the selected categories for all public green space visits were summed (where 4 or more hours were treated as '4'). All four measures of nature dose were treated as ordinal.

2.4. Nature dose intensity

We used tree cover equal to or that exceeding 2 m in height as a measure of the availability of nature (or nature intensity) around the home. We measured neighbourhood tree cover within a 250 m buffer around each respondent's address location, approximately reflecting the viewscape from, and the area immediately adjacent to, people's homes. Trees are a highly visible component of nature, and are found throughout the urban matrix at both locations. The presence of trees also provides a reasonable indicator of many other aspects of biodiversity (e.g. birds, Sandström, Angelstam, & Mikusinski, 2006), and as tree cover increases several studies have recorded increases in well-being as shown by a reduction of stress and asthma, and increased feelings of psychological restoration (Dallimer et al., 2012; Fuller, Irvine, Devine-Wright, Warren, & Gaston, 2007; Jiang, Dongying, Larson, & Sullican, 2016; Lovasi, Quinn, Neckerman, Perzanowski, & Rundle, 2008). The tree cover maps used here were derived from airborne Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data for both regions, alongside Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) for the U.K.; full details of their development are provided in the Supplementary material (Appendix A; Armston, Denham, Danaher, Scarth, & Moffiet, 2009). We restricted the analysis to the core populated areas of the Brisbane City Council area (i.e. excluding outlying islands and large nature reserves), and for the Cranfield Triangle the extent of the towns was estimated using the vector layer of Edina Digimap (2015), Ordnance Survey MasterMap Topography Layer (Updated



Fig. 2. The percentage of respondents using different green space types within Brisbane (a sprawling city) and the Cranfield Triangle (comprising three compact towns).

Jan 2015) to develop a polygon for each town that surrounded all the residential and commercial land plots. We finally generated an estimate of mean size of residential plots (i.e. area encompassing the main house, any out buildings, and garden if present) for Brisbane and the Cranfield Triangle. In Brisbane these areas were manually delineated for respondents who provided their exact address using Google Maps, and in the Cranfield Triangle we used the Ordnance Survey MasterMap^{TM} Topography Layer to digitise polygons around the boundaries of two residential properties within each respondent's postcode, before calculating the area (m^2) within each polygon. Data extraction was performed in ArcGIS v10.3 (ESRI, 2015) and QGIS v2.6 (Quantum GIS Development Team, 2015).

2.5. Analysis

All statistical analyses were carried out in R (version 3.1.2; R Development Core Team, 2014). We examined the relationship between and neighbourhood tree cover and first the frequency and then the duration of nature dose within private gardens and within public green spaces (response variables), using ordinal logistic regression (Ordinal package version 2015.6-28; Christensen, 2015). We incorporated age, gender, ethnicity, income and formal education level (highest qualification) as covariates. We then applied an Information Theoretic approach that simultaneously evaluates hypotheses by balance between model complexity and goodness of fit (Burnham & Anderson, 2002). We used the MuMIn package (Bartoń, 2015) to model all possible combinations of variables in



Fig. 3. The relationship between the frequency and duration of nature dose (the frequency and duration of visits) in private and public green spaces and the level of tree cover in the surrounding neighbourhood.

turn against each response variable, with the models fitted and ranked on the basis of the weights W_1 of the Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) corrected for small sample sizes (AICc). Following Richards (2005) and to be 95% sure that the most parsimonious models were maintained within the best supported model set, we retained all models where the AICc < 6. We then used model averaging to produce the average parameter estimates and associated standard errors (Burnham & Anderson, 2002). Second, we examined how respondents' Nature Relatedness scores (both overall and the three components) varied with neighbourhood tree cover using model averaged linear regression, and again accounted for the



Fig. 4. The relationship between people's Nature Relatedness score and neighbourhood tree cover in Brisbane and in the Cranfield Triangle.

additional covariates in the model including age, gender, ethnicity, income and formal education level.

3. Results

A similar proportion of survey respondents had access to their own garden (91.6% in Brisbane, 93% in Cranfield Triangle). A greater percentage of respondents living in Brisbane used private gardens, but more Cranfield Triangle residents used public green spaces (Fig. 2). For both cities we found a positive relationship between the level of tree cover surrounding a person's home and the frequency of garden use during the week the respondent completed the survey, and in Brisbane only there was a significant relationship with the total duration of that use (Table 1 and Fig. 3). We found a similar positive relationship between tree cover and the duration of visits to public green spaces, but the frequency of visits was significant for the Cranfield Triangle but not Brisbane. A range of other factors clearly correlated with the exposure of people to nature in both locations. Specifically, a person's level of formal education and age was significant across many models, with those in the second salary quartile in Brisbane less likely to visit public green spaces; ethnicity was also an significant predictor of garden use in Brisbane (Table 1).

Overall, Nature Relatedness scores were significantly higher in the sprawling city of Brisbane, with an average of 3.47 (standard error = 0.02) in comparison with 3.37 (standard error = 0.02) in the more compact Cranfield Triangle ($t = 3.45$, $df = 1002$, $p < 0.001$). In both cases we found a significant, but weak positive relationship between Nature Relatedness scores and tree cover that held even after adjusting for socio-demographic covariates (Table 2 and Fig. 4, Brisbane $R^2 = 0.07$, $p < 0.001$; Cranfield Triangle $R^2 = 0.07$; $p < 0.001$). We found that the results varied for the three factors within the Nature Relatedness scale. Specifically, NR-perspective had a significant relationship with tree cover in Brisbane, whereas NR-self and NR-experience factors were significant for the Cranfield Triangle.

4. Discussion

4.1. Experiences of nature

Here we have mapped how experiences of nature vary across a gradient of neighbourhood vegetation cover. We show that people's propensity to engage with nature is lower in neighbourhoods with poorer physical availability of tree cover. Given the range of

Table 1
Results from ordinal regression models exploring the relationship between predictor variables and the frequency and duration of visits to private gardens and public green spaces. We show parameter estimates and associated standard errors. Given the ordinal nature of predictor variables, the results show the outcome as compared to a base factor level (i.e. for age the base factor is <40 years age, thus a positive coefficient suggests those >40 tend to have a higher level of frequency or duration of green space visits; the base factors for the other variables are: gender, female; ethnicity, English not the primary language spoken at home; income, 1st quartile income group; education, year 10 completed or lower).

Location	Nature dose	Model averaged coefficients and standard errors										
		Tree cover	Age (>40 yrs)	Gender (male)	Ethnicity (English)	Income quartile			Highest qualification			
						2nd quart.	3rd quart.	4th quart.	Year 11/12	Trade or dipl.	Under grad degree	Post grad degree
Brisbane private gardens	Frequency	0.02 (0.005)***	0.9 (0.1)***	−0.01 (0.1)	−0.7 (0.1)***	−0.3 (0.1)*	−0.2 (0.1)	−0.03 (0.1)	0.2 (0.2)	0.4 (0.2)*	0.01 (0.2)	0.1 (0.2)
	Duration	0.02 (0.004)***	0.8 (0.1)***	0.2 (0.1)#	−0.7 (0.1)***	−0.3 (0.1)*	0.02 (0.1)	0.1 (0.1)	0.1 (0.2)	0.3 (0.2)	−0.04 (0.2)	0.3 (0.2)
Brisbane – public green spaces	Frequency	0.009 (0.005)#	−0.1 (0.1)	0.2 (0.1)	−0.2 (0.1)	0.1 (0.1)	−0.2 (0.2)	−0.05 (0.1)	0.6 (0.2)**	0.8 (0.2)**	1.0 (0.2)***	1.0 (0.2)***
	Duration	0.01 (0.005)*	−0.1 (0.1)	0.1 (0.1)	0.1 (0.1)	−0.1 (0.1)	0.01 (0.1)	−0.2 (0.1)	0.4 (0.2)*	0.6 (0.2)**	0.7 (0.2)***	0.7 (0.2)***
Cranfield Triangle – private gardens	Frequency	0.02 (0.01)*	1.1 (0.2)***	0.07 (0.2)	0.2 (0.2)	0.1 (0.2)	0.09 (0.3)	0.4 (0.2)#	−0.1 (0.2)	−0.1 (0.1)	−0.2 (0.2)	0.5 (0.3)
	Duration	0.01 (0.1)	1.0 (0.2)***	0.1 (0.2)	−0.1 (0.2)	0.05 (0.2)	0.05 (0.3)	0.7 (0.2)**	−0.2 (0.2)	−0.1 (0.2)	−0.3 (0.2)	02 (0.3)
Cranfield Triangle – public green spaces	Frequency	0.02 (0.01)***	0.6 (0.2)***	0.1 (0.2)	−0.1 (0.2)	−0.4 (0.2)	−0.01 (0.3)	−0.1 (0.2)	0.3 (0.2)	0.2 (0.2)	0.3 (0.2)	0.6 (0.3)*
	Duration	0.01 (0.008)	0.6 (0.2)**	−0.05 (0.2)	−0.002 (0.2)	−0.1 (0.2)	0.2 (0.2)	0.2 (0.2)	0.08 (0.2)	0.1 (0.1)	0.08 (0.2)	0.5 (0.3)*

Significant variables and factor levels: *$P < 0.05$; **$P < 0.01$; ***$P < 0.001$. # indicates marginal significance at $P < 0.07$.

Table 2
Results from linear regression between the Nature Relatedness scores of Brisbane and Cranfield Triangle residents, with neighbourhood tree cover, and other potential covariates. We show the model averaged coefficients and standard errors of variables relative to a comparative base factor level (i.e. for age the base factor is <40 years age, thus a coefficient suggests those >40 tend to have a higher Nature Relatedness score; the base factors for the other variables are: gender, female; Ethnicity, English not primary language spoken at home; income, 1st quartile income group; education, secondary school not completed).

Model averaged coefficients and standard errors:	NR-score	NR-self	NR-perspective	NR-experience
Brisbane				
Intercept	2.89 (0.1)***	2.65 (0.12)***	3.51 (0.12)***	2.58 (0.12)***
Tree cover	0.003 (0.001)*	0.004 (0.002)*	0.00 (0.00)	0.01 (0.00)***
Age (>40 years)	0.26 (0.03)***	0.40 (0.04)***	0.15 (0.04)***	0.21 (0.12)***
Gender (male)	−0.10 (0.03)**	−0.15 (0.04)***	−0.30 (0.04)***	0.22 (0.04)***
Ethnicity (English spoken at home)	−0.15 (0.05)***	−0.01 (0.03)	−0.12 (0.05)*	−0.37 (0.06)***
Income:				
2nd quartile	0.01 (0.05)	0.02 (0.06)	0.05 (0.05)	−0.04 (0.06)
3rd quartile	0.10 (0.5)*	0.10 (0.06)#	0.12 (0.06)*	0.08 (0.06)
4th quartile	−0.05 (0.05)	−0.11 (0.05)*	−0.01 (0.05)	−0.01 (0.06)
Highest qualification:				
Secondary school completed	0.09 (0.06)	0.02 (0.06)	0.10 (0.07)	0.06 (0.08)
Trade or diploma	0.22 (0.06)***	0.25 (0.07)***	0.13 (0.07)#	0.27 (0.07)***
Bachelor's degree	0.25 (0.06)***	0.29 (0.07)***	0.20 (0.07)**	0.25 (0.08)**
Postgraduate degree	0.24 (0.06)***	0.31 (0.08)***	0.12 (0.08)	0.24 (0.09)**
Cranfield Triangle				
Intercept	3.02 (0.11)***	3.34 (0.14)***	3.01 (0.15)***	2.66 (0.11)***
Tree cover	0.01 (0.002)*	0.00 (0.003)	0.01 (0.003)**	0.00 (0.00)
Age (> 40 years)	0.22 (0.05)***	0.19 (0.07)**	0.24 (0.07)***	0.26 (0.06)***
Gender (male)	−0.04 (0.05)	−0.04 (0.54)	−0.18 (0.06)**	0.14 (0.06)*
Ethnicity (English spoken at home)	−0.09 (0.06)	−0.16 (0.09)#	−0.02 (0.05)	−0.01 (0.08)
Income:				
2nd quartile	−0.07 (0.07)	0.01 (0.09)	0.14 (0.12)	0.00 (0.08)
3rd quartile	−0.07 (0.07)	−0.16 (0.10)	0.03 (0.08)	−0.11 (0.09)
4th quartile	−0.02 (0.07)	−0.03 (0.09)	0.03 (0.07)	0.02 (0.08)
Highest qualification:				
Secondary school completed	−0.11 (0.06)#	−0.16 (0.09)#	−0.02 (0.05)	0.02 (0.08)
Trade or diploma	0.07 (0.10)	−0.16 (0.14)	−0.04 (0.08)	0.14 (0.12)
Bachelor's degree	−0.04 (0.07)	0.00 (0.09)	−0.03 (0.09)	0.04 (0.08)
Postgraduate degree	0.09 (0.08)	0.20 (0.12)	−0.02 (0.07)	0.17 (0.11)

Significant variables and factor levels: #P < 0.1; *P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001.

health and wellbeing benefits that people can gain from nature via both passive pathways (e.g. temperature regulation or pollution reduction; Donovan et al., 2013) and those that require nature interactions (e.g. relief from mental fatigue, reduced stress and improved cognitive function; e.g. Berman, Jonides, & Kaplan, 2008; Kaplan & Kaplan, 1989), these differences could lead to long-term health inequalities.

People who live in nature-poor neighbourhoods visited both private and public green spaces less frequently, and for a shorter duration than those living in more vegetated neighbourhoods. This effect could have arisen for a range of non-mutually exclusive reasons. First, people who enjoy spending time outdoors may 'self-select' by electing to move into neighbourhoods that are greener, or by actively working to create a greener living environment. Indeed, there is some support for this in our study as Nature Relatedness scores of respondents showed a positive correlation with tree cover. Moreover, people who have a higher Nature Relatedness score are also more likely to visit more natural public green spaces (Shanahan, Lin, Gaston, Bush, & Fuller, 2015c). Thus, it remains unclear whether a person's connection to nature is shaped by the environment they live in, whether they move to a neighbourhood that reflects this trait, or whether it is some combination of these factors. Population-level studies that explore how attitudes to nature change as people move between neighbourhoods, or as neighbourhoods themselves change over time, would provide valuable insight into this issue on causality. A second explanation is that the nature present within neighbourhoods creates an environment that is more conducive to spending time outdoors (Shanahan, Lin, Bush et al., 2015). This is particularly likely to be a contributing factor in sub-tropical locations such as Brisbane, where vegetation provides important climate regulation services including shade and temperature regulation. However, several studies have now shown that simply having green space available within a neighbourhood is insufficient to guarantee its use by local residents (Cohen et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2014). This study supports these results, suggesting that interventions that aim to improve people's nature dose might be best focused on enhancing their connection with nature, perhaps in concert with enhancing the availability and quality of green spaces in cities.

4.2. Differences between sprawling and compact cities

We observed surprising similar relationships between engagement with nature and the availability of tree cover for both the sprawling (Brisbane) and compact (Cranfield Triangle) urban case studies examined here. This is despite the considerable climatic and cultural differences between these two locations. These results suggest that there may be a consistent trend towards a reduction in nature experiences as it becomes less available; however, further studies in additional cities would be required to further tease out the various factors that could contribute to patterns in nature experiences. These results also suggest that neither approach to city growth is immune from the extinction of experience with nature. Urban sprawl is a major facet of urbanisation in countries such as the US and Australia, and there is a range of arguments as to the benefits and costs of this development for both people's way of life and biodiversity. For example, in some instances urban sprawl has been shown to have a negative impact on biodiversity as it can extend into higher quality habitats both within and on the outskirts of cities (Sushinsky et al., 2013), and it can also have a negative impact on people's way of life as commute times grow (Rydin et al., 2012). Yet there are also instances where urban sprawl could lead to biodiversity gains, for example in the UK countryside where the agricultural landscape is already highly disturbed (e.g. Robinson & Sutherland, 2002).

An additional interesting pattern observed in this study was that despite the much higher population density in the Cranfield Triangle, a similar proportion of households had private gardens to the Brisbane sample. Though these gardens were much smaller, they had similar levels of use in both locations. Likewise, Syme, Fenton, and Coakes (2001) found that residents with small lot developments in Perth, Australia, did not visit local green spaces any more than did residents with larger lots. This suggests that compact development can be achieved in a way that maintains ready access to nature in the form of a private garden or backyard, albeit a relatively small one, and these spaces can be as important for enabling interactions with nature.

Ultimately the variation in nature dose observed here has the potential to lead to a decline in attitudes towards nature (Miller, 2005; Pyle, 1978). Indeed, though the relationship was weak, we did show that city residents Nature Relatedness scores were lower where there were lower levels of nature in the surrounding neighbourhood. This overall pattern was markedly similar for both sprawling and compact urban designs, but the components of Nature Relatedness showed different patterns. Specifically, in the Cranfield Triangle only the perspective factor showed a correlation with tree cover, whereas both the self and experience factors were significant for Brisbane. There could be a range of reasons for these trends, for example, differences in education of the surveyed population could cause differences in the attitudes and values associated with nature (i.e. Nature Relatedness Perspective), whereas cultural differences might drive the observed variation in Nature Relatedness self or experience. Exploring these differences in full was not the focus of this study (rather, we examined patterns across the gradient of tree cover); as such, future research might fruitfully focus on comparing individuals with similar characteristics in multiple locations. In any case, the consequences of the association between Nature Relatedness and tree cover have potential implications beyond the influence on conservation support; Nature Relatedness itself (not just exposure to nature) has been found to correlate with wellbeing, specifically, increased happiness (Zelenski & Nisbet, 2012) and reduced anxiety (Martyn & Brymer, 2016). This again suggests that interventions that aim to enhance a city resident's connection to nature could provide an important avenue to better health and wellbeing.

Our results highlight that the provision of tree cover should continue to be a key objective in city planning to ensure people continue to access nature and so the health benefits it provides. This could include encouraging (or even legislating for) natural features that can be integrated into space-poor urban environments. Furthermore, given the variation in Nature Relatedness seen here, social programs should be considered a key approach that encourages people to engage with the local green spaces that are already available to enhance their levels of connection to nature (e.g. Cohen et al., 2013; Shanahan, Lin, Gaston et al., 2015).

Ethical clearance

This research was conducted in accordance with Institutional Human Research Ethics Approval of the Behavioural & Social Sciences Ethical Review Committee, University of Queensland (project number 2012000869), and the Bioscience ethics committee of the University of Exeter (project number 2013/319). Participants provided written consent at the beginning of the online survey by checking a box stating their agreement to participate. Participants were compensated with either a nominal fee for their participation in the survey (both locations) or a chance to win a new iPad (Cranfield Triangle).

Acknowledgements

D.F.S. is supported through ARC Discovery Grant DP120102857 and the Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions (CEED, Australia); R.A.F. holds an ARC Future Fellowship; D.T.C.C, S.H., K.A. and K.J.G. are supported by the Fragments, Functions, Flows and Urban Ecosystem Services project, NERC grant NE/J015237/1.

Supplementary material

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.07.004.

References

Armston, J. D., Denham, R. J., Danaher, T. J., Scarth, P. F., & Moffiet, T. N. (2009). Prediction and validation of foliage projective cover from Landsat-5 TM and Landsat-7 ETM+ imagery. *Journal of Applied Remote Sensing*, *3*, 033540.

Bartoń, K. (2015). *MuMIn: multi-model inference. R package version 1.13.4*. http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn

Berman, M. G., Jonides, J., & Kaplan, S. (2008). The cognitive benefits of interacting with nature. *Psychological Science*, *19*, 1207–1212.

Bureau of Meteorology. (2015). *Climate statistics for Australian locations*. Canberra: Australian Government.

Burnham, K. P., & Anderson, D. R. (2002). *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Catterall, C. P. (2009). Responses of faunal assemblages to urbanisation: global reseach paradigms and an avian case study. In M. J. McDonnell, A. K. Hahs, & J. H. Breuste (Eds.), *Ecology of cities and towns—a comparative approach* (pp. 129–155). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christensen, R. H. B. (2015). *Ordinal—regression models for ordinal data R package version 2015*. pp. 1–21. http://www.cran.r-project.org/package=ordinal/

Cohen, D. A., Lapham, S., Evenson, K. R., Williamson, S., Golinelli, D., Ward, P., et al. (2013). Use of neighbourhood parks: does socio-economic status matter? A four-city study. *Public Health*, *127*, 325–332.

Cohen, D. A., Marsh, T., Williamson, S., Derose, K. P., Martinez, H., Setodji, C., et al. (2010). Parks and physical activity: why are some parks used more than others? *Preventive Medicine*, *50*(Suppl), S9–S12.

Dallimer, M., Irvine, K. N., Skinner, A. M. J., Davies, Z. G., Rouquette, J. R., Maltby, L. L., et al. (2012). Biodiversity and the feel-good factor: understanding associations between self-reported human well-being and species richness. *BioScience*, *62*, 47–55.

Donovan, G. H., Butry, D. T., Michael, Y. L., Prestemon, J. P., Liebhold, A. M., Gatziolis, D., et al. (2013). The relationship between trees and human health evidence from the spread of the emerald ash borer. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *44*, 139–145.

ESRI. (2015). *ArcGIS desktop: release 10.3*. Redlands, CA: Environmental Systems Research Institute.

Fuller, R. A., Irvine, K. N., Devine-Wright, P., Warren, P. H., & Gaston, K. J. (2007). Psychological benefits of greenspace increase with biodiversity. *Biology Letters*, *3*, 390–394.

Gaston, K. J., Warren, P. H., Thompson, K., & Smith, R. M. (2005). Urban domestic gardens (IV): the extent of the resource and its associated features. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, *14*, 3327–3349.

Gong, Y., Gallacher, J., Palmer, S., & Fone, D. (2014). Neighbourhood green space, physical function and participation in physical activities among elderly men: the Caerphilly Prospective study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, *11*, 40.

Hartig, T., Mitchell, R., de Vries, S., & Frumkin, H. (2014). Nature and health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *35*, 207–228.

Home, R., Hunziker, M., & Bauer, N. (2012). Psychosocial outcomes as motivations for visiting nearby urban green spaces. *Leisure Sciences*, *34*, 350–365.

Jiang, B., Dongying, L., Larson, L., & Sullican, S. (2016). A dose-response curve describing the relationship between urban tree over density and self-reported stress recovery. *Environment and Behaviour*, *28*(4), 607–629. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013916514552321

Jones, A., Hillsdon, M., & Coombes, E. (2009). Greenspace access, use, and physical activity: understanding the effects of area deprivation. *Preventive Medicine*, *49*, 500–505.

Juster, F. T., Ono, H., & Stafford, F. P. (2004). *Changing times of American youth: 1981–2003*. Child Development Supplement Institute for Social Research.

Kaczynski, A. T., Besenyi, G. M., Stanis, S. A. W., Koohsari, M. J., Oestman, K. B., Bergstrom, R., et al. (2014). Are park proximity and park features related to park use and park-based physical activity among adults? Variations by multiple socio-demographic characteristics. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, *11*(146).

Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (1989). *The experience of nature: a psychological perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keniger, L. E., Gaston, K. J., Irvine, K. N., & Fuller, R. A. (2013). What are the benefits of interacting with nature? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *10*, 913–935.
Lin, B. B., Fuller, R. A., Bush, R., Gaston, K. J., & Shanahan, D. F. (2014). Opportunity or orientation? Who uses parks and why. *Plos One*, *9*, e87422.
Lin, B.B., Gaston, K., Fuller, R.A., Wu, S., Bush, R., & Shanahan, D.F. Vegetation and socio-demographic factors influence potential ecosystem service benefits from private yards. *Landscape & Urban Planning* (in preparation).
Lovasi, G. S., Quinn, J. W., Neckerman, K. M., Perzanowski, M. S., & Rundle, A. (2008). Children living in areas with more street trees have lower prevalence of asthma. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, *62*, 647–649.
Martyn, P., & Brymer, E. (2016). The relationship between nature relatedness and anxiety. *Journal of Health Psycholology*, *21*, 1436–1445.
McCormack, G. R., Rock, M., Toohey, A. M., & Hignell, D. (2010). Characteristics of urban parks associated with park use and physical activity: a review of qualitative research. *Health & Place*, *16*, 712–726.
McKinney, M. L. (2002). Urbanization, biodiversity, and conservation. *BioScience*, *52*, 883–890.
Miller, J. R. (2005). Biodiversity conservation and the extinction of experience. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *20*, 430–434.
Nisbet, E. K., Zelenski, J. M., & Murphy, S. A. (2009). The nature relatedness scale: linking individuals' connection with nature to environmental concern and behavior. *Environment and Behavior*, *41*, 715–740.
Edina. Digimap Ordinance Survey, GB. Surface vector polygon in gml format. Available: http://edina.ac.uk/digimap. Accessed 01.10.15.
Pyle, R. M. (1978). The extinction of experience. *Horticulture*, *56*, 64–67.
Quantum GIS Development Team. (2015). *Quantum GIS geographic information system v2.6. Open source geospatial foundation project*. http://qgis.osgeo.org
R Development Core Team. (2014). *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
Richards, S. A. (2005). Testing ecological theory using the information-theoretic approach: examples and cautionary results. *Ecology*, *86*, 2805–2814. http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/05-0074
Robinson, R. A., & Sutherland, W. J. (2002). Post-war changes in arable farming and biodiversity in Great Britain. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *39*, 157–176.
Rydin, Y., Bleahu, A., Davies, M., Davila, J. D., Friel, S., De Grandis, G., et al. (2012). Shaping cities for health: complexity and the planning of urban environments in the 21st century. *The Lancet*, *379*, 2079–2108.
Sandström, U. G., Angelstam, P., & Mikusinski, G. (2006). Ecological diversity of birds in relation to the structure of urban green space. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *77*, 39–53.
Shanahan, D. F., Lin, B. B., Gaston, K., Bush, R., & Fuller, R. A. (2014). Socio-economic inequalities in access to nature on public and private lands: a case study from Brisbane, Australia. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *130*, 14–23.
Shanahan, D. F., Fuller, R. F., Bush, R., Lin, B. B., & Gaston, K. J. (2015). The health benefits of nature: how much do we need? *BioScience*, *65*, 476–485.
Shanahan, D. F., Lin, B. B., Bush, R., Gaston, K. J., Barber, L., Dean, J., et al. (2015). Toward improved public health outcomes from urban nature. *American Journal of Public Health*, *105*, 470–477.
Shanahan, D. F., Lin, B. B., Gaston, K., Bush, R., & Fuller, R. A. (2015). What is the role of trees and remnant vegetation in attracting people to urban parks? *Landscape Ecology*, *30*, 153–165.
Sigman, A. (2012). Time for a view on screen time. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, *97*, 935–942.
Soga, M., & Gaston, K. J. (2016). Extinction of experience: evidence, consequences and challenges of loss of human-nature interactions. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *14*, 94–101.
Soga, M., Yamaura, Y., Koike, S., & Gaston, K. J. (2014). Land sharing vs. land sparing: does the compact city reconcile urban development and biodiversity conservation? *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *51*, 1378–1386.
Sushinsky, J. R., Rhodes, J. R., Possingham, H. P., Gill, T. K., & Fuller, R. A. (2013). How should we grow cities to minimize their biodiversity impacts? *Global Change Biology*, *19*, 401–410.
Syme, G. J., Fenton, D. M., & Coakes, S. (2001). Lot size, garden satisfaction and local park and wetland visitation. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *56*, 161–170.
United Nations. (2014). *World urbanization prospects: the 2014 revision*. New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division.
Wells, N. M., & Lekies, K. S. (2006). Nature and the life course: pathways from childhood nature experiences to adult environmentalism. *Children, Youth and Environments*, *16*, 1–24.
Zelenski, J. M., & Nisbet, E. K. (2012). Happiness and feeling connected: the distinct role of nature relatedness. *Environment and Behaviour*, *46*, 3–23.