Class, Contamination and Health: The Reinforcement of Health Disparities through Environmental Inequality in Britain

Xiaohang Wang *

School of Social & Political Sciences, University of Glasgow, G12 8QQ, Glasgow, United Kingdom

* Corresponding Author Email: 2961221W@student.gla.ac.uk

Abstract. Environmental inequality, a crucial connection between class and health, is glaringly absent from mainstream policy discourse in the UK, despite the fact that health disparities are growing and are best understood as structurally created. Using a case study that contrasts East London districts with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, this paper investigates how the unequal distribution of environmental burdens—such as air pollution, noise, and access to green spaces—reinforces class-based health disparities in the UK. Three structural mechanisms driving environmental health inequality are identified in this study by synthesising peer-reviewed data from public health, urban planning, and social epidemiology: housing market segmentation that concentrates pollution in working-class communities; cumulative physiological burdens from long-term environmental disadvantage; and regressive austerity-driven cuts to environmental and regulatory services that weaken protections for the poorest. This paper suggests three policy directions to address these problems: restoring environmental regulatory capacity through needs-weighted public funding; rerouting green infrastructure investment to the most underprivileged areas; and integrating environmental justice criteria into housing and planning frameworks. This study makes the case that considering environmental factors as a primary, as opposed to a secondary, driver of health is necessary to improve health equity in the UK. To effectively eliminate class-based health disparities, public health interventions must be integrated with urban, housing, and environmental policy.

Keywords: Environmental Justice; Health Equity; Spatial Inequality; Urban Deprivation; Policy Integration.

1. Introduction

1.1. Contextualising Health Inequality in the UK

The UK faces a deep and persistent problem of health inequality. Driven by deindustrialisation, urban restructuring, and post-2008 austerity, spatial concentrations of poverty now coincide with heightened environmental risk, disproportionately exposing low-income communities to hazardous living conditions. While the link between socioeconomic status and health outcomes is well documented, one critical mediating pathway remains conspicuously absent from mainstream public health discourse: environmental inequality as a structural link between class and health. The Marmot Review 10 Years On 2020 confirms that, for the first time in over a century, life expectancy in the UK has stagnated, with life expectancy for women in the poorest 10% of areas even declining [1]. This stagnation is not accidental. The Review identifies reduced state support for impoverished communities as a core driver and describes the health consequences of austerity policies as "regressive and unfair" [1].

1.2. Integrating Public Health and Environmental Justice Scholarship

Existing academic research has laid an important foundation for understanding health inequality and environmental injustice in the UK, but integrated research in these two fields remains relatively rare. Marmot et al. argued that health inequality reflects a social gradient—the lower the socioeconomic status, the worse the health outcomes—and called for structural interventions targeting the social determinants of health [1]. Walker examined the theoretical and empirical dimensions of environmental justice in the UK context, demonstrating that the distance from pollution

sources and the lack of green space follow the spatial pattern of socioeconomic deprivation across the country [2]. Early evidence of environmental inequality in the UK was provided by civil society organisations such as Friends of the Earth, and this was further developed through peer-reviewed university research, forming a national small-area analysis of the pattern of environmental inequality. Fecht et al. provided quantitative evidence of systemic inequality in indoor and outdoor air pollution exposure in London, linking housing location, income level, and resident behaviour to differential exposure to PM2.5 and NO_2 [3]. A 2023 report by the Greater London Authority found that the population in areas with the lowest NO_2 and PM2.5 concentrations was predominantly white and high-income, and that the exposure gap between class and ethnicity was not expected to narrow without further major policy action. McLaughlin and Pound further demonstrated the relationship between economic inequality and health outcomes across London neighbourhoods, finding that neighbourhood-level inequality independently predicted life expectancy and premature mortality [4].

1.3. Identifying the Missing Link: From Correlation to Causality

While existing research has examined health inequality and environmental pollution separately, and some studies have established correlations between deprivation levels and pollution exposure, there remains a significant gap in scholarship that systematically traces the causal chain of "class status → environmental exposure → health outcomes" within a single integrative analytical framework. Rarely do studies look at the precise processes by which environmental inequality actively perpetuates and reinforces class-based health disparities; instead, they either concentrate on the social determinants of health or the spatial distribution of environmental dangers. Given the combined consequences of industrial history, location, and more than ten years of public spending cuts, this disparity is especially noteworthy in the British context. Analytical Framework and Case Rationale

Through a structural case study of London's East-West divide, this research closes this gap. First, it describes the health and environmental situations of several regions, especially the wealthy Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the impoverished eastern boroughs of Newham and Tower Hamlets. Second, it examines the structural mechanisms—such as housing market segmentation, past planning choices, and the unequal allocation of political power—by which class status influences environmental exposure. Thirdly, it looks at the precise mechanisms by which differences in exposure result in measurable health inequalities. In order to interrupt the vicious cycle of poverty, pollution, and class, this article concludes with a set of policy proposals. By foregrounding environmental inequality as a structural mechanism of class reproduction, this study contributes to health equity scholarship and informs urban and environmental policy debates in Britain.

2. Case Study Context: Contrasting Deprivation and Advantage in London

This study focuses on a comparative case analysis of two contrasting areas within Greater London: the eastern boroughs of Newham and Tower Hamlets, and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in the west. These two areas represent the opposite ends of London's class spectrum, offering well-documented, spatially adjacent stark contrasts in environmental conditions, socioeconomic structures, and health outcomes.

2.1. Socioeconomic Structure and Class Division

Newham and Tower Hamlets are among the most deprived local authorities in England, characterised by a highly concentrated working-class and low-income population, with historical roots in the area's deindustrial heritage and the resulting economic marginalisation. In contrast, Kensington and Chelsea consistently rank among the wealthiest local authorities in the UK. This affluence translates into markedly better health outcomes, as demonstrated by McLaughlin and Pound's analysis of 533 London wards. McLaughlin and Pound studied 533 London wards and found a significant negative correlation between ward-level mean income and both life expectancy and

premature mortality, confirming that socioeconomic status is a robust predictor of health outcomes at the neighbourhood level across the capital [4].

2.2. Environmental Inequalities: Pollution and Green Space

Systematic disparities in air quality and green-space access underpin these divergent living conditions. Ferguson et al. analysed air pollution exposure inequalities in London and found that NO_2 concentrations in the most deprived neighbourhoods were 7.8 μg/m³ higher than in the least deprived; the NO_2 and PM2.5 concentrations outside the homes of the highest-income households were 1.3 and 0.12 μg/m³ lower, respectively, than those of the lowest-income households [5]. The same study found that road traffic—primarily concentrated in working-class inner-city areas such as Newham and Tower Hamlets—is the main source of NO_2 emissions in London, with diesel vehicles alone contributing approximately 50% of the city's NO_2 emissions [5]. Belcher et al.'s research is consistent with this, demonstrating that socioeconomic deprivation significantly moderates the relationship between residential green space and health outcomes: Deprived communities not only have less green space but also gain greater health protection from the limited green space available [6].

The disparities in green space accessibility are equally stark. Tran et al. conducted a nationwide UK analysis and found significant inequality in the distribution of green space across urban neighbourhoods in England, consistently favouring wealthier areas, and further confirmed that higher grass coverage is associated with fewer preventable deaths in the poorest communities [7]. In London, this pattern is clearly visible along the East–West axis: East London boroughs such as Newham have the lowest per capita public green space, whereas Kensington and Chelsea benefit from major Royal Parks and over a hundred privately restricted garden squares [6].

2.3. Health Outcomes and Spatial Disparities

Measurable and long-lasting health inequities result from these environmental disparities. According to research by Marmot et al., there is a distinct socioeconomic gradient in life expectancy in England: the lower the level of local deprivation, the shorter the life expectancy, and this gradient has gotten steeper in the ten years after 2010 [1]. This gradient is spatially dispersed along an East-West axis within London: women in Kensington and Chelsea have among the longest life expectancies in the nation, but premature mortality rates in boroughs like Tower Hamlets are almost twice as high as those in the wealthiest districts [4]. Ferguson et al. also reported that increased PM2.5 and NO_2 concentrations cause over 9,000 premature deaths in London annually, with estimated health costs ranging from £1.4 billion to £3.7 billion—a burden that is disproportionately concentrated in low-income working-class populations [5]. When combined, these metrics show a city where environmental exposure, class, and location all work together to create and perpetuate systemic health disparities. The intersection of social, environmental, and health indices in the two case-study sites is mapped in Table 1, which summarises these multifaceted discrepancies. The structural mechanisms behind these patterns are examined in the sections that follow.

Table 1. Comparative Environmental and Health Indicators: East London vs Kensington and Chelsea.

Indicator	Newham / Tower Hamlets	Kensington and Chelsea	Source
Socioeconomic Status	Among the most deprived in England	Least deprived in London	[4]
NO_2 Exposure Gap (deprived vs affluent)	7.8 μg/m³ higher than the least deprived areas	Baseline (lowest exposure)	[5]
Green Space Distribution	Lowest per capita in London	Royal Parks + 100+ private gardens	[6,7]
Green space–health association	Greater mortality benefit from green space in deprived areas	Lesser marginal benefit	[7]
Life Expectancy Gradient	Shorter; premature death rate ~double affluent boroughs	Highest female life expectancy in London	[1,4]
Annual premature deaths (London-wide, air pollution)	Burden concentrated in the deprived east	Lower exposure, lower burden	[5]

3. Structural Drivers of Environmental Health Inequality

3.1. Policy Context: Partial Advances Amid Structural Constraints

3.1.1. Regulatory interventions and urban air quality improvements

In recent years, targeted policy interventions have led to measurable reductions in air pollution in parts of London. The introduction and successive expansions of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) have significantly reduced roadside NO_2 concentrations in the city centre and inner London. Based on UK Biobank data from England, Scotland, and Wales, Pereira et al. confirmed that environmental exposure exhibits systematic social stratification along the dimensions of income, employment, and education, but also noted that urban policy interventions, when systematically promoted, have the potential to narrow these gaps [8]. These findings suggest that regulatory tools designed with attention to socioeconomic distribution can bring environmental improvement benefits to working-class communities.

3.1.2. Shifting policy framings: from amenity to environmental justice

At the same time, institutional awareness of the link between environmental conditions and health equity is deepening. According to Tran et al., these results unequivocally show that green space investment should be prioritised in the poorest urban neighbourhoods—exactly where the availability is now most limited and the number of avoidable fatalities is largest [7]. By aligning environmental improvement with social justice and public health concerns, this reframing lays the groundwork for more equitable urban government. This conceptualisation lays the groundwork for more equitable environmental outcomes to the extent that it becomes popular in public health governance and urban planning. Core Mechanisms Linking Class, Environment, and Health

3.1.3. Housing market segmentation and the spatial concentration of pollution risk

The structure of the housing market is the most basic mechanism that connects environmental degradation and class. The market acts as an environmental sorting mechanism, giving lower-income households a disproportionate share of the danger of pollution and the lack of green space. In the UK, low-income households are concentrated in locations with more pollution, less natural space, and closer proximity to transit or industrial infrastructure due to the effective filtering impact of property prices. Low-income households are consistently clustered in regions with the greatest ambient NO_2 and PM2.5 concentrations, as Ferguson et al. showed that housing location is the single most significant factor affecting differential exposure to interior and outdoor air pollution in London [5]. This is not a matter of individual choice but of structural constraint: working-class families cannot afford housing in cleaner environments, and the housing market ensures that cleaner environments command premium prices.

Pereira et al. confirmed this pattern at the national scale using UK Biobank data, finding that lower income and unemployment independently predict higher exposure to air pollution and reduced access to green space in urban areas [8]. The market thus operates as an environmental sorting mechanism, systematically allocating pollution risk downward along the class hierarchy. In East London, this process has deep historical roots: areas such as Newham and Tower Hamlets were industrialised precisely because land was cheap and political resistance was weak, and deindustrialisation has left behind a legacy of contaminated land, poor infrastructure, and entrenched environmental disadvantage that housing prices continue to reflect and reinforce.

3.1.4. Cumulative environmental burdens and life-course health trajectories

Differential exposure has serious and cumulative effects on health. According to Ferguson et al., the main causes of the growing health disparity between the most and least deprived areas in the UK over the past 20 years have been respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, the two conditions most closely associated with air pollution, with prevalence continuously higher in lower socioeconomic groups [5]. Importantly, the same study found that pre-existing illness, which is more common in

underprivileged areas, increases vulnerability to the harmful effects of air pollution, resulting in a vicious cycle where environmental exposure and underlying vulnerability exacerbate one another [5].

There are several physiological routes through which this cumulative burden functions. Long-term exposure to PM2.5 and NO_2 is linked to decreased lung function, causing increased risks of premature mortality and cardiovascular disease, with lifelong repercussions for those exposed since childhood, according to data from the UK Biobank [9]. Children who grow up in highly polluted locations, like Tower Hamlets, may have permanent lung capacity reduction and other irreversible developmental repercussions that limit their health trajectories for the rest of their lives [5]. As a result, class-based environmental inequality is a mechanism of class reproduction as much as a public health issue because it not only affects well-being in the present but also biologically transmits disadvantage over generations.

3.1.5. Austerity, governance failure and the erosion of environmental protection

A third structural mechanism concerns the role of the state—and specifically its withdrawal from deprived communities under austerity. Murrell et al. conducted a longitudinal analysis of environmental and regulatory service expenditure across English local authorities from 2009 to 2020, revealing that the most deprived areas suffered the deepest cuts, with London boroughs experiencing the sharpest declines in environmental health expenditure [10]. London boroughs — which include the most deprived and densely populated communities in the country — recorded the greatest reductions in food safety and environmental health expenditure of all local authority types, at 10% [10].

This pattern of regressive austerity directly undermines environmental protection in the communities that need it most. Stuckler et al. established that austerity measures disproportionately harm deprived groups through both a social risk effect — increasing unemployment, poverty, and housing insecurity—and healthcare effect, reducing access to preventive and curative services [11]. When environmental enforcement capacity is cut most deeply in the areas most exposed to pollution, the state effectively withdraws from its role as guarantor of a basic environmental standard for all citizens. The result is a governance failure that compounds market failure: working-class communities in East London are not only priced into polluted environments by the housing market, but also left without adequate public resources to monitor, regulate, or remediate those conditions.

3.2. Synthesis: Environmental Inequality as a Vehicle of Class Reproduction

Taken together, these three mechanisms—housing market segmentation, cumulative physiological burden, and institutional abandonment—reveal environmental inequality not as an incidental feature of urban life but as a structural mechanism through which class disadvantage is produced, deepened, and transmitted. The East–West divide in London is not simply a spatial pattern: it is the material expression of a social order in which those systematically bear the costs of economic development and environmental degradation with the least power to resist them. Addressing health disparities in Britain, therefore, requires confronting the environmental conditions in which working-class communities live — conditions produced by the interplay of market logics, planning histories, and political choices about public investment.

4. Transformative Policy Pathways for Environmental Health Equity

The preceding analysis identified three structural problems driving environmental health inequalities in East London: housing market segmentation leading to concentrated pollution exposure in working-class communities; the cumulative physiological burden caused by long-term environmental disadvantage; and institutional failures resulting from regressive austerity reductions to environmental and regulatory services. The following recommendations address each of these problems in turn.

4.1. Mainstreaming Environmental Justice in Housing and Planning Systems

The housing market currently functions as a mechanism for allocating environmental risk along class lines, pricing working-class households out of areas with higher pollution and less green space. Addressing this requires structural reform of the planning and housing systems. Nix et al., in a thematic synthesis of housing policy for health, argued that effective housing policy must integrate health impact considerations from the earliest stages of planning, and that cross-sectoral coordination between housing, transport, and environmental agencies is essential to prevent the reproduction of environmental health inequalities through new development [12]. Specifically, planning authorities should be required to conduct Environmental Health Impact Assessments (EHIAs) for all major development proposals in deprived areas, with binding requirements to ensure that new developments do not exacerbate pollution burdens or displace green infrastructure. Social housing allocation should explicitly avoid sitting units in areas with demonstrably poor air quality or insufficient access to green space.

The risk of green gentrification—where environmental improvements raise property values and displace the very communities they were intended to benefit—must also be proactively managed. Equitable urban greening, therefore, requires community-led planning, inclusive zoning, and targeted funding mechanisms to prevent displacement. Maalouf et al. demonstrated in a systematic review that greening efforts frequently favour higher-income neighbourhoods, and that equitable urban greening requires community-led planning, inclusive zoning, and targeted funding mechanisms to prevent displacement [13]. In the London context, this means that green space investment in areas such as Newham and Tower Hamlets must be accompanied by robust rent controls and secure social tenancy protections to ensure that environmental improvements translate into health gains for existing residents.

4.2. Prioritising Green Infrastructure Investment for Deprived Communities

Given the evidence that green space reduces preventable deaths most significantly in the most deprived communities—and that these communities are currently the worst served—green infrastructure investment should be explicitly redistributed toward areas of highest deprivation. Tran et al. recommended that increased investment in green space in urban areas should be urgently prioritised in the most deprived neighbourhoods, where provision is lowest and preventable deaths are highest [7]. Belcher et al. further demonstrated that the health-protective benefits of green space are strongest precisely in areas of high socioeconomic deprivation, making targeted greening a high-efficiency public health intervention [6].

In practical terms, this requires dedicated national funding streams—ring-fenced and protected from local authority budget cuts—for green infrastructure in areas classified within the highest deprivation quintiles of the Index of Multiple Deprivation. This should include creating new accessible parks, greening school streets, and converting derelict or underutilised land into publicly accessible natural space. Minimum per-capita green space standards should be made legally binding in planning law, with enforcement mechanisms that penalise local authorities failing to meet equity-adjusted targets.

4.3. Rebuilding and Redistributing Environmental Regulatory Capacity

The regressive pattern of austerity cuts identified by Murrell et al.—whereby the most deprived areas experienced the largest reductions in environmental and regulatory service expenditure—must be directly reversed [10]. Environmental enforcement capacity, including air quality monitoring, food safety inspections, and public health infrastructure, should be restored in deprived local authorities through a nationally funded, needs-weighted allocation formula that explicitly accounts for deprivation level and population density.

Stuckler et al. established that austerity's health harms operate through both the direct withdrawal of services and the indirect amplification of social risks [11]. Reversing these harms, therefore, requires not only restoring funding but redesigning the allocation mechanism so that resources flow

toward communities according to need rather than fiscal capacity. In parallel, the data infrastructure for monitoring environmental health inequalities should be strengthened, building on the socially patterned exposure data produced by researchers such as Pereira et al. and Ferguson et al., to enable regular, fine-grained tracking of progress toward environmental health equity at the borough and neighbourhood level [5,8].

5. Conclusion

5.1. Summary of Key Findings

This paper has examined the structural mechanisms through which class position in Britain shapes environmental exposure, and how this differential exposure deepens and reproduces health inequality through the life course. Through a comparative case analysis of East London—specifically the boroughs of Newham and Tower Hamlets—and the affluent Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, the study has demonstrated that the East–West health divide in London is not incidental but structurally produced. Three interlocking mechanisms were identified: the housing market, which allocates pollution risk downward along class lines by pricing low-income households into areas of higher environmental burden; the cumulative physiological damage sustained by working-class communities through chronic exposure to poor air quality and insufficient green space; and the regressive pattern of austerity-era funding cuts that most severely reduced protective capacity in the communities that need it most.

The study suggested three policy approaches to address these issues: integrating environmental justice standards into housing and planning choices; directing investments in green infrastructure toward the most impoverished urban areas; and rebuilding and redistributing environmental regulatory capacity using a needs-weighted funding formula.

5.2. Research Significance

By incorporating environmental inequality into the understanding of class-based health disparities in Britain—a relationship that is still understudied in popular public health and social policy discourse—this study adds to the body of previous scholarship. The study makes the case that health fairness cannot be attained through healthcare reform alone by highlighting the material and spatial aspects of class disadvantage. As essential to health outcomes as clinical care, environmental factors—such as the air individuals breathe, the green space they can access, and the regulatory protection they receive—must be included in both academic study and policy design.

5.3. Limitations and Future Research

The identification of individual-level causal pathways connecting class status, environmental exposure, and health outcomes is hampered by this scalar restriction. Longitudinal cohort designs that follow people across home histories and environmental exposures throughout time would be beneficial for future research because they would allow a more accurate estimation of the relationship between cumulative environmental disadvantage and particular health trajectories. Determining the degree to which the London situation reflects a general national trend or a context-specific configuration of class, space, and environment might also be aided by comparative studies across other British cities, such as Manchester, Birmingham, and Glasgow.

References

[1] Marmot, Michael, Allen, Jessica, Boyce, Tammy, Goldblatt, Peter, & Morrison, Joana. Health equity in England: The Marmot Review 10 years on. Institute of Health Equity / The Health Foundation, 2020. https://www.health.org.uk/publications/reports/the-marmot-review-10-years-on

[2] Walker, Gordon. Environmental justice: Concepts, evidence and politics. Routledge, 2012.

[3] Fecht, Daniela, Fischer, Paul, Fortunato, Léa, Hoek, Gerard, de Hoogh, Kees, Marra, Marten, Kruize, Hanneke, Vienneau, Danielle, Beelen, Rob, & Hansell, Anna. Associations between air pollution and socioeconomic characteristics, ethnicity and age profile of neighbourhoods in England and the Netherlands. Environmental Pollution, 2015, 198, 201–210.

[4] McLaughlin, Jaye Lee, & Pound, Nicholas. (2024). Economic inequality, life expectancy, and interpersonal violence in London neighbourhoods. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2024, 40(13–14), 3231–3250.

[5] Ferguson, Lauren, Taylor, Jonathon, Zhou, Ke, Shrubsole, Clive, Symonds, Phil, Davies, Mike, & Dimitroulopoulou, Sani. Systemic inequalities in indoor air pollution exposure in London, UK. Buildings and Cities, 2021, 2(1), 425–448.

[6] Belcher, Richard N., Murray, Kris A., Reeves, Jonathan P., & Fecht, Daniela. Socioeconomic deprivation modifies green space and mental health associations: A within-person study. Environment International, 2024, 192, 109036.

[7] Tran Thu Ngan, Wang, Ruoyu, Tate, Christopher, Green, Mark, Mitchell, Richard, Hunter, Ruth F., & O'Neill, Ciaran. Inequality in green space distribution and its association with preventable deaths across urban neighbourhoods in the UK, stratified by the Index of Multiple Deprivation. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 2024, 79(2), 102–109.

[8] Pereira, Gauthier, Lepage, Benoît, de Hoogh, Kees, Fecht, Daniela, Hansell, Anna, & Gulliver, John. Education, employment, income, and urban–rural differences as drivers of social inequalities in environmental exposures: Evidence from the UK Biobank. Environmental Science & Technology, 2026.

[9] Doiron, Dany, Bourbeau, Jean, & Ferroud, Sarah. Air pollution, lung function and mortality: Survival and mediation analyses in UK Biobank. ERJ Open Research, 2024, 10(2), 00093-2024.

[10] Murrell, Laura, Fahy, Kevin, Clough, Helen E., Middleton, John, & Batterham, Philip. Inequalities in local government expenditure on environmental and regulatory services in England from 2009 to 2020: A longitudinal ecological study. European Journal of Public Health, 2024, 34(Supplement 3).

[11] Stuckler, David, Reeves, Aaron, Loopstra, Rachel, Karanikolos, Marina, & McKee, Martin. Austerity and health: The impact on the UK and Europe. European Journal of Public Health, 2017, 27(Supplement 4), 18–21.

[12] Nix, Emily, Ibbetson, Andrew, Zhou, Ke, Davies, Michael, Wilkinson, Paul, Ludolph, Ramona, & Pineo, Helen. Getting to effective housing policy for health: A thematic synthesis of policy development and implementation. Cities & Health, 2024, 8(3), 512–526.

[13] Maalouf, Anthony, Bou Orm, Ibrahim, El Zein, Ali, & Salameh, Pascale. Exploring the intersection of environmental justice and urban green space planning: A systematic review. Urban Science, 2025, 9(12), 540.