An evaluation of Google Street View as an environmental data source for conducting park audits

Rhianne H. Fiolka, BHSc (student), Gavin R. McCormack, PhD,
Department of Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, Institute for Public Health, University of Calgary

Background

- Physical inactivity is responsible for an estimated $6.8 billion of direct and indirect health care costs in Canada[1].
- The built environment, including access and quality of public open space, influences physical activity[2].
- Google Street View (GSV) is a feasible data source for auditing walkability[3] and recreational facilities[4] and is more efficient than foot audits[5,6].
- Few studies[7], however, have taken advantage of GSV to audit public open space and park-specific features that influence physical activity.

Objective

- To evaluate the feasibility, reliability, and validity of conducting virtual park audits using environmental park attribute data sourced from GSV.

Methods

- Parks (n=34) were purposively sampled from 11 neighbourhoods with differing socioeconomic status (low, low-medium, high-medium, and high) and urban form (grid-pattern, warped-grid, and curvilinear).
- The Public Open Space Tool (POST[8]; adapted to the Canadian context) was used to measure the micro-scale quality of parks.
- Two raters systematically audited parks using POST via GSV and Google Maps aerial image at two time points (ten days between each audit round).
  - Intra-rater reliability
    - Raters' combined GSV audit data was compared at time one and time two using Kappa coefficient, intraclass correlation (ICC) and percent of overall agreement (POA).
  - Inter-rater reliability
    - Raters' time two GSV audit data were compared together using Kappa coefficient, ICC and POA.

Results: Intra- and inter-rater reliability for GSV audits

	INTRA-RATER RELIABILTY		INTER-RATER RELIABILTY	
Variable	Percent overall agreement (%)	Kappa/ Intraclass correlation*	Percent of overall agreement (%)	Kappa/ Intraclass correlation
• Amount of formal entrances	`**	0.95	`	0.86
• Area type	86.8	0.73	52.9	0.21
ACTIVITY AREAS				
• Presence of a tennis court	100	1.00	100	1.00
• Presence of a soccer field	100	1.00	100	1.00
• Presence of a football field (rugby, gridiron)	98.6	0.66	97.1	`
• Presence of a skating/hockey rink	98.5	0.88	97.1	0.79
• Presence of a baseball diamond or cage	100	1.00	100	1.00
• Presence of a children's playground	98.5	0.97	100	1.00
• Presence of a skate park or ramps	98.5	`	100	`
• Presence of a dog exercise or off leash area	100	1.00	97.1	`
• Other areas present within the POS***	97.1	0.49	94.1	`
PATHS/SHADE/LIGHTING				
• No Presence of formal walking/cycle paths, sidewalks, in POS	94.1	0.64	100	1.00
• Presence of formal walking/cycle paths on the perimeter inside POS barrier/fence	89.7	0.78	88.3	0.75
• Presence of formal walking/cycle paths on the perimeter outside POS barrier/fence	95.6	0.88	94.1	0.85
• Presence of formal walking/cycle paths crossing through the POS	97.1	0.93	97.1	0.93
• Presence of other formal walking/cycling paths in the POS	97.1	`	100	`
• Amount of shade along formal paths	`	0.89	`	0.96
• No presence of informal walking/cycle paths in the POS	80.9	0.57	70.6	0.39
• Presence of informal walking/cycle paths on the perimeter inside POS barrier/fence	75	0.46	79.4	0.54
• Presence of informal walking/cycle paths on the perimeter outside POS barrier/fence	95.6	0.64	85.3	`
• Presence of informal walking/cycle paths crossing through the POS	79.4	0.59	67.6	0.35
• No Presence of lighting	92.7	0.84	85.3	0.67
• Presence of lighting located around courts, buildings, BBQ, and play equipment	97.1	0.87	97.1	0.87
• Presence of lighting located along paths	95.6	0.75	94.1	0.64
• Presence of lighting located on the perimeter all sides	98.6	0.66	100	1.00
• Presence of lighting located on the perimeter some sides	91.2	0.82	85.3	0.71
• Presence of lighting located randomly throughout	98.5	`	97.1	`
• Presence of lighting could not be determined	95.6	`	97.1	`
• Shade level around playground	`	0.97	`	0.96
PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT				
• Presence of any children's playground equipment	100	1.00	100	1.00
• No presence of play equipment	100	1.00	100	1.00
• Presence of swing/s	95.6	0.91	94.1	0.88
• Presence of slide/s	94.1	0.88	94.1	0.88
• Presence of climbing equipment	95.6	0.91	88.2	0.76
• Presence of hanging bars/rings	95.6	0.90	91.2	0.79
• Presence of seesaws/rockers	94.1	0.88	91.1	0.82
• Presence of bridges/tunnels	89.7	0.66	76.4	0.31
• Presence of activity panels	95.6	0.83	88.2	0.54
• Play equipment could not be determined	100	1.00	94.1	0.48
• Presence of fencing around playground	`	1.00	`	1.00
PLAYGROUND SURFACE				
• There is no playground surface because there is no playground	100	1.00	100	1.00
• Playground surface is sand	98.5	`	100	`
• Playground surface is rubber	98.5	0.79	94.1	`
• Playground surface is gravel or pebbles	94.1	0.88	95.3	0.69
• Playground surface could not be determined	97	0.65	91.2	`
AMENITIES				
• Presences of seating/benches	97	0.91	97	0.90
• Presence of drinking fountains	98.4	`	96.7	`
• Presence of public access toilets	98.4	0.88	93.5	`
• Full, restricted, or no access for dogs	`	0.94	`	0.66
• No water features present in, or immediately adjacent to, the POS	98.5	`	100	`
• No features present within the POS	97	0.91	94.1	0.82
• Presence of a transit stop located on perimeter of POS	98.6	0.90	97.1	0.79
• Presence of statues or monuments or sculptures	100	1.00	100	1.00
• Presence of a gazebo or rotunda	97.1	`	100	`
• Presence of gardens (landscaped)	95.6	0.78	79.4	`
• Presence of a pedestrian bridge	100	1.00	100	1.00
• Presence of picnic tables	97.1	0.93	97.1	0.93
• Presence of barbeques	100	1.00	97.1	`
• Presence of any other features	95.5	0.55	91.2	`
TREES				
• Estimate number of trees	`	0.73	`	0.30
• No applicable location for trees because there are no trees	97.1	`	94.1	`
• Trees are located on the perimeter at all sides of the POS	80.9	0.61	91.2	0.81
• Trees are located on the perimeter at some sides of the POS	72.1	0.44	82.3	0.65
• Trees are located along walking paths in the POS	92.7	0.72	85.3	0.47
• Trees are located randomly throughout the POS	70.6	0.32	58.8	0.10
INCIVILITIES				
• Presence of trash cans within, or along paths entering, the POS	95.6	0.87	97.1	0.92
• Number of trash cans provided within, or along paths entering, the POS	`	0.97	`	0.94
• Presence of graffiti	`	0.74	`	1.00
• Presence of vandalism	`	0.65	`	`
• Presence of litter	`	0.63	`	`
• Amount of house frontage that connects with POS	`	0.94	`	0.32

Any variables that were not identified by rater 1 or 2 were excluded from table
* = Kappa coefficient was used for categorical variable. Intraclass correlation was used for ordinal variables, or nominal variables that had more than two response options
** = ` = Cannot be estimated
*** = POS = Public open space

Results

- *Intra-rater reliability* for the aerial image audits was poor to excellent (POA = 83.8% - 100% and kappa/ICC = 0.31-1.00).
- *Inter-rater reliability* of the aerial image audits showed agreement ranging from poor to excellent (POA = 50%-100% and kappa/ICC = 0.28-1.00).
- *Concurrent validity* of GSV compared to aerial image audits ranged from very poor to excellent (POA = 63%-100% and kappa/ICC = 0.12-1.00).
- GSV audits took an average of **13±4** minutes, while aerial image audits took **7±2** minutes to complete.

Conclusions

- GSV is a potentially reliable and valid method for conducting park audits, with the majority of the audited variables having good to excellent intra- and inter-rater agreement, as well as concurrent validity with aerial image audits.
- GSV audit times in this study were comparable to other studies'[6] supporting the feasibility of using GSV for park audits.

References

1. Janssen I. (2012). Health care costs of physical inactivity in Canadian adults. Apply Physiol Nutr Me, 37(4): 803–806.
2. Kaczynski AT, et al. (2007). Environmental Correlates of Physical Activity: A Review of Evidence about Parks and Recreation. Leisure Sci, 29(4): 315–354.
3. Rundle AG, et al. (2011). Using Google Street View to Audit Neighborhood Environments. Am J Prev Med, 40(1): 94–100.
4. Clarke P, et al. (2010). Using Google Earth to Conduct a Neighborhood Audit: Reliability of a Virtual Audit Instrument. Health Place, 16(6): 1224–1229.
5. Badland HM, et al. (2010). Can virtual streetscape audits reliably replace physical streetscape audits? J Urban Health, 87(6): 1007-1016.
6. Edwards N, et al. (2013). Development of a Public Open Space Desktop Auditing Tool (POSDAT): A remote sensing approach. Appl Geogr, 38(0): 22-30.
7. Taylor BT, et al. (2011). Measuring the Quality of Public Open Space Using Google Earth. Am J Prev Med, 40(2): 105–112.
8. Broomhall M, et al. (2004). Quality of Public Open Space Tool (POST). Perth, Western Australia: School of Population Health, The University of Western Australia.

Acknowledgment

Rhianne H. Fiolka is funded by the O'Brien Centre Summer Studentship from the BHSc program.
Ally Gordey is also acknowledged for her contribution for data collection.