



Waite, D., Whyte, B. and Muirie, J. (2020) From an agreeable policy label to a practical policy framework: Inclusive growth in city-regions. *European Planning Studies*, 28(9), pp. 1812-1835. (doi: [10.1080/09654313.2019.1691507](https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2019.1691507))

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/201113/>

Deposited on 18 October 2019

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

From an agreeable policy label to a practical policy framework: Inclusive growth in city-regions

David Waite – University of Glasgow – david.waite@glasgow.ac.uk (corresponding author)

Bruce Whyte – Glasgow Centre for Population Health – bruce.whyte@glasgow.ac.uk

Jill Muirie – Glasgow Centre for Population Health - jill.muirie@glasgow.ac.uk

Word count (excluding references): 8400

Inclusive growth is a label increasingly deployed as the uneven consequences of growth are brought sharply into view. Whilst numerous policy transfer agents are shaping policy diagnoses and suggesting indicator dashboards, conceptualisations of inclusive growth remain markedly varied. Proposing some foundations, this paper argues that capabilities enables a pluralistic and agent-centred view of place-based change to be developed. In order to apply this perspective to a particular policy context, the paper outlines steps to develop an inclusive growth framework – taking the starting perspective of an “evaluability assessment” - to inform the monitoring and evaluation of a large urban infrastructure project. Questions about the benefits that existing communities may experience from the development come to the fore in this framing.

Section 1 – Introduction

Inclusive Growth is a label drawing policy (OECD, 2018; European Commission, 2010) and academic attention (Lee, 2018; Trullén and Galletto, 2018; Sissons et al., 2018). The policy focus on inclusive growth has emerged as a result of persistent socio-economic patterns appearing in many contexts (pre- and post the global financial crisis (Lee, 2018: 2-3) – the

continuing bypassing of certain population groups from the processes of, and the rewards derived from, economic growth. Allied to this new lines of debate are emerging about what sustains growth. Running against assumptions that there is an inevitable trade-off between economic growth and equality, national (Berg et al., 2012) and metro-level analyses (Benner and Pastor, 2015b) give support to the notion that lower levels of income inequality are positively related to longer growth periods.

A broad literature, explicitly or implicitly connected, supports the research focus on inclusive growth. Panoptic assessments (Piketty, 2014; Atkinson et al., 2011) and commentaries (Stiglitz, 2013), which show patterns of capital and investment privileging elite groups, have punctuated the public imagination over recent years. At the same time, nationally specific research suggests that economic growth appears insufficient in and of itself to reduce poverty (Lee et al., 2014; Lee and Sissons, 2016).ⁱ Urban and local development literatures give further framing (Chapple, 2018), with notions of justice and the Just City (Fainstein, 2010; 2018); the New Urban Crisis (Florida, 2017); and long-running claims for a “right to the city” (Purcell, 2013) exemplifying - through varying normative frames - how urban governance and politics are, or should be, shaped by issues of social division. Such research taken together raises alarm about the perverse distributional effects that growth-focused approaches can create, and, because of this, the risks of widening divides within metropolitan areas (Benner and Pastor, 2015a).

As a response to the considerations and re-emphases emerging, inclusive growth is being considered as an input to, or a framing for, a wide range of policy activities (Lee, 2018). At the multi-lateral level, for instance, the OECD have centred inclusive growth as a policy concern (OECDa, 2016), whilst the World Bank, the World Economic Forum and the Asian Development Bank have all signalled relevant work interests (e.g. Hansen, 2010). With national audiences in mind, the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program in the US (through

an “inclusive growth index” (Shearer et al., 2018)), and the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) and the Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (RSA) in the UK, represent concerted interest groups. At sub-national levels, buy-in and adoption of the agenda is perhaps more variable, though this is rapidly evolving (WMCA, 2018).

Despite having a simple core concern – connecting previously excluded groups to the processes and rewards from growth - the concept of inclusive growth becomes muddier when we consider how growth and inclusion do and should pair up. For policymakers seeking to address inclusive growth – and at a somewhat more fundamental level than analytical choices around composite indicatorsⁱⁱ or dashboardsⁱⁱⁱ - there is not a simple a priori stance that steers policy frameworks and models. Nevertheless, we may ask a series of questions to clarify what inclusive growth means for a particular context. On the one hand, are we focusing on how we ensure growth benefits wider groups or are we considering how to optimise redistributive mechanisms given original maldistribution from growth (ex-ante considerations or ex-post outcomes)? Additionally, are we talking about processes for directing growth policies and who are involved in shaping these policies; and are we seeking new forms and sources of growth that are intrinsically more inclusive and sustainable (rejecting the existing growth model, at least to some degree)? Moreover, are there thresholds of tolerance, in terms of both growth and inclusion levels and rates of change, where different normative and political positions rest or rely upon at certain points? These are long-running issues, central to economic development, and are arguably far from new (in the early 2000s, the UK Treasury spoke of linking competitiveness with cohesiveness (Turok and Bailey, 2004)). In other words, one risk with the inclusive growth agenda as broadly specified, at present (Lee, 2018), is that it risks spawning anything goes policymaking. We argue instead that inclusive growth, as a concept, needs to have inviolable underpinnings: one, policies and strategies must have a

focus on distributional consequences (in terms of resources and capabilities); two, impacted citizens and communities must have an ability to input into policies and strategies.

Space and geography present further challenges in conceptualising inclusive growth. At the intra-national level, we may show concern for disparities in development outcomes across places (from the “rust belt” in the US (Hobor, 2013) to the “north-south divide” in the UK (Pike et al., 2016; Tyler et al., 2017)); at the city-region or metropolitan level, it is a concern for the competing fortunes of different places, from suburbs to town-centres; at the neighbourhood level, meanwhile – and as a drop-down from the metro-level - efforts are typically targeted to areas and neighbourhoods showing acute and persistent deprivation (McGregor and Fitzpatrick, 1995). Across these layers, different policy levers and capacities to act exist. How well these policy layers can and do cohere has not been extensively considered it would appear, yet present fundamental questions about policy cohesiveness (Benner and Pastor, 2011).

The paper distinctively contributes to the literature by, first, presenting a view of inclusive growth at an intervention level. Indeed, in presenting an operational perspective on the concept of inclusive growth, this paper views the growth-distribution nexus from the perspective of a particular infrastructure investment project, as warranted by the mix of objectives attached to the intervention. Along with other UK cities, Glasgow exhibits stark intra-urban divides in terms of deprivation profiles (Scottish Government, 2016a), and this research focuses on a policy initiative that seeks to make steps to address this. More particularly, looking ahead to possible outcomes ex-ante - rather than viewing effects ex-post - the paper adopts the broad lens of an “evaluability assessment” (Craig and Campbell, 2015; Brunner et al., 2017; Youtie et al., 1999; Davies and Payne, 2015). This asks how would we consider, and monitor and evaluate an intervention that will produce outcomes in the future, and what data may be required for this. Secondly, the paper advances the argument that the

capabilities approach provides strong foundations for considering inclusive growth outcomes and the indicators that assess them. Challenges with operationalising a capabilities perspective have previously been noted in the literature. Indeed, Alkire (2005: 129) has remarked: “We [talked] of the need for the capability approach to become user friendly so it is not left behind by frustrated practitioners ... But we left off having explored the bewildering breadth and dexterity of the capability approach. Operationalization may well be more art than science.”

As will be outlined in more detail later in the paper, the case hinges on a central inclusive growth problematic: the capabilities of an existing population that records high relative deprivation, to withstand and benefit from a large-scale regeneration project. In taking such a perspective, the paper argues that the spatial context and nature of the policy or intervention must be laid bare in order to clarify an appropriate approach to consider inclusive growth. In other words, the approach to inclusive growth given in this paper will differ from those that give a snapshot of a place at a particular point in time, reflecting the idea that the nature of the urban problem shapes the appropriate definition and framing. In looking at small areas, moreover, the paper directs attention to urban dynamics that have been explored in wider literatures on neighbourhood: systems (Galster, 2001) effects (Van Ham and Manley; 2012; Maclennan, 2013), change (Grigsby et al., 1983), and social mixing (Lees, 2008; Lupton and Fuller, 2009); plus housing systems (Maclennan and Tu, 1996; O’Sullivan and Gibb, 2003).

The empirical context brought into focus in this paper reflects a major capital infrastructure project at a brownfields site adjacent to central Glasgow (Scotland, UK). The Canal and North project is funded in part by a unique mechanism – the City Deal – which, hinging on a tripartite arrangement, is sponsored by the UK Government the Scottish Government (a devolved administration in the UK) and involves eight local authorities (each providing a funding commitment) (HM Government, 2014). The mechanism is novel in that it sets out

gateway evaluation periods, through to 2029, at which success and progress will be measured by the UK and Scottish Governments (the scope for the first gateway in 2019 is being prepared).^{iv} As we will discuss below, given the UK and Scottish governments take different views on deal-based success and progress (Scottish Parliament Communities and Local Government Committee, 2018a: 20), a current example is provided to test the tractability of inclusive growth as a development outcome. Figure 1 provides a schematic, positioning the inclusive growth problem within this particular urban policy mechanism.

The contribution of this paper, looking forward to the potential inclusive growth outcomes from an infrastructure project, sits within a wider and historically extensive literature charting urban regeneration and policy approaches in Glasgow and the wider city-region (Donnison, 1987; Maclellan et al., 2018; Pacione, 1995, 2009; Hall, 1975; McCarthy and Pollock, 1997). Such policy approaches, through the pursuit of major events and cultural strategies, coupled with major institutional changes (such as in housing), aimed at changing socio-economic profiles and public health outcomes *inter alia* (Wannop, 1986; Boyle and Hughes, 1994; Paton, 2009; MacLeod, 2002; Gray and Porter, 2014; Gray and Mooney, 2011; Christie and Gibb, 2015; Clark and Kearns, 2016; Gómez, 1998; Kearns and Whitley, 2018; Gibb, 2003; Kearns and Lawson, 2008). This provides an archive, to some extent, of inclusive growth as an implicit meta-theme for urban and regeneration policy – as a response to de-industrialisation - in and across the conurbation.

The methodology for developing the evaluability assessment – which comes at a point where funding for the project is committed and where construction activity is underway - hinges on the review of publicly available documents, notably reports presented to the city-region Cabinet, that provide an overview of project rationales and objectives. Included within these documents is outline evaluation work prepared for the City Deal, which informed the authors' thinking on an inclusive growth sensitive theory of change.^v The fullness of the documentary

evidence base was clarified in a small number of discussions with policymakers and stakeholders in late-2016. From this point, an inclusive growth framework – as delineated in section 4 – was worked up. The framework, which has been initially reported to city-region policymakers in a reduced form, provides a starting point for iterating an evaluability assessment based on further dialogue and engagement with stakeholders. The approach taken at this next stage should continue to draw on existing evaluability assessment guidance but will, to some extent, be novel and appropriate to the context, given the limited examples of applications at an intervention (as opposed to policy programme) level.

The paper proceeds, in section 2, to argue that to frame the diversity of outcomes that may be sought and valued from an inclusive growth perspective, a capabilities framework gives a viable foundation. Section 3 then lays out the policy context for inclusive growth in Glasgow and Scotland, before outlining the particular case project. Section 4 sets out the evaluability of the case project, and does this across a series of steps, from identifying the inclusive growth problematic to generating data at small geographic areas to gauge appropriate responses. Section 5 offers reflections and conclusions on the approach and framework presented.

[insert figure 1 about here]

Section 2 – Capabilities as a framework for inclusive growth

Given the breadth of phenomena that inclusive growth encompasses, we need some orienting concept to secure a view on inclusive growth. That is, it is incumbent on the researcher to set out the basis for why in evaluating development dynamics certain socio-economic outcomes are necessary or instructive. For the purposes of this paper, we argue that an inclusive growth framework proposed can be helpfully underpinned by a capabilities approach. Indeed,

capabilities provides principles yet a flexibility in the nature of development outcome sought that permits the multi-faceted objectives of inclusive growth to be considered.

Relevant to the urban perspective adopted in this paper, Fainstein (2010: 54) considers capabilities to be instructive in terms of devising “rules that can govern the evaluation of urban policy”, whilst efforts to frame a Human Development Report for Greater Manchester shares the conceptual framing (Rubery et al., 2018). In the US context, moreover, one study has attempted to apply capabilities to a local policy initiative concerning arts and culture provision in Philadelphia (Zitcer et al., 2016), whilst Tovar and Bourdeau-Lepage (2013) apply capabilities to give a view of the differentiated socio-spatial characteristics of wellbeing in Paris, France. In the aforementioned contributions, capabilities offers a new lens to frame desired development outcomes, moving to include broader notions of equity and sustainability, in parity with or acting as a check on, objectives for economic growth. Additionally, whilst capabilities is a staple for conceptualising development in the global south, the conceptual orientation is pertinent to a wider range of geographic contexts (Sen, 1999: 6).

With origins in the work of Sen and Nussbaum, a capabilities approach centres on the opportunities for a target population to exercise freedoms and make choices, and then what functionings (“beings and doings”) they are able to pursue (Robeyns, 2005: 95; 2016a). Robeyns (2005: 94) notes: “The core characteristic of the capability approach is its focus on what people are effectively able to do and to be; that is, on their capabilities”. Brunner and Watson (2015: 5) remark furthermore: “wellbeing is evaluated in terms of how people are able to live and it enables an analysis of the ‘actual opportunities a person has’ (Sen, 2009: 253) for example in health, in education or in community engagement”. The capabilities approach has been progressed in development economics, particularly by those interested in assessing socio-economic progress beyond headline output indicators (there are “beyond

GDP” initiatives, for example)^{vi}. However, whilst distinguishing the means and ends of well-being is central to capabilities, economic considerations clearly remain central to Sen’s version of capabilities, where he notes: “... inadequate income is a strong predisposing condition for an impoverished life” (Sen, 1999: 87). With the Capabilities approach taking a view of development as fundamentally rooted in what people are able to be and do – rather than exclusively their claim to resources - the approach now sits at the heart of the human development approach.

However, the conception of opportunities for beings and doings central to capabilities presents challenges, and the two seminal authors in the literature present some differences. For Sen, capabilities are fundamentally about agency (also see Robeyns, 2016b) – what people choose to be and then do (based on what they value) (Baujard and Gilardone, 2017). For Nussbaum, criteria – indeed a list - needs to be satisfied to achieve a minimally just life. These “central human capabilities” are: “life; bodily health; bodily integrity; senses, imagination and thought; emotions; practical reason; affiliation; other species; play; and control over one's environment” (Nussbaum, 2006: 76-78). Sen in contrast, rejects, or has at least avoided to date, “one pre-determined canonical list” of capabilities (Sen, 2005: 158).

Challenges emerge, furthermore, in taking Nussbaum’s criteria to offer an application to a particular empirical context and there is alignment here with the wider views of Robeyns (2003) and Alkire (2005), who note that the relevance of capabilities should be determined according to particular uses in “specific field[s] and place[s]” (Neilsen and Axelsen, 2017: 50). Indeed capabilities such as a concern for “other species” somewhat rest on policy set out beyond the case context presented in this paper. When we consider the role of education, and the possibilities for this to be advanced through a new school (“Sighthill Community Campus”)^{vii} provided by the Canal and North Gateway development, however, other capabilities relevant to reason and thought fall into view perhaps. “Affiliation”, one of

Nussbaum's central capabilities - defined as "being able to live with and toward others, to recognise and show concern for other human beings ... being able to be treated as a dignified being whose worth is equal to that of others" (Nussbaum, 2006: 77) – is perhaps a key concern given the socio-economic changes pertinent to the case context.

Furthermore, the notion of "converters" ("personal", "social" and "environmental") considers the transition of various resources into functionings (Robeyns, 2005: 99). This has traction with the case context in terms of thinking through the differential ability of citizens to convert new assets and public facilities – for example, parks and cycle routes – into wellbeing enhancing activities and functionings. In essence, and in exemplifying the concern for human diversity, those with good physical health may be able to take advantage of new active travel infrastructure, however, those with limiting health conditions may find little gain. Wider debates in the literature concern the appropriate identification of capabilities or functions as core to particular instances of well-being (Robeyns, 2016a; 2005: 101).

The capabilities literature – particularly in Sen's account (Sen, 2005; Baujard and Gilardone, 2017) - gives scope for local communities to put weights on what opportunities and activities are most important, thus enabling some perspective on the relative hierarchy of social, health, environmental and economic factors (Robeyns, 2016a). This perhaps is the key link between capabilities and inclusive growth; it brings to the centre-ground the need for community voice and "public reasoning" in determining what a successful or good development would entail (Sen, 2005). Ultimately, capabilities avoids imposing a singular or pre-given normative vision (Robeyns, 2016a); rather, it offers "a broad normative framework" (Robeyns, 2005: 94) and it is up to those affected by or subject to the development to determine what they want and value from it. In the case context in focus in this paper, consultation has been undertaken with communities through planning for the Sighthill part of the project particularly. With various fora taking place – it has been noted that the project has been

“developed collaboratively with stakeholders through extensive partnership working”^{viii} by Glasgow City Council - though whether the project constitutes development with the community or development to the community may warrant further reflection and evidence over time (Pill, 2018). As construction activity proceeds, this consultation will need to be maintained and efforts to avoid tokenistic approaches must be stressed. A community forum, that helps to design the evaluation of inclusive growth - perhaps placing weights on the metrics set out in the aforementioned framework - may, as discussed below, be useful in pointing policy officials to what policies and initiatives need to go alongside to support the infrastructure project (Youtie et al., 1999).

Finally, emerging work on capability sufficiency offers guidance to consider the distributional logics presented by different capabilities (Nielsen and Axelsen, 2017), and seeks to strike a balance between the Sen and Nussbaum view. Key to the sufficiency perspective is that different categories of capabilities possess different distributional logics in terms of social justice. This acknowledges the incommensurability of different capabilities, and suggests that for some capabilities relative distribution amongst a population is important, while for others it is the absolute level that is important (above a threshold). The former connects to considerations of inclusive growth where concern is given for inequality within a group as being, in and of itself, socially corrosive. For example, societal status – where people may be seen to be of more or lesser worth – is pertinent (Nielsen and Axelsen, 2017: 54). Here, capabilities for one group within a population erodes capabilities for another group. For other provisions, such as housing, having provision above a threshold (in quality or quantity in some form) is perhaps more critical than the nature of the provision relative to the wider group. However, this taxonomy between relative and absolute capability status must be open to interactions; in other words, might relatively poor quality housing, even if above a threshold level, impact societal status (suggesting a limit on tolerable inequality over

a threshold)? With these considerations - coupled with the fundamental role of local dialogue - we have some steer for moving to a position on the weighting of capabilities for a local context.

Section 3 – Policy Contexts

Inclusive growth has been positioned at the centre of the Scottish Government's policy focus. With powers devolved from the UK Government in areas of housing, local government, health and transport (though not in equal measure) - and more recently tax and welfare - the administration in Edinburgh has sought to set out a distinctive and contrastive approach to policymaking. In the Scottish Government's economic strategy released in 2015, inclusive growth emerged in equal standing to competitiveness as a policy focus (Scottish Government, 2015). Adding a further backcloth, Scotland's position within the UK has recently been contested (with an independence referendum held), though the focus on inclusion is seen not to be diminished. The First Minister noted:

“If you remember just one word from my speech today, I want it to be this one.

It begins with an ‘I’. No, not that one! Not yet. The word I want you to remember is this - inclusion. Inclusion is the guiding principle for everything we do. It encapsulates what we stand for as a party and it describes the kind of country we want Scotland to be. An inclusive country. A country where everyone has the opportunity to contribute to a better future and to share in the benefits of that better future.” (SNP, 2016)

The following year, the First Minister sought to position her government at the agenda's vanguard, suggesting inclusive growth had morphed from a “niche” interest into a mainstream policy concern (Scottish Government, 2017a). Following strategy pieces - such

as the Agenda for Cities (Scottish Government, 2016b) and the Skills and Enterprise Review (Scottish Government, 2017b) – seek to strengthen the position of inclusive growth within policymaking in Scotland, as do proposed revisions to the National Performance Framework (Scottish Parliament Communities and Local Government Committee, 2018b) and the Fairer Scotland Duty (Scottish Government, 2018a).

Operationalising inclusive growth has and is proving to be a challenge, as in all contexts arguably. The Scottish Government’s approach to date has been based on a diagnostic approach. Taking inspiration from a broader literature in macroeconomics (Hausmann et al., 2005), the diagnostic approach seeks to focus policy to address the most significant constraint on a system. In the Scottish Government’s application, and utilising both desk based methods and consultative approaches, the work endeavours to find factors that are significant growth constraints (and can be evidenced as such), while doing the same for inclusion factors. An assessment is then made for “sustainability” and a consideration given to trade-offs and synergies. The factors are then considered for what policy leverage there is over the factor (is it within the control, to varying degrees, of policymakers?) and political will (North Ayrshire Council, 2017).

Despite the steps made by the Scottish Government, questions remain in what is ultimately an experimental methodology (Fraser of Allander Institute, 2018). Notably, the diagnostic work gives a snapshot of the constraints facing a locality at a point in time. For example, the inter-relationships between growth and inclusion factors and the melding of quantitative analysis with qualitative weighting warrant further consideration. Second, the diagnostic work leaves open the issue of how we understand how existing policies and strategies may or may not be contributing to inclusive growth (and how we deal with the different gestation effects of policy, where impacts are staggered). This paper changes the lens on inclusive growth by

asking the question – how can we understand if a particular infrastructure and regeneration project has contributed to inclusive growth objectives at a locality?

To introduce the capital investment project that forms the case study of this paper, Canal and North Gateway attempts to remediate and encourage development in an area just north of the city centre. Prior to this regeneration activity taking place, the Sighthill area - often stigmatised by the media (Kearns et al., 2013) - had been dominated by a highly contaminated derelict area, which was once occupied by a major chemical plant, whilst multi-story residential tower blocks, now demolished, were in place. Perceptions of change to this area have been recorded in GoWell research, highlighting the perspective of refugee communities and responses to housing change and moves out of the area (Kearns and Darling, 2013). Regeneration for the area has been proposed for a long period, and a previous council leader noted: “Let’s not kid ourselves. This is an area that has been going downhill for many years” (Matheson cited in Leslie, 2015). The Sighthill area reflected one of the city council’s Transformational Regeneration Areas, whilst previous initiatives, such as Glasgow’s bid to host the Youth Olympics, had also been linked to the area’s re-development.^{ix} The regeneration activity taking place is hailed by the council as the “biggest such project in the UK outside of London”.^x

Existing residents at the Sighthill site in 141 homes managed by the Glasgow Housing Association (a registered social landlord)^{xi}, will be joined by a population occupying new housing (628 for sale, 198 for mid-market rent^{xii}); this, as will be explained below, points to a fundamental inclusive growth issue. New commercial space is also proposed across the City Deal intervention area (spreading to Cowlares, Spiers Lock and Port Dundas), and transport infrastructure in the form of walking (a bridge across the motorway) and road connections will be provided (The Planner, 2018). New public spaces also form a key feature of the masterplanning.^{xiii} Table 1 gives a broad overview of the project. Council documentation

(August 2015) sets out the aim of the project as follows: “Promote sustainable economic growth through regenerating the Canal and North Gateway as a dynamic integrated mixed-use new city neighbourhood that is a focus for cultural industries, connected to the city centre and centred on a vibrant ‘Canal Quarter’.”^{xiv}

The development or intervention area (Canal and North) is differentiated in that Sighthill, in the east, has a dominant residential focus, whilst Spiers Lock, in the west, is positioned to support the cultural industries and host student housing (coupled with non-deprived residential areas already in place). The Port Dundas development framework suggests a shift to a mixed use quarter, furthermore, a move away from the dominant industrial heritage of the area (Glasgow City Council, 2016). For some, such developments and creative-led visions, show the seeds for gentrification are already sewn and are about to take hold (Gray, 2018).

The project forms part of the Glasgow city-region City Deal – the deal covers 20 infrastructure projects across the city-region amounting to £1.13 billion^{xv} - and projects were appraised, it is claimed, to support those that will produce the highest economic output and jobs growth. However, programme “minima” was inserted into the modelling to “focus on benefiting socially deprived areas (as measured by an above average increase to employment opportunities in the lowest 25% of SIMD^{xvi} data zones) ... the fund is targeted at both increasing the income earned by people living in socially-deprived areas and in narrowing the gap in participation across the Glasgow City Region geography”.^{xvii}

Evaluation and monitoring was not put in place at the time the City Deal was agreed nor when the projects (within the deal) were selected. With steps being made now through a national panel appointed by the UK Government – which will inform evaluation decisions at 5-year gateway periods - there is nevertheless an interesting situation presented. Indeed, as

evidenced in the Scottish Parliament Local Government and Communities Committee review of City Deals (2018a: 20), the UK and Scottish Governments hold different views of success and progress; indeed the UK Government sees success in terms of narrowly conceived economic growth, while the Scottish Government will adopt an inclusive growth lens. As a consequence, whilst the national panel, convened by the UK Government, will attempt to report on initial growth effects at the first gateway assessment in 2019 (reflecting their remit to date),^{xviii} inclusion considerations may not be comprehensively dealt with. This leaves open the question of how the Scottish Government's inclusive growth interests will be covered, and we argue that it is appropriate to consider this at latter gateways, from 2024, given the time required for change from the development activities to emerge.

[Insert table 1 about here]

A further consideration is timing. In essence, the City Deal was signed in 2014, but the Scottish Government's "inclusive growth" thrust did not emerge until 2015. Arguably, however, this is a somewhat nugatory point given the programme minima in the appraisal work (as noted above), and the fact that the City Deal document notes on the first page (under aims and objectives) that interventions will: "spread the benefits of economic growth across Glasgow and Clyde Valley, ensuring deprived areas benefit from this growth" (HM Government, 2014). If not by label, the ethos of inclusive growth is surely captured. Furthermore, and following the initial modelling and commitments, the business case for Canal and North seeks to tackle "persistent multiple deprivation" and address "fragmented communities".^{xix} Providing further context, regional planning frameworks which ultimately set out desirable outcomes from regeneration activities, albeit in broad terms, refer to "improved health and wellbeing" and "reducing inequality" through "sustainable", "low carbon", "resilient" and "connected" objectives (Clydeplan, 2017: 9).

In summary, the background to the selection of projects within the City Deal, coupled with the aims of the particular project - which seeks to regenerate a derelict site that hosts some of the most deprived small areas in Glasgow - suggests a framework to understand the inclusive growth impacts of the infrastructure project would be useful. Put in terms of a theory of change, the outputs in Table 1 need to be considered in terms of the inclusive growth outcomes that may emerge.

Section 4 - Inclusive Growth through the lens of project evaluation and monitoring

Having set out the policy context and having identified capabilities as a way of conceptually accounting for the plural outcomes necessary to consider inclusive growth, the following discussion looks at how a case project may be evaluated or monitored. The approach set out adopts the lens of an “evaluability assessment”, considering, across a series of steps, how inclusive growth can be considered in terms of the future outputs and outcomes stemming from the infrastructure investment (Craig and Campbell, 2015).

As a first step, to operationalise inclusive growth at the local and intervention area level, it is suggested that an inclusive growth problem needs to be identified. In essence, inclusive growth can cover a vast array of factors and it will be implausible to consider all relative to one intervention. To operationalise inclusive growth, the factors have to be linked - directly or indirectly - to the infrastructure project (and thus the theory of change) and be relevant to the two inviolable conditions previously set out in section 1 (distributional consequences and citizen inputs). In this case context, given the stated aims and nature of the project, the inclusive growth problem can be presented as follows: To what extent will existing residents, who exhibit high deprivation characteristics, benefit from the re-development taking place? This problematic rests in the local context being addressed and the potential perversity of

primarily changing and re-developing a place by inserting a new population (also see OECD, 2016b: 13).

Robson et al's (2008; 2009) typology of deprived neighbourhoods - based on "in" and "out" movers and their origins and destinations – provides a heuristic to consider the potential nature of change at the development site. Permitting an answer to the question of "what kinds of poor neighbourhoods do we have in the city" (Hughes and Lupton, 2018: 7), the typology recognises the different functions of neighbourhoods within an urban area: for example, do places serve as first entry points on the housing market for a population group; do places host older or younger population groups; are housing tenures mixed or uniform? (Robson et al., 2008; Hughes and Lupton, 2018). The "ideal types" set out by the authors are "transit", "escalator", "gentrifier" (or "improver") and "isolate" neighbourhoods (Robson et al., 2008: 2697), and, of these, the transit and gentrifier/improver categories appear to be the most relevant to this paper. In the transit type, in-movers come from and out-movers go to less deprived neighbourhoods relative to the focus neighbourhood, and hinge on transitory populations (reflecting, for instance, a first move onto the housing ladder for younger persons from affluent households with initially constrained resources (Robson et al., 2008: 2698)). In terms of gentrifier/improver types, in-movers originate from less deprived areas, while out-movers head to similar or more deprived neighbourhoods. Of course concerns about gentrification – as an almost conscious process that results in the displacement of poorer households - have spawned a wide literature (Lees, 2008; Davidson, 2009), and the alleged pitfalls and merits of such change remain sources of vigorous debate (Meltzer and Ghorbani, 2015; Freeman, 2005; Hwang and Sampson, 2014). The perceived relevance of the two aforementioned types reflects the fact that bringing a site back into use, that is close to the city-centre - which will involve substantial new private housing - is likely to support economic growth (narrowly conceived). Indeed Glasgow has a modestly growing population,

there is a demand for housing and commercial space and the development site is next to the largest employment centre in the city-region. However, if that growth emerges at the expense of or with little benefit to the existing population in Sighthill (who are highly deprived) can inclusive growth be claimed? Further to the transit and gentrifier/improver categorisations, it is conceivable that the development dynamics may also feature “escalator” qualities – which is marked by a path of “continuous onward and upward progression” (Robson, 2008: 2698) - if we consider what happens to the existing population of Sighthill, who have already moved from the site, but may come back to the site at a future point (this scenario is uncertain to the authors at this point). The varied set of potential moves in and out of the development area reflects the marked change that the development process at Canal and North may produce.

Figure 2, below, sets out the basic inclusive growth problem and points to the need to focus on both the existing population that stays in the development area, and the existing population that moves (relative to the characteristics of the incoming population) (Lupton and Fuller, 2009). Additionally, consideration will need to be given to capability-linked indicator levels and relative positions vis-à-vis the new population.

[insert figure 2 about here]

Linking to a capabilities perspective, figure 2 gives scope, moreover, to take a nuanced stance on displacement, and its spatial forms. Through the schematic, displacement can be considered in terms of a physical move – as communities are unable or unwilling to sustain residence at a location due to the location’s changing nature - and displacement from a site even where they continue to reside there for the time being (Davidson, 2009; Davidson and Lees, 2010). The latter refers to the distance and barriers faced by existing communities to participate in communities that have drastically or quickly changed around them (despite

their continued presence at a place) (Shaw and Hagemans, 2015). In context of this paper, displacement as reflected by a physical move will be shaped and minimised, to some degree, by the continuing presence of social rented housing managed by the registered social landlord at the development site.

Having established the key inclusive growth problematic in the context of this case study, the next step is to specify how the problematic will be assessed. There are crudely two options to consider here. First, a “narrow” perspective simply reflects integrating populations into the labour market more effectively – in essence, it is inclusion within the existing growth model (human-capital interactions). A “broader” perspective calls into question the sufficiency and desirability of the existing growth model, and suggests social, health and environmental factors should be given weight alongside economic growth (connecting to a capabilities perspective on development). Ultimately the narrow or broad framings reflect different normative framings and policy foci (see, for the broad approach, RSA Inclusive Growth Commission, 2017). Though this binary approach perhaps obscures a continuum of options to frame inclusive growth - through which a wide range of categories could be proposed - it has heuristic value in setting out a view of inclusive growth constrained to economic growth, and a view of wider outcomes of concern alongside economic growth. Within these two choices, there is then the need to distinguish the existing population from the new population, to capture the problematic presented above. In taking either the narrow or broad view on inclusive growth, the next step in the evaluability assessment is to devise an appropriate set of metrics by which to marshal existing data sets and/or generate surveys.

We set out a list of proposed metrics, at table 2, with indicators given under four categories (accommodating the broad view above) – economic; social cohesion; health and environmental – which in turn link to Nussabaum’s core capabilities. In terms of the economic factors, this reflects considerations core to the project business case. Indeed, by

redeveloping land north of the city centre, and by providing scope for workplaces at the development site, it is hoped residents can attain employment, perhaps in higher paying occupations (of course, for the existing population, the capital project may require additional interventions to support such shifts). Social cohesion, relates to the role of developing educated citizens and the desire for positive interactions to emerge between citizens in the area. The Sighthill community campus is a place based feature relevant to this, though so are wider informal interactions. Health links to key wellbeing considerations for the population, and are particularly important in the Glasgow context given long running public health challenges. Environmental factors reflect, more directly, the physical changes brought about by the redevelopment, and how this may shape daily life practices.

Table 2 engenders important conceptual questions about development outcomes. First, an approach predicated on a capabilities framework presents, at its core, a view of development where growth factors are placed in balance with other considerations. Though previously cited monitors are clearly useful, we argue that a capabilities approach gives firmer foundations for indicator selection. Capabilities also suggests a different reading or interpretation is required of indicator lists; as discussed in section 2, different capabilities may have different distributional logics that require absolute levels or relative positions to be satisfied (this needs to be considered empirically, rather than purely a priori). Capabilities underscores the need, moreover, to grapple with context and the development processes experienced in particular places.

Second, the table raises questions about people versus place effects. Whilst the distinction is analytically important, so is resisting attempts to suggest all indicators can be allocated in terms of a clean binary. In the context of this project, consideration needs to be given to the limited nature of the intervention (what the project achieves as opposed to other interventions and policies having effect) and the porosity of the area within the wider urban system (that is,

for work and many other reasons, people move in and out of the development area).

Somewhat unambiguously, environmental principles are inextricably linked to indicators of place, however, issues pertaining to education may point to issues of place (e.g. school quality) while others reflect people concerns more obviously (e.g. educational attainment). In terms of employment, and hinging on the scope of evaluation research that can be undertaken, data may be usefully collected from residents on jobs taken at the site and in the city centre, and jobs taken elsewhere.

When considering the application of table 2, moreover, a series of technical and process considerations need to be given to the data sets assembled. First, the aforementioned categories and metrics point, in some instances, to data where changes may be observable shortly after the completion of the project (reflecting an output in the theory of change). In other instances, metrics will reflect social processes that are much more path dependent and entrenched. Second, the framework does not escape the traditional evaluation challenges associated with spillovers and exogenous factors. In terms of the latter, changes to economic welfare brought about by the development will still be contingent on UK and Scotland-wide taxation and welfare approaches inter alia, whilst the demand-side of the Glasgow metropolitan economy will continue to shape the “more and better jobs” gap, for example (Pike et al., 2017); in essence, and as signalled prior, project impacts are limited and may hinge on other interventions. As concerns spillovers, some measure of the attenuation of benefits and costs brought about by the development to consider the impacts on neighbouring residents would be useful (see, for example, Leishman and Watkins, 2017). Context again matters here, and the severances imposed by major roads bounding the development area, may restrict the spatial scope of spillovers.

Third, data availability is a key issue. Statistics for small data zones in Scotland do not provide a view on the many socio-economic indicators you would want to track to build a

view on inclusive growth. Table 1 sets out the “intermediate” zones (2011) that give a best approximation for the intervention area. Given data granularity issues, it seems likely that primary research may be needed, and consideration needs to be given as to how, and if, data collection can piggy-back off existing survey work (perhaps run by the housing association or health department, for example, or through the Glasgow Household survey^{xx} or the Glasgow Health and Wellbeing survey^{xxi}). As a consequence of the questions and required sample - including the possibility of comparison to a similar control (perhaps synthetic control) area - a specifically commissioned survey would optimally enable a comprehensive evaluation of the re-development impacts. Such an approach would also have the virtue of being able to directly interrogate capabilities (or factors established as proxies for capabilities). Additionally, the timing of data collection will need to be considered relative to the gateway process set out for the City Deal.

Fourth, weightings of the aforementioned categories and metrics need to be determined and shaped by communities – ideally through a community forum (for participation) - and by politicians ultimately (in adjudicating success). Linking to the Capabilities perspective, community engagement at an early stage between completion of the construction works and the second gateway may be helpful not only to promote participation but to obtain initial feedback on desired inclusive growth outcomes. Focus groups that gather intelligence on the positive and negative elements of the project would complement this, and could provide useful evaluation insights.

Fifth, and with respect to tracking the existing community, which is central to the inclusive growth problematic, it is proposed that Scottish Community Health Index (CHI) data may be usefully used. The CHI database holds records of patients registered with doctor’s practices across Scotland and, as such, can provide useful demographic detail on age, gender and area deprivation characteristics of residents. In theory - subject to ethical, privacy and

confidentiality agreements - resident movements from and into the project area could be tracked longitudinally using the CHI number. For example, this would allow the evaluator of the framework to link the CHI number to a new area that a Sighthill resident has moved to, and to gauge the deprivation profile (SIMD) of that new area, and, conversely, to determine where people have come from who enter the project area.

Mindful of the aforementioned considerations, the categories and metrics, in Table 2, may be usefully considered where supported by appropriate participatory steps. The metrics listed exhibit degrees of alignment with JRF's inclusive growth monitor (Beatty et al, 2016) the Scottish Government's inclusive growth diagnostic, and are tractable with respect to the core capabilities advanced by Nussbaum (2006: 76-78). The "specific metrics" are suggested to be useful – subject to the resource available - as it allows capabilities judgements across the existing and new communities to be made.

[insert table 2 about here]

Section 5 – Reflections and Conclusions

Though widely rehearsed and latched onto as a banner for policymaking (Lee, 2018), inclusive growth may be considered old wine in new bottles if it merely seeks to shift attention to notions of "inclusion" and "growth" whilst providing little guidance as to their complementarities and trade-offs. However, where inclusive growth can provide clear framings for policy activity - from the strategic-level to areas of policy implementation - a more effective position may be arrived at. Some argue, moreover, that just giving a view for distributional consequences is a necessary check on the tendency for growth-led urban and

regional policymaking (Lee, 2018). With themes like the “revenge of the places that don’t matter” now striking a chord (Rodriguez-Pose, 2018), and with questions about the future of globalisation and the rise of populism stirring interest across the social sciences, stubborn questions about the nexus between growth and inclusion - what is necessary; what is desirable; what is achievable – are being revived.

In seeking to operationalise inclusive growth for a specific policy intervention, this paper has proposed a framework, taking the perspective of an evaluability assessment, to consider how an infrastructure project in Glasgow may be judged to be contributing (or not) to such outcomes. Both the framework proposed to assess the intervention (which could be adapted, following the core logic for other interventions) and the basing of the framework on the capabilities approach, reflect the principal contributions of this paper. The need for an inclusive growth sensitive assessment for the case outlined reflects the multiple interests in the outcomes produced by City Deal investments, as well as the Scottish Government’s strategic focus more particularly. As noted prior, the objectives set out in both the City Deal modelling and the specific project business case suggest that addressing deprivation is a key concern.

The approach to inclusive growth proposed in this paper may be refined and developed in a number of ways. For similar project level cases in Scotland, links could be made to specific provisions in Scottish policymaking. For example. The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015, seeks to give communities a greater say in the ownership of assets and land, while also increasing their participation in decisions about public services. Moreover, through placemaking – which is an endorsed approach to development in Scotland - the Place Standard tool has been developed to help structure conversations between communities and public bodies in order to target improvements to health and wellbeing. The tool focuses on both the physical environment - the buildings, streets, public spaces and natural spaces that

make up a place - and the social environment - the relationships, social contact and support networks that make up a community. This tool could potentially be used in shaping conversations about inclusive growth projects at an early stage.

In terms of wider applications and conceptual concerns, inclusive growth frameworks could usefully consider inputs from a wide range of disciplinary and professional perspectives.

Work on health inequalities, for example, proposes a framing of inequalities based on “causes of the causes” (Marmot, 2010). Here, three levels of determinants are considered:

fundamental causes (the unequal distribution of power, money and resources), wider environmental causes (the availability of quality work, housing, transport and education) and individual experiences, risks and lifestyles (Beetson et al., 2014). Of course inter-disciplinary viewpoints will need to be sensitive to the empirical focus, and the case of an infrastructure project will differ from that of an inclusive innovation strategy or a skills development application. The infrastructure project presented in this paper, given its size and aspirations for place-based transformation, is helpful, we argue, for trying to advance thinking on how inclusive growth applies. Nevertheless, the applicability of the framework steps presented in section 4 will need to be tested and revised in other contexts (including regeneration activities that are positioned in different parts of city-regions, and those that involve works different in nature from remediation).

Finally, in developing an inclusive growth framework at the intra-city level, questions remain about how policy can be cohesively developed to account for wider city-region and indeed national concerns; in other words how can neighbourhood, city-region and national inclusive growth policies be linked together? This is an important question given different policy levers are held by varying layers of government. At stake here is weaving inclusive growth into different and overlapping policy frameworks, so a more consistent approach to territorial policy - that balances equity and efficiency – may emerge (Iammarino et al., 2018).

References

- Alkire S (2005) Why the Capability Approach? *Journal of Human Development*, 6(1): 115-135.
- Atkinson A, Piketty T and Saez E (2011) Top Incomes in the Long Run of History. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49(1): 3–71.
- Beatty C, Crisp R and Gore T (2016) An inclusive growth monitor for measuring the relationship between poverty and growth. Report for JRF, May.
- Benner C and Pastor M (2011) Moving On Up? Regions, Megaregions, and the Changing Geography of Social Equity Organizing. *Urban Affairs Review*, 47(3): 315–348.
- Benner C and Pastor M (2012). *Just growth: Inclusion and prosperity in America's metropolitan regions*. New York: Routledge.
- Benner C and Pastor M (2015a) Whither resilient regions? Growth and Community. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 38(1): 5-24.
- Benner C and Pastor M (2015b). Brother, can you spare some time? Sustaining prosperity and social inclusion in America's metropolitan regions. *Urban Studies*, 52(7): 1339–1356.
- Berg A, Ostry JD and Zettelmeyer J (2012) What makes growth sustained? *Journal of Development Economics*, 98, 149–166.
- Boyle M and Hughes G (1994) The Politics of Urban Entrepreneurialism in Glasgow. *Geoforum*, 25(4): 453-470.
- Bruner R, Craig P and Watson N (2017) Evaluability Assessment of Thriving Places: a Report for Glasgow Community Planning Partnership. What Works Scotland evaluability assessment, February.

Chapple K (2018) Just growth: Strategies for growth with equity. In Clark G, Feldman M, and Gertler M (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography (second edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Christie L and Gibb K (2015) A collaborative approach to event-led regeneration: The governance of legacy from the 2014 Commonwealth Games. *Local Economy*, 30(8): 871–887.

Clark J and Kearns A (2016) Going for gold: A prospective assessment of the economic impacts of the Commonwealth Games 2014 on the East End of Glasgow. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 34(8): 1474–1500.

Clydeplan (2017) Strategic development plan. July.

Craig P (2015) Synthetic controls: a new approach to evaluating interventions. What Works Scotland working paper, March.

Craig P and Campbell M (2015) Evaluability Assessment: a systematic approach to deciding whether and how to evaluate programmes and policies. What Works Scotland working paper, June.

Davidson M (2009) Displacement, Space and Dwelling: Placing Gentrification Debate. *Ethics Place and Environment*, 12(2): 219-234.

Davies R and Payne L (2015) Evaluability Assessments: Reflections on a review of the literature. *Evaluation*, 21(2): 216–231.

Donnison D (1987) Glasgow and its East End. In Donnison D and Middleton A (eds.) *Regenerating the inner city: Glasgow's experience*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Europeam Commission (2010)

Fainstein SS (2010) *The Just City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fainstein SS (2018) Resilience and justice: planning for New York City. *Urban Geography*, published online, 13 March.

Felice E (2016) The Misty Grail: The Search for a Comprehensive Measure of Development and the Reasons for GDP Primacy. *Development and Change*, 47(5): 967-994.

Foley L, Prins R, Crawford F, Sahlqvist S and Ogilvie D (2017) Effects of living near a new urban motorway on the travel behaviour of local residents in deprived areas: Evidence from a natural experimental study. *Health and Place*, 43: 57-65.

Florida R (2017) *The New Urban Crisis: How Our Cities are Increasing Inequality, Deepening Segregation, and Failing the Middle Class — and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Basic Books.

Florida R and Adler P (2017) The patchwork metropolis: The morphology of the divided postindustrial city. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, published online, 21 November.

Fraser of Allander Institute (2018) Fraser of Allander Economic Commentary. 42(3), September.

Freeman L (2005) Displacement of succession? Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(4): 463-491.

Gómez MV (1998) Reflective images: the case of urban regeneration in Glasgow and Bilbao. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 22(1): 106-121.

Gibb K (2003) Transferring Glasgow's council housing: financial, urban and housing policy implications. *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 3(1): 89-114.

Glasgow City Council (2016) Port Dundas Creative Canal Quarter Draft Supplementary Guidance. February.

Gray N and Mooney G (2011) Glasgow's new urban frontier: 'Civilising' the population of 'Glasgow East'. *City*, 15(1): 4-24.

Gray N and Porter L (2014) By Any Means Necessary: Urban Regeneration and the "State of Exception" in Glasgow's Commonwealth Games 2014. *Antipode*, 47(2): 380-400.

Grigsby W, Baratz M and MacLennan D (1983) The dynamics of neighborhood change and decline. Research report series no.4, Department of City and Regional Planning, University of Pennsylvania.

HM Government (2014) Glasgow and Clyde Valley City Deal. July.

Hall P (1975) Book reviews – West Central Scotland Plan Consultative Draft Report. *Urban Studies*, 12(3): 343-344.

Hansen S (2010) ADB's Contribution to Inclusive Growth in Transport and Energy Projects. ADB Sustainable Development. Working Paper Series.

Hausmann R., Rodrik D and Velasco A (2005) Growth Diagnostics. The Growth Lab, Harvard University.

Hobor G (2013) Surviving the Era of Deindustrialization: The New Economic Geography of the Urban Rust Belt. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 35(4): 417-434.

Hughes C and Lupton R (2018) Understanding changes in Greater Manchester's 'deprived' neighbourhoods 2004 to 2015 using a typology of residential mobility. Inclusive Growth Analysis Unit, working paper 01/2018.

Hwang J and Sampson RJ (2014) Divergent pathways of gentrification: Racial inequality and the social order of renewal in Chicago Neighborhoods. *American Sociological Review*, 79(4): 726-751.

Iammarino S, Rodriguez-Pose A and Storper M (2018) Regional inequality in Europe: evidence, theory and policy implications. *Journal of Economic Geography*, published online, 27 April.

Kearns A and Darling L (2013) Giving the 'all clear': housing staff experience of the rehousing process in Transformational Regeneration Areas. Report for GoWell, December.

Kearns A and Lawson L (2008) Housing Stock Transfer in Glasgow—the First Five Years: A Study of Policy Implementation. *Housing Studies*, 23(6): 857-87.

Kearns A, Kearns O and Lawson L (2013) Notorious Places: Image, Reputation, Stigma. The Role of Newspapers in Area Reputations for Social Housing Estates. *Housing Studies*, 28(4): 579-598.

Kearns A and Whitley A (2018) Perceived neighborhood ethnic diversity and social outcomes: Context-dependent effects within a postindustrial city undergoing regeneration. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40(2): 186-208.

Lawn, P (2003) A theoretical foundation to support the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW), Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), and other related indexes. *Ecological Economics*, 44: 105-118.

Lee N (2018) Lee (2018): Inclusive Growth in cities: a sympathetic critique. *Regional Studies*, published online, 6 June.

Lee N and Sissons P (2016) Inclusive growth? The relationship between economic growth and poverty in British cities. *Environment and Planning A*, 48(11): 2317–2339.

Lee N, Sissons P, Hughes C., Green A, Atfield G, Adam D. and Rodriguez-Pose, A. (2014) Cities, growth and poverty: a review of the evidence. Report for JRF.

Lees L (2008) Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance? *Urban Studies*, 45(12): 2449–2470.

Leishman C and Watkins C (2017) Assessing the spatial impact of policy interventions on real-estate values: an exemplar of the use of the hybrid hedonic/repeat-sales method. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 4(1): 202-21.

Leslie C (2015) Disappearing Glasgow: documenting the demolition of a city's troubled past. The Guardian, 22 April.

Lupton R and Fuller C (2009) Mixed Communities: A New Approach to Spatially Concentrated Poverty in England. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33(4): 1014-1028.

McCarthy J and Pollock SHA (1997) Urban regeneration in Glasgow and Dundee: a comparative evaluation. *Land Use Policy*, 14(2): 137-149.

McGregor A and Fitzpatrick I (1995) The impact of urban regeneration partnerships on unemployment. *Scottish Economic Bulletin*, 51: 15-28.

MacLennan D (2013) Neighbourhoods: Evolving Ideas, Evidence and Changing Policies. In David Manley D, van Ham M, Bailey N, Simpson L and MacLennan D (eds.) *Neighbourhood Effects or Neighbourhood Based Problems? A Policy Context*. Dordrecht: Springer.

MacLennan D and Tu Y (1996) Economic perspectives on the structure of local housing systems. *Housing Studies*, 11(3): 387-406.

MacLennan D, Waite D and Muscatelli A (2018) Cities in the Scottish Economy: Patterns, Policies and Potentials. In Gibb K, MacLennan D, McNulty D and Comerford M (eds.) *The Scottish Economy: A Living Book*. Abingdon: Routledge.

MacLeod G (2002) From Urban Entrepreneurialism to a “Revanchist City”? On the Spatial Injustices of Glasgow’s Renaissance. *Antipode*, 34(3): 602-624.

Meltzer R and Ghorbani P (2015) Does gentrification increase employment opportunities in low-income neighborhoods. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 66: 52-73.

Nielsen L and Axelsen DV (2017) Capabilitarian Sufficiency: Capabilities and Social Justice. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 18(1): 46-59.

North Ayrshire Council (2017) Response to Scottish Parliament Economy, Jobs and Fair Work Committee Inquiry on Scotland's economic performance: trends, challenges and future developments. November. Available at: http://www.parliament.scot/S5_EconomyJobsFairWork/Inquiries/PSE006-North_Ayrshire_Council.pdf [retrieved 21/6/18]

OECD (2016a) The Productivity-Inclusiveness Nexus. Meeting of the OECD Council at Ministerial Level, Paris, 1-2 June.

OECD (2016b) *Making cities work for all: Data and actions for inclusive growth*. OECD Publishing: Paris.

OECD (2018) The Framework for Policy Action on Inclusive Growth. Meeting of the OECD Council at Ministerial Level, Paris, 30-31 May.

O'Sullivan T and Gibb K (2003) Introduction. In O'Sullivan T and Gibb K (eds.) *Housing Economics and Public Policy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pacione M (1995) The Geography of Multiple Deprivation in the Clydeside Conurbation. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 86(5): 407-425.

Pacione M (2009) The View from the Tower: Geographies of Urban Transformation in Glasgow. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 125(2): 127-181.

Paton K (2009) Probing the symptomatic silences of middle-class settlement: A case study of gentrification processes in Glasgow. *City*, 13(4): 432-450.

Pike, A, Mackinnon, D, Coombes, M, Champion, T, Bradley, D, Cumbers, A, Robson, L and Wymer, C (2016) Uneven growth: tackling city decline. Report for JRF.

Pike A, Lee N, MacKinnon D, Kempton L and Iddawela Y (2017) Job creation for inclusive growth in cities. Report for JRF, August.

Piketty T (2014) *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pill M (2018) The austerity governance of Baltimore's neighborhoods: "The conversation may have changed but the systems aren't changing". *Journal of Urban Affairs*, published online, 14 June.

The Planner (2018) Deal agreed for £250m Glasgow regeneration project. 12 April. Available at: <https://www.theplanner.co.uk/news/deal-agreed-for-£250m-glasgow-regeneration-project> [accessed 6/9/19]

Purcell M (2013) Possible Worlds: Henri Lefebvre and the Right to the City. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(1): 141-154.

RSA Inclusive Growth Commission (2017) Making our economy work for all.

Robeyns (2003) Sen's capability approach and gender inequality: Selecting relevant capabilities. *Feminist Economics*, 9(2-3): 61-92.

Robeyns I (2005) The Capability Approach: a theoretical survey. *Journal of Human Development*, 6(1): 93-117

Robeyns I (2016) The Capability Approach. In Zalta EN (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition). Available at:

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/capability-approach/> [retrieved 21/6/18]

Robson B, Lympelopoulou K and Rae A (2008) People on the move: exploring the functional roles of deprived neighbourhoods. *Environment and Planning A*, 40: 2693-2714.

Robson B, Lympelopoulou K and Rae A (2009) Understanding the different roles of deprived neighbourhoods: A typology. Report for Communities and Local Government, February.

Rodríguez-Pose A (2018) The revenge of the places that don't matter (and what to do about it). *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 11(1): 189–209.

Rubery J, Johnson M, Lupton R and Roman GZ (2017) Human Development Report for Greater Manchester: Human Development Across the Life Course. June.

SNP (2016) Nicola Sturgeon's address to #SNP16. Speech, 15 October. Available at: https://www.snp.org/nicola_sturgeon_address_to_snp16 [retrieved 21/6/18]

Scottish Government (2015) Scotland's Economic Strategy. March.

Scottish Government (2016a) SIMD 16 Analysis – Glasgow City. Available at: <https://www2.gov.scot/Resource/0051/00510723.pdf> [retrieved 6/9/19]

Scottish Government (2016b) Agenda for Cities, March.

Scottish Government (2017a) Inclusive growth conference. Speeches, 20 October.

Scottish Government (2017b) Enterprise and Skills Review: Report on Phase 2. June.

Scottish Government (2018a) Fairer Scotland Duty - Interim Guidance for Public Bodies. March.

Scottish Government (2018b) Centre for Regional Inclusive Growth – Business Case. April.

Available at: <https://beta.gov.scot/publications/foi-18-00991/> [retrieved 22/6/18]

Scottish Parliament Local Government and Communities Committee (2018a) City Regions – Deal or No Deal? 8 January.

Scottish Parliament Local Government and Communities Committee (2018b) The Scottish Government's Revised National Outcomes. Website. Available at: <http://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/108188.aspx> [retrieved 21/6/18]

Sen A (1999) Development as Freedom. New York: Knopf.

Sen A (2005) Human Rights and Capabilities. *Journal of Human Development*, 6(2): 151–66.

Sen A (2009) *The idea of justice*. London: Penguin.

Shaw KS and Hagemans IW (2015) 'Gentrification Without Displacement' and the Consequent Loss of Place: The Effects of Class Transition on Low-income Residents of Secure Housing in Gentrifying Areas. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(2): 323-341.

Shearer C, Shah I, Friedhoff A and Berube A (2018) Metro Monitor 2018. Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program. Available at: <https://www.brookings.edu/research/metro-monitor-2018/> [retrieved 21/6/18]

Sissons P, Green AE and Broughton K (2018) Inclusive growth in English cities: mainstreamed or sidelined? *Regional Studies*, published online, 22 October.

Stiglitz JE (2013). *The price of inequality*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Stiglitz JE, Sen A and Fitoussi J-P (2009) Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.

Tovar E and Bourdeau-Lepage L (2013) Well-being Disparities within the Paris Region: A Capabilist Spatialised Outlook. *Urban Studies*, 50(8): 1575–1591.

Trullén J and Galletto V (2018) Inclusive growth from an urban perspective: a challenge for the metropolis of the twenty-first century. *European Planning Studies*, published online, 2 August.

Turok I and Bailey N (2004) Twin track cities? Competitiveness and cohesion in Glasgow and Edinburgh. *Progress in Planning*, 62: 135–204.

Tyler P, Evenhuis E, Martin R, Sunley P and Gardiner B (2017) Growing apart? Structural transformation and the uneven development of British cities. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 10: 425–454.

van Ham M and Manley D (2012) Neighbourhood effects research at a crossroads. Ten challenges for future research. *Environment and Planning A*, 44: 2787–2793.

Wannop U (1986) Regional fulfilment: Planning into administration in the Clyde Valley 1944–84, *Planning Perspectives*, 1(3): 207–229.

WMCA (2018) Inclusive Growth Unit. Website. Available at: <https://www.wmca.org.uk/what-we-do/public-service-reform/inclusive-growth-unit/> [accessed 6/9/19]

Youtie J, Bozeman B and Shapira P (1999) Using an evaluability assessment to select methods for evaluating state technology development programs: the case of the Georgia Research Alliance. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 11: 55–64.

Zitcer A, Hawkins J and Vakharia N (2016) A capabilities approach to arts and culture? Theorizing community development in West Philadelphia. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(1): 35–51.

ⁱ There is an ambiguous relationship between growth and poverty reduction, in other words.

ⁱⁱ Composite indicators mesh a number of indicators into a single indicator; for example, the “genuine progress indicator” (Lawn, 2003) and “multiple dimensional living standards” (OECD, 2016a)

ⁱⁱⁱ Dashboards provides a suite of indicators, populating a set of relevant categories. The Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission (2009) remarked on the merits and challenges of both composite indicators and dashboards, citing parsimony, challenges with weightings and normative underpinnings (also see Felice, 2016).

^{iv} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDNDNNT8181T1>

^v <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDN2U0GDXXDX0G>

^{vi} See, for example – European Commission: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/beyond_gdp/index_en.html;

^{vii} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=39256&p=0>

^{viii} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDNT1DNT1ZL81>

^{ix} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=18395>

^x <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=21762>

^{xi} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=18395>

^{xii} “Mid market rent properties have a monthly cost that is lower than the normal market” - <https://linkhousing.org.uk/find-a-home/renting-options/mid-market-rent/>

^{xiii} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=33447&p=0>

^{xiv} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDNT1DNT1ZL81>

^{xv} Of this £1.13 billion, the Scottish Government provides £500 million; the UK Government, £500 million; with the remainder provided by local authorities.

^{xvi} Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation.

^{xvii} <http://www.glasgow.gov.uk/Councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDNT1DXZ3810G>

^{xviii} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDN2U0GDXXDX0G>

^{xix} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/viewSelectedDocument.asp?c=P62AFQDNT1DNT1ZL81>

^{xx} <https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=17712>

^{xxi} <http://www.nhs.uk/your-health/public-health/research-and-evaluation/reports-library/?id=240795>