



## Strathprints Institutional Repository

**Nairn, Alasdair G M (1983) GEAR : comprehensive redevelopment or confidence trick? Quarterly Economic Commentary, 9 (2). pp. 59-72. ISSN 0306-7866 ,**

This version is available at <http://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/51579/>

**Strathprints** is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Unless otherwise explicitly stated on the manuscript, Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Please check the manuscript for details of any other licences that may have been applied. You may not engage in further distribution of the material for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute both the url (<http://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/>) and the content of this paper for research or private study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to Strathprints administrator: [strathprints@strath.ac.uk](mailto:strathprints@strath.ac.uk)

---

# Feature Article

---

## GEAR - COMPREHENSIVE REDEVELOPMENT OR CONFIDENCE TRICK ?

by Alasdair G M Nairn

Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Strathclyde\*

### INTRODUCTION

The Glasgow Eastern Area Renewal (GEAR) project was portrayed at its birth in May 1976 as one of the largest urban renewal projects in Europe. In essence, the project represented an attempt to mount a coordinated comprehensive response to the problems of multiple deprivation. In recent years, however, the level of "extra" investment genuinely attributable to the GEAR project has been questioned (Booth et al 1982, Orton 1982). Orton (1982) for instance suggests that the whole project may be regarded as a "mere confidence trick". The purpose of this paper is to analyse the investment in GEAR in order that an estimate of "extra" expenditure attributable to the project may be derived.

### BACKGROUND

It is not the intention of this paper to pass comment on the effectiveness of the various expenditures involved in the GEAR project. However, it is important that they be placed in the context of the magnitude of the problems facing the GEAR area. The characteristics of the GEAR area prior to the inception of the project were as follows:

- 1) The GEAR area covered some 4,000 acres including seven existing Comprehensive Development Areas (CDA's) and the Cambuslang Industrial Recovery Area. In 1976, over 20% of the land in GEAR and 12% of the housing was lying vacant, leaving an overall impression of dereliction and decay.
- 2) Slum clearance and rehousing had caused the population of the area to fall by two-thirds between 1951 and 1976. This combined with selective migration had left a population with a disproportionate number of elderly, unskilled, and unemployed persons, consequently income per head was (and still is) extremely low.

---

\* The analysis contained within this paper is the author's own and consequently no responsibility for the interpretation of the figures should be attached to members of the GEAR team. This research was carried out under an SSRC linked award.

3) Although GEAR continues to be a major employment centre for Glasgow as a whole, the area experienced and is still experiencing a high rate of job loss through industrial decline and closures (49,000 jobs in 1971 had been reduced to 36,000 in 1981).

In August 1976, the Scottish Office announced the creation of the GEAR project with a formal objective of bringing about "in a coordinated way the comprehensive social economic and environmental regeneration of the East End, and creating the conditions for the development of a balanced and thriving community" (Scottish Office 1976). The nature of the project was conditioned by dissatisfaction existing within the Scottish Office over the speed and quality of urban renewal "achieved by the former Glasgow Corporation in comparison with the perceived successes in the development of the New Towns" (Boyle and Wannop, 1982). As a result, the body (ie the GEAR team) charged with the task of regeneration, although a new initiative and composed of existing agencies and authorities, represented an attempt to introduce New Town attitudes to the area whilst operating within the established framework of local government (Deloitte, 1982). Thus central government and seven other public sector participants were brought together in a joint approach to the problems of the area; all the participants retained their individual statutory responsibilities, with the Scottish Development Agency (SDA) bearing in addition the role of project management coordination. Table 1 details the participants together with their principal activities and expenditures in the GEAR area over the period 1977-82.

The data in table 1 are drawn from the GEAR Project Report '82 compiled by the SDA. As this Report forms the basis for much of the analysis which follows it is considered worthwhile at this stage to comment upon the data contained within it. The first point to note is that the Project Report '82 is composed almost entirely of capital expenditure items containing only a negligible number of items of revenue expenditure. This may be due to the fact that revenue programmes are considerably more difficult than capital programmes to analyse by selected areas within local authority boundaries or within sub-regions of Strathclyde. Consequently the Report excludes possibly the majority of expenditures in the East End by participants other than the SDA. For instance; excluded are the salaries of teachers, policemen, social workers, housing management staff, water and sewage staff, bus drivers, etc., together with the bills for recurring costs of maintenance and the running of local services. The omission of these expenditures is not thought to have unduly distorted the results of the analysis which follows, given that such expenditure falls either within the statutory responsibilities of the local authorities or is a part of city or region-wide programmes. Therefore although a considerable financial commitment they would not be considered "extra" or GEAR specific. The second point which relates to the way in which the expenditures are detailed in the Project Report is unfortunately more problematic. The data contained between actual expenditure and commitments, presenting them as combined figures; omits all administrative overheads and service costs, and excludes certain financial information where it has not been provided by participants (Deloitte 1982). Although an attempt has been made to overcome these problems in the analysis the resulting estimates obviously contain some margin of error. Unfortunately, it is not possible to convert the expenditure figures to constant prices since data are not available on when the actual expenditures were incurred. However, the completion dates of the various schemes have been noted where applicable.

Table 1 Summary of Project Costs 1977-82

	1977-82 (£000's)	Active 1982/83 (£000's)
<u>Scottish Development Agency(SDA)</u>		
Land Assembly - Site Preparation	8795	3532
Factory Building	12751	3858
Environment, Recreation, Other	12646	5466
	<u>34192</u>	<u>12856</u>
<u>Strathclyde Regional Council(SRC)</u>		
Infrastructure, Transport	13676	7358
Education, Social Services, Community	3573	294
Protection Services	2992	1270
	<u>20241</u>	<u>8922</u>
<u>Glasgow District Council(GDC)</u>		
New Housing	14896	1505
Modernisation, Rehabilitation	21111	1500
Other	11850	852
	<u>47857</u>	<u>3857</u>
<u>Scottish Special Housing Assoc(SSHA)</u>		
New Housing	14873	1505
Modernisation, Rehabilitation	10577	5567
Other	188	-
	<u>25638</u>	<u>9509</u>
<u>Housing Corporation</u>		
Local HA New Housing*	1860	-
Local HA Rehabilitation	17175	9800
	<u>19035</u>	<u>9800</u>
<u>Greater Glasgow Health Board</u>	1760	1980
<u>Manpower Services Commission</u>	n/a	n/a
<u>Other</u>		
Department of Health and Social Security	-	1060
Vol. Orgs. under Urban Programme	280	-
	<u>280</u>	<u>1060</u>

\* HA=Housing Association  
Source: GEAR Project Report '82

The analysis which follows details under the various headings chosen by the author expenditure in GEAR which may be considered "extra" ie which may have been stimulated by GEAR or protected from cutback by the GEAR project. However it should be noted that in some cases expenditures thus defined would, in the project's absence, have occurred sooner or later. The expenditure headings are as follows:-

- 1) Projects undertaken within SDA Industrial Programme.
- 2) Projects undertaken within SDA Environmental Programme.

- 3) Action by SDA Projects and Planning Directorate.
- 4) Action outside mainstream programmes of the SDA.
- 5) Projects falling within the Urban Programme.
- 6) Projects falling within the Mainstream Programme.
- 7) Administrative initiatives.
- 8) Administrative costs and future revenue costs

Scottish Development Agency Expenditure

1) Within Industrial Programme

SDA expenditure falling within the industrial programme is comprised of two elements: land assembly and site preparation, and factory building. The Cambuslang Industrial Recovery Area was established prior to the inception of the GEAR project and, consequently, expenditure associated with Cambuslang is considered to be "consistent with programmes outside GEAR". The relocation of Norit Clydesdale to Cambuslang for environmental reasons is however considered to be an item stimulated by GEAR. Table 2 details the factory units completed at 1982 by size and number of units.

Table 2 Factory Provision Completed Projects 1977-82

Project Type	Stimulated by GEAR			Consistent with prog. outside GEAR		
	No of Units	Floorspace	Cost £000s	No of Units	Floorspace	Cost £000s
Under 1000m2	122	22925	6512	-	-	-
Over 1000m2	-	-	-	12	18060	3293
Refurbishments	1	3333	701	-	-	-
Conversions	2	11405	2	-	-	-
Purpose built	2	13611	3440	-	-	-
Yards	1	4000	100	-	-	-
Other (ie Templetons)	n/a*	9053	1558	-	-	-
	128*	64327	12312	12	18000	3293

Source: Interpretation by the author of data from 1982,83 Project Programmes and Reports.

It is estimated in Table 2 that perhaps some £12.3 million (79%) of the Agency expenditure on factory provision may be attributable to the GEAR project. However, it must be borne in mind that the SDA has built advance factories in other areas of Scotland after discussion with the appropriate local authorities, thus depending on the stance one assumes that Glasgow District Council (GDC) would have taken in the absence of GEAR, it is possible to argue that certain developments would have gone ahead anyway. On the other hand, there are certain developments that are clearly GEAR specific such as the Templetons Business Centre and the Rimsdale Street development. The foregoing argument is also relevant to the figures for land assembly and site preparation presented in Table 3, given that they are related to the data in Table 2.

Table 3 Land Assembly and Site Preparation 1977-82

Stimulated by GEAR		Consistent with progs. outside GEAR	
Area acquired	Cost £000s	Area acquired	Cost £000s
19.52ha	1020	112.7ha	5419
* 64.20	2286	-	-
83.72	3306	112.7ha	5419

\* Clyde Iron Works Source: As Table 2

Thus, to summarise Tables 2 and 3, it appears that of the £24.3m spent by the SDA in the period 1977-82 some £15.7m (64%) may be considered "extra" or directly attributable to GEAR.

## 2) Within Environmental Programme

SDA expenditure within the Environmental Programme is detailed in Table 4. Unfortunately it is not possible to distinguish for individual items as to whether or not they could be considered extra. However, informal discussion with the SDA suggested that perhaps some 25-30% of the improvements undertaken would have happened in the absence of a GEAR project. It was suggested that the GEAR project had allowed the "bending" of improvement powers and the concentration of action, and had the project not existed the SDA would, for instance, have adopted a more selective attitude towards stonecleaning.

Thus, given 70% of SDA expenditure within the Environmental Programme is being considered as "extra", some £6.7m could be regarded as GEAR specific. It is worthwhile at this juncture to reiterate the point that it has proved impossible to convert the expenditure in different periods to constant prices, with the consequence that these and any other figures presented in this paper must be interpreted with care.

Table 4 Environmental Programme (1977-82/83)

	Completed 1977-82		Completed 82/83		Total
	No	Cost( 000s)	No	Cost( 000s)	
General landscaping works	68	5431	8	514	5945
Preliminary backcourt) imp Env. Imp. in HAA )	21	1423	6	170	1593
Treatment to Buildings	30	1260	5	177	1437
Camlachie Burn Phi	1	167	-	-	167
Maintenance			1	395	395
		8281		1256	9537

Source: Interpretation by the author of data from Project Report '82 and '83, Project Programme '82 and '83.

### 3) Action by Projects Planning Directorate

The two items falling within the scope of the Projects and Planning Directorate were the Strategy and Programme and the GEAR Review. The Strategy and Programme (May 1980) identified six goals which would facilitate the achievement of the formal Scottish Office objective mentioned earlier. These goals were:

- i) To increase residents' competitiveness in securing employment;
- ii) To arrest economic decline and realise the potential of GEAR as a major employment centre;
- iii) To overcome the social disadvantages experienced by residents;
- iv) To improve and maintain the environment;
- v) To stem population decline and engender a better balanced age and social structure;
- vi) To foster residents' commitment and confidence.

The GEAR Review was a three part study commissioned by the SDA to review the progress and future of the GEAR project; investigating administrative aspects, business development and employment strategy, and social aspects. Clearly both the Strategy and Programme and the GEAR Review would be considered "extra" or GEAR specific. Unfortunately data relating to the cost of each are not available.

#### 4) Action outside Mainstream Programme

SDA expenditure outwith the Mainstream Programme (ie Industrial and Environmental) may be divided into three categories: capital expenditure, revenue expenditure and project administration. All of the expenditure within these categories is considered to be "extra".

Table 5 Capital Expenditure 1977-82

Project	Completed 1977-82		Programmed 1982-83	
	No of schemes	Cost (£000s)	No of schemes	Cost (£000s)
New Play Areas and Kickabouts	24	3202	2	282
Major new recreational facilities	6	2600	1	500*
Anti-Graffiti Project	1	24	-	-
GEAR Centres	2	82	-	-
		5908		782

\* Does not include SDA/GDC/SRC joint expenditure of £2.099m programmed for Crownpoint Rd by 1985.

Table 5 details SDA capital expenditure outwith the Mainstream Programme. Items such as the GEAR Centres are clearly GEAR specific, whilst schemes on the scale of the Crownpoint Road sports complex or the Helenvale astro-turf pitch and centre are thought to be unlikely to have occurred in the absence of a GEAR Project. The major item of revenue expenditure comprises the GEAR team salaries on non-industrial and environmental action. However, no estimates of such costs are available. The problem of salary costs associated with GEAR will be returned to later. The final category of expenditure outwith the SDA Mainstream Programme comes under the heading "coordination to action". These items are either uncoded or the expenditures were not available; the schemes include various feasibility studies, community initiatives, advisory visits to GEAR firms, meetings with Community Councils and other local groups, quarterly meetings with Parliamentary and Council representatives, SDA/SRC/GDC programme of leisure facilities, joint use of education facilities by the local community, and the preparation of Project Reports and Overall Proposals.

#### Expenditure by Participants other than the SDA

This section analyses expenditure by participants other than the SDA, principally Strathclyde Regional Council (SRC), Glasgow District Council (GDC) the Scottish Special Housing Association (SSHA), the Greater Glasgow Health Board (GGHB) and the Housing Corporation through Housing Associations (H.Assn). A similar method of analysis was used to that employed for the



SDA expenditure; namely, the aggregated expenditures in the Project Report '82 were examined as to whether or not they could be considered "extra"; they were then disaggregated using the Project Programme, the results discussed informally with participants, and then finally updated using the 1983 Project Report and Programmes.

#### 5) Expenditure within the Urban Programme

Applications for Urban Aid may be made either directly by a local authority or by a voluntary group through the appropriate department of the local authority. If a voluntary group submits an application which is subsequently supported by the local authority (ie. GDC or SRC), the application is forwarded to the Urban Renewal Unit at the Scottish Office for judgement as to whether or not it falls within the remit of the Urban Programme. A normal project once accepted by the Scottish Office would be financed 75% by central government and 25% by the local authority for a period of 3 years; in exceptional cases the project financing may be extended to 5 or even 7 years. Where an extension is granted the proportion to be financed by the local authority rises to a greater or lesser degree, depending upon whether the project was undertaken directly by a local authority or was sponsored by them.

The problems of identifying "extra" or GEAR specific expenditure encountered in other sections of this paper were greatly magnified for items financed by the Urban Programme. This is due to the fact that if an individual scheme is to be financed from Urban Programme funds, it must fall within the terms of The Local Government Grants (Social Need) Act 1969 and its various updates. Thus, the nature of a project alone would not identify it as GEAR specific, however there are some factors which point to special consideration being afforded to projects within the GEAR area. First, until 1982 Strathclyde Regional Council operated a priority list for the processing of applications, namely: GEAR first, Priesthill/Nitshill and Maryhill second and then all other APT's (Areas for Priority Treatment). Secondly, the GEAR project commands great Ministerial political support as evidenced by the extension of the full grant period to five years in response to financial problems encountered by SRC. Thus, one would expect a greater degree of flexibility in Scottish Office handling of "GEAR" applications than would be the case for applications from other areas. Finally, there are schemes which by their level of funding (eg. SRC revenue funding of education £1.428m) or by their innovativeness, mark them as candidates for inclusion under the GEAR specific or "extra" heading. It is worth noting that in some cases GEAR has been used as a testing ground for innovative schemes which have thereafter spread to other areas of need. Thus the expenditure within the Urban Programme considered to have been protected or stimulated by GEAR amounted to some £2.6m, and included such items as capital and revenue expenditure on education and young people (£1.7m). The figure for expenditure within the Urban Programme consistent with programmes outside GEAR amounted to some £2m (derived from Project Report Programmes).

#### 6) Mainstream Programme

The items falling within the Mainstream Programme consist mainly of traffic management schemes and housing development. Tables 6 and 7 detail

respectively that expenditure which could be considered to have been "protected or stimulated by GEAR", and that which could be considered "consistent with programmes outside GEAR". The programmed items included were either begun before the end of 1982 or were of such a magnitude as to justify inclusion. It should be noted, however, that the list of items programmed for operation after 1982 is by no means exhaustive. The schemes financed by SRC included in Table 6 included items for which special provision was made because of GEAR, such as the Hamilton Road Route and street lighting improvement. For GDC, leadpipe replacement gained priority and renovation of Shettleston Halls was carried out to a higher standard (and cost) due to GEAR. The building of private housing in GEAR was undoubtedly stimulated by the improvement in the general environment in the East End and facilitated by the release of suitable sites, although this is now spreading to other areas. The Health Centres provided by the GGHB at Parkhead and Bridgeton are understood to be a provision specific to GEAR. The total expenditure included in Table 6 amounts to some £44m excluding private house building. An estimate of the costs of private housing units completed or under construction in GEAR at 31.3.83, is put at some £19.2m (SDA Report 1983). The schemes in Table 7, on the other hand, are considered likely to have been in operation in the absence of a GEAR project. The Bogleshole road /rail bridges, for instance, are linked to the Cambuslang Recovery Area which was designated prior to the birth of GEAR. Similarly, GDC and SSHA housing provision were part of a city-wide housing programme. The total expenditure included in Table 7 amounts to some £155.7m. Thus, even if private sector housing costs are included GEAR, specific expenditure may only have accounted for some 29% of the mainstream programme.

#### 7) Administrative Initiatives

The bulk of the Administrative initiatives were considered to be consistent with programmes outside GEAR. This was because they were either part of regionwide strategies (eg. SRC Young Person and Adult Education) or nationwide programmes (MSC, YOPs, etc.), of which the GEAR area by its nature would command a part. The major item which was considered "extra" was the joint SDA/MSC/SRC GEAR employment centre initiative, which provides 60 places for adults. The established MSC/SRC schemes on the other hand provided for some 1300 places.

#### 8) Administrative Costs and Future Revenue Costs

It has proved impossible to estimate the total administrative costs associated with GEAR, however, there are data from different sources that indicate the order of such costs:

- 1) 1980-81 salary and overhead costs attributable to GEAR within the SDA were approximately £1.2m (Deloitte 1982).
- 2) the manpower allocated to GEAR by GDC Planning Department was some 550 man/months in 1978/79 - 1981/82 and 120 man/months in 1982/83 (GDC, 1982).
- 3) perhaps some £1m of the SSHA costs of maintaining their regional office in Glasgow may be attributable to GEAR. (Deloitte 1982)

Finally, it should be noted that certain schemes currently in operation in GEAR have revenue implications for the local authorities. Glasgow Parks Department, for instance, estimate that some £272,000 will be required each year for the maintenance of the environmental improvement sites in GEAR.

Table 6 Mainstream Programme (Not financed by Urban Aid) - Protected or Stimulated by GEAR

	Completion Date	Cost (£000s)
SRC - COMPLETED		
Traffic Management	81/82	425
SRC - PROGRAMMED		
Hamilton Road Route	86/88	27515
Traffic Management - Annick Street/ Old Shettleston Road	83/84	698
Youth Wing - Eastbank Academy		
GDC - COMPLETED		
Domestic smoke control programme	79/81	894
20 houses for sale	Dec. 79	453
Modernisation Shettleston Halls	Jul. 80	700
Local shops at Dalmarnock	81/82	-
GDC - PROGRAMMED		
606 lead pipe replacements	Nov. 83	n/a
90 houses (foam slag) modernised	82/84	1500
GGHB - COMPLETED		
Health Centre, Bridgeton	Apr. 82	1250
GGHB - COMPLETED		
Health Centre, Parkhead, Shettleston	82/84/86	4480
SSHA - COMPLETED		
33 houses for sale	Aug. 81	489
Housing Management Office, Parkhead	Aug. 78	68
SSHA - PROGRAMMED		
Refurbishment 48 shop units	81/83	-
299 houses modernised	82/85	3558
42 houses rehabilitated	82/84	524
DHSS - PROGRAMMED		
Social Security Offices - Bridgeton Shettleston	83/87	2460
PRIVATE - COMPLETED		
587 houses for sale	81/82	-
PRIVATE - PROGRAMMED		
1309 houses for sale	83/85	-

Source: Interpretation by the author of data from Project Programme 82, 83; Project Report 82,83.

Table 7 Mainstream Programme (Not financed by Urban Aid) - Consistent with Programmes outside GEAR

	Completion Date	Cost (£000s)
<b>SRC - COMPLETED</b>		
Cambuslang Pipe Bridge	Dec. 78	450
Bogleshole Road road/rail bridges	Sept. 80	1090
Sewers - Parkhead	July 80	1395
Local Traffic Improvements	82/83	4830
Public Transport	79/82	3280
Police, Fire stations	81/83	4097
<b>SRC - PROGRAMMED</b>		
Bogleshole Road road/rail bridge	83/85	2670
Townhead/London Road link	82/87	24573
Local Traffic Improvements	82/85	1629
Hostel for physically handicapped	82/84	70
<b>GDC - COMPLETED</b>		
30 sheltered units	1983	n/a
Hostel, Calton	Sept. 77	1205
801 houses built	78/82	13651
2482 houses modernised	78/80	16649
834 houses modernised with TG & IRP	81/82	n/a
465 houses rehabilitated	77/80	4642
Renovation, Peoples Palace	81/82	200
Housing Management Office, Parkhead	Nov. 79	240
Abbattoir - Duke St.	81/82	3949
<b>GDC - PROGRAMMED</b>		
Outdoor Athletic Track	82/83	-
47 homesteading dwellings	82/83	-
<b>GGHB - COMPLETED</b>		
Geriatric, psychiatric facilities	1979	510
<b>GGHB - PROGRAMMED</b>		
Health Education programme	82/83	-
<b>SSHA - COMPLETED</b>		
932 houses built	79/83	17849
1372 houses modernised	79/83	11827
4 Housing Assoc. Offices	1977	100
<b>SDD - PROGRAMMED</b>		
Link M74 to Hamilton Road Route	82/86	41600
<b>H.Assoc. - COMPLETED</b>		
84 units built	1981	1860

Source: Interpretation by the author of data from Project Programme 82, 83; Project Report 82, 83.

## CONCLUSIONS

The estimates of GEAR "specific" expenditure arrived at in the previous sections are summarised and presented in Table 8. The figures differ slightly from those in Table 1 since those in Table 8 were compiled from the 1983 Project Programme, which in some cases required an update of the 1982 figures and, in others, merged contributions from various participants. However, certain major conclusions still emerge:

- 1) over the period 1977-82 possibly some £48.6m or 31% of the expenditure in GEAR may be considered "extra".
- 2) the largest areas of GEAR specific expenditure were in infrastructure provision by the SDA and Strathclyde Regional Council.
- 3) in the period from 1976 to March 1983, private sector housebuilders had spent some £19.2m in the GEAR area.

Clearly the foregoing analysis would tend to reject the notion that GEAR may be regarded as a "confidence trick". Substantial funds have been invested in the area which either would not have found their way there, or could well have been the target for public expenditure cuts. The interpretation of published data in this paper may be disputed, given that it incorporates informed but fallible judgements of what would have happened had there been no GEAR project. Yet, accepting that individual items of expenditure and specific items are open to challenge and to other equally valid interpretations, the weight of evidence clearly points to GEAR having brought a substantially higher level of expenditure than would otherwise have occurred in the East End of Glasgow. This conclusion corroborates the belief of the participants in the project. What may not be readily apparent from the preceding analysis is, first, the way in which the multi-agency structure of the GEAR project may have conditioned the investment of the local authorities and, secondly, whether extra money in the East End is also extra money for Glasgow, Strathclyde and Scotland. Over the last five years, for instance, the amount of housing investment by Glasgow District Council which has been allocated to GEAR has declined substantially whilst over the same period that allocated to the Maryhill Corridor project has increased. It appears that the involvement in GEAR of the Housing Corporation and the Scottish Special Housing Association has allowed Glasgow District Council to allocate elsewhere resources which would otherwise have been channelled into the GEAR area. There may thus have been an increase of housing investment in Glasgow because of GEAR. The involvement of other agencies was less able to allow a redirection of resources, for instance, Strathclyde Regional Council had their major responsibilities for expenditure which were not readily substitutable by other agencies as was possible in housing. On the issue of whether extra GEAR expenditure merely beggared other localities within the participants' responsibilities, further enquiries are required. SDA expenditure is separated in Treasury allocations from Scottish local government expenditure; to this extent the SDA's extra expenditure in GEAR has not been at the expense of reductions in local authority allocations. However, discretion lies with the Secretary of State to adjust allocations to individual local authorities within the overall Scottish block grant. It is unclear whether any adjustments have been made for GEAR or any other SDA projects. Specifically in the field of housing, it appears that the Housing Corporation found their involvement in GEAR a useful lever on Government to increase their cash limits. A question which arises from these arguments relates to the extent to which changes in the pattern of expenditure in GEAR represent coordinated changes in policy emphasis, or are merely reflections of changes in the budgets or goals of the individual agencies. Indeed, it may be that by its nature the GEAR project may best be regarded as a "sum of parts" with the nature and magnitude of each part being determined by the individual circumstances of

each participant, rather than through any unified direction by the SDA. Direction in this sense could only be attempted through Scottish Office adjustment of financial allocations and even then would only be possible to a limited degree. The greatest temptation for the Scottish Office to intervene was, of course, in housing policy, where Ministers could have considered it worthwhile to "buy-out" the District Council in GEAR, thereby securing innovations in tenure choice and management practise which the District Council had previously been reluctant to attempt. Examples of such innovation include the use of architects from outwith the District Council and the encouragement of SSHA and private housebuild.

Table 8 Summary of GEAR Expenditure (1977-82)

	Protected or Stimulated (£000s)	Consistent with progs. outside (£000s)	Total (£000s)
Scottish Development Agency			
Land Assembly Site Prep.	3306	5419	8725
Factory Building	12312	3293	15605
Environment, Recreation	11359	4868	16227
	<u>26977</u>	<u>13580</u>	<u>40557</u>
Strathclyde Regional Council			
Infrastructure, Transport	11045	425	11470
Education, Social Services, Community	1850	2067	3917
Protection Services	-	3282	3282
	<u>12895</u>	<u>5774</u>	<u>18669</u>
Glasgow District Council			
New Housing	453	13651	14104
Modernisation, Rehabilitation	700	21291	21991
Other	1496	5950	7446
	<u>2649</u>	<u>40892</u>	<u>43541</u>
Scottish Special Housing Assoc.			
New Housing	489	17849	18338
Modernisation, Rehabilitation	-	11827	11827
Other	68	100	168
	<u>557</u>	<u>29776</u>	<u>30333</u>
Housing Corporation			
Local HA New Housing	-	1860	1860
Local HA Rehabilitation	-	17175	17175
		<u>19035</u>	<u>19035</u>
Greater Glasgow Health Board	4480	510	
Manpower Services Commission	-	-	n/a
Dept. Health & Social Security	1060	-	1060
Private Sector	19200*		19200
FINAL TOTALS	<u>48618</u>	<u>109567</u>	<u>158185</u>

\* private sector housing investment excluded from final totals

Source: Interpretation by the author of data from Tables 2-7, Project Reports and Programmes, 1983 SDA Annual Report

## REFERENCES

- Allan, R (1982), (ed) Making the City Work, Enterprise and Democracy in Urban Europe, Glasgow District Council.
- Booth, S A S, Pitt, D C and Money, W J (1982), Organisational Redundancy. A Critical Appraisal of the GEAR Project, Public Administration, Vol. 60
- Boyle, R M and Wannop, U A (1982), Area Initiatives and the SDA: the rise of the Urban Project, Fraser of Allander Quarterly Economic Commentary.
- Deloitte Haskins and Sells (1982), GEAR Review, Business Development and Employment Strategy, Interim Report for the SDA.
- GEAR (1980), Strategy and Programme, SDA.
- GEAR (1982), Project Programme '82, SDA.
- GEAR (1983), Project Programme '83, SDA.
- GEAR (1982), Project Report '82, SDA.
- GEAR (1983), Project Report '83, SDA.
- GDC (1982), Policy Resources Sub-Committee on Special Resources June 1982.
- Orton, I (1982), "Whatever Happened to GEAR", Fraser of Allander Institute Quarterly Economic Commentary, Vol. 7, No. 3, 27-30.
- SDA (1983), Annual Report 1983 - Focus on Technology.