

Chapter 1

What is an Inclusive City?



Ajay Bailey and Kei Otsuki

Abstract Cities around the world are constantly exposed to a wide range of impacts and shocks, including pandemics, adverse climate events, political crises, civil unrest, and deepening social and economic inequalities that lead to precarious living conditions. Vulnerable groups of people at the urban margins are particularly affected by the unequal distribution of available resources and a lack of access to basic services. This book, with a particular focus on various forms of intersectionality—hence, intersectionalities—presents a range of examples showcasing imaginaries of sustainable urban development across cities in the Global South and North.

1 Introduction

Cities around the world are constantly exposed to a wide range of impacts and shocks, including pandemics, adverse climate events, political crises, civil unrest, and deepening social and economic inequalities that lead to precarious living conditions. Vulnerable groups of people at the urban margins are particularly affected by the unequal distribution of available resources and a lack of access to basic services. The COVID-19 pandemic has served as a wakeup call for researchers, development practitioners, and decision-makers to re-examine the notion of well-being, which can be easily undermined by powerlessness, poverty, and social exclusion that impact vulnerable groups of people across the Global South and the Global North.

Cities are also sites of frequent displacement. In 2021, more than 38 million people were forced to flee their homes due to conflicts, violence, and disasters (IDMC, 2022). Additionally, Cernea and Maldonado (2018: 4) predict that 20 million people will be displaced annually due to infrastructure development around the world in the current decade. In cities, displacements and evictions can also occur due to rising real estate prices and gentrification. This is particularly evident in cities experiencing “speculative urbanism,” which is driving global urban transformation (Goldman, 2011;

A. Bailey (✉) · K. Otsuki
Department of Human Geography and Spatial Planning, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands
e-mail: a.bailey@uu.nl

Leitner & Sheppard, 2023). Under the current neoliberal investment and urban political conditions, urban displacement push vulnerable groups further into the urban fringes and precarity (Harvey, 2007). In addition to external pressures, vulnerable groups in cities face discrimination based on factors such as gender, disability, ethnicity, caste, and religion. This discrimination persists and contributes to social exclusion (Haque et al., 2019; Jha, 2019; Najib & Hopkins, 2019). In this context, international agendas such as the United Nations' New Urban Agenda and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development push the idea of "making cities inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable" (SDG11, United Nations, 2023). However, urgent questions remain unanswered: What defines an inclusive city? More specifically, what does "a city for all" entail? Who has the authority to decide who is included and who is not, and how can we develop innovative theoretical and methodological approaches to address the multiple intersectional inequalities?

2 Defining Inclusion and the Inclusive City

More than half of the world's population now lives in cities, with a projected increase to 70 percent by 2050. Nearly 2.2 billion people will move to and live in cities in Asia and Africa. Urbanization and development of new cities, especially in emerging economies and the Global South more broadly, were seen as citadels of economic growth and opportunity to break free from social and ethnic barriers to work, education, and social life. However, while many cities continue to experience economic growth and prosperity, this prosperity is not shared equally among urban dwellers. The concept of the "inclusive city" emerged in the mid-2010s to address this selective urban prosperity, drawing from the classic concept of social exclusion (Anttiroiko & de Jong, 2020).

Social exclusion in cities implies the structural inequality that exists in both social and spatial dimensions. For example, Levitas et al. (2007) define social exclusion as a complex and multidimensional process involving the denial of resources, rights, goods, and services to specific groups of people. This also includes their inability to participate in broader social relationships and activities that are available to most people in society, whether in economic, social, cultural, or political spheres. Social exclusion affects both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society. The lack of access to schools, high healthcare costs, and precarious housing limits the development of socially excluded people, particularly the urban poor. Unequal access to urban amenities, a safe environment, and quality services perpetuates a vicious cycle of poverty that is difficult to escape. Whitzman et al. (2013) highlight the vulnerability of women in cities, while Espino (2015) argues that creating an inclusive city involves confronting social segregation in different urban contexts that affect different groups of people.

One way to address the inequality of access for socially excluded people in cities is by providing sustainable, clean, green, and affordable transport infrastructure and services. The transport disadvantage literature emphasizes that unequal access to

transport, particularly public transport, limits an individual's mobility to access essential activities (Preston & Raje, 2007; Ma et al., 2018). Similarly, providing affordable housing and co-producing public services in low-income neighborhoods are key policy goals in both the Global South and the Global North. The trend towards privatization of basic public services, driven by neoliberal policies, has created a hidden informal economy where these services are exchanged at higher costs. This has resulted in higher costs of living, coupled with high unemployment rates and loss of income due to various shocks, including displacements or the pandemic, leading to lower resources for basic health care and everyday subsistence, such as quality and nutritious food. Within households, children and older adults are usually most affected in this context of social exclusion and underlying unequal access to services, with women bearing a larger care burden.

To address the multidimensional nature and extent of social exclusion, design principles for inclusive cities have been developed in studies conducted across continents, including Asia–Pacific (Dahiya & Das, 2020), Latin America (Leite et al., 2020), Southern Africa (Mboup & Oyeleran-Oyeyinka, 2019), and Europe (Stratigea & Kavroudakis, 2019). These studies all emphasize the need for social inclusion to become an operational social justice-based concept (Fitzgibbons & Mitchell, 2019). Inclusion is a basic human and socioeconomic right for all people, particularly to challenge and change norms and values that underlie social inequalities and injustices, in order to continually work towards a quality life. In this sense, increasing attention is being paid to smart cities and how inclusive the new innovative city-making process is becoming (Guma, 2019; Aldinhas Ferreira, 2021).

As the debate on designing and building an inclusive city grows, we believe that inclusive cities should not merely be conceptualized as utopias or cities that actually exist as such. They should be cities that are possible, constantly allowing citizens to engage, debate, reflect, and recognize the diverse sets of inequalities that have been produced and experienced. It is a joint task of the state, various social actors, and citizen groups to co-produce tools, policies, and interventions to reduce inequalities and open pathways towards a more just society.

3 The Intersectionality of Urban Inequalities in the Context of Global Urban Transformations

The concept of “intersectionality” is particularly useful in establishing an inclusive imaginary of cities where all citizens can co-produce various interventions to reduce inequalities and improve their quality of life. According to Crenshaw (1991), intersectionality explains how multiple forms of discrimination (such as classism, sexism, ageism, and ableism) intersect, overlap, and combine to produce inequalities for marginalized groups. Originally, Crenshaw used the concept to showcase the oppressions faced by Black women in the United States. Over time, it has been applied in various geographies and contexts, enabling researchers to examine how different

forms of oppression and discrimination can have differential impacts depending on the subject position and the privileges and disadvantages accrued to those positions (Bastia, 2014; Cho et al., 2013). Changing access to resources can help change subject positions and reduce the impact of discrimination.

While not a new concept, intersectionality is increasingly relevant in examining the specific lived experiences of diverse groups in cities and preventing homogenizing identities in assessing inequalities and exclusion. Societal markers, such as gender, race, class, income, caste, (dis)ability, and sexuality, persist in stigmatizing groups of people and increase urban inequalities; the effects are more severe when these markers overlap and intersect. However, intersectionality is not prominently used in studies on the inclusivity of cities. For example, in a general review of 650 articles with keywords “inclusive” and “city,” only six explicitly used the terminology and concept of intersectionality to expose how inequalities can be multifaceted. Castán Broto and Neves (2018) observed that bringing an intersectional lens to analyzing the co-production of urban services can aid in identifying context-specific inequalities that reproduce inequality and social exclusion. Lacey et al. (2021) used intersectionality to establish that designing public space involves a more intricate understanding of gendered and racialized spatial planning. Gooding (2020) applied the concept of intersectionality to experiences and the potential management of climate hazards that many urban dwellers, especially those in more vulnerable conditions, currently face.

The imaginary of inclusion and attention to intersectionality requires alternative urban strategies and concrete infrastructures that address exclusion, co-production of services, and sustainable place-making, especially in the Global South (Rigon & Castán Broto, 2021). This can address the urban violence often experienced in southern cities (Salahub et al., 2019). However, exclusion and vulnerability are not limited to urban dwellers in the Global South. Cities across the south and the north face similar challenges of increasing inequality and vulnerability for groups such as older women, children in low-income neighborhoods, or citizens exposed to racial discrimination in particular socioeconomic contexts. Therefore, addressing intersectionality and multidimensional inequalities must be placed in the context of *global urban transformations* and connections, rather than confined to either the Global South or North.

Transformation can take various forms. At the policy level, combatting systemic inequalities involves implementing anti-discrimination policies; improving access to urban services such as housing, education, health care, and water; and implementing policies and interventions for affirmative action. An intersectional lens aids in specifying the profiles and extent of vulnerability and discrimination to ensure that these actions reach the most affected. Cassan’s (2019) analysis of the impact of affirmative action on education for scheduled castes and tribal groups in India found that men from these groups benefited more from the action compared to women. Intersectionality allows us to evaluate the effects of policy interventions. Furthermore, we must understand the level of citizen agency and collaboration with the policy sphere to imagine how exclusive urban processes can become transformed from below into an inclusive city-making process based on interactions between various groups of citizens and urban dwellers.

4 Scope and Structure of the Book

This book with a particular focus on various forms of intersectionality—hence, intersectionalities—presents a range of examples showcasing imaginaries of sustainable urban development across cities in the Global South and North. The book examines the inclusive city as imagined and practiced by various actors, including state and non-state actors, and most importantly, urban dwellers who (re)claim, negotiate, and transform everyday urban forms of socio-cultural practices and infrastructural constellations.

The book is divided into four parts. The first part, “Infrastructures and Ambivalent Properties,” explores the relationship between infrastructures that shape the physical frameworks of cities and different groups of citizens. The relationship can be both inclusive and exclusive, and we gather cases that discuss, both theoretically and methodologically, the effects of infrastructures on city spaces and peoples. The second and third parts focus on “intersectionalities,” first in relation to infrastructures and second in relation to how agencies of marginalized groups of people unfold in cities. The last part of the book conceptualizes the inclusive city as the city in the making. The section provides an overview of historical and current experiments and designs shaping up inclusive cities in various urban frontiers. In what follows, we detail the rationale of each section, introducing the chapters included in this book.

Infrastructures and Ambivalent Properties

In recent years, there has been a renewed interest in infrastructure, both as a manifestation of the persisting “modernization ideal” (Graham & Marvin, 2001) and as a tangible representation of the ambivalence associated with modernization (Rodger & O’Neill, 2012). Infrastructure embodies the various promises of a good life and future-oriented “development” while also excluding groups of people who find it increasingly difficult to attain that good life (Anand et al., 2018). Infrastructure, as a set of “public” works, is often selective in terms of who is included in this “public” and who is made invisible (Otsuki, 2019). This trend of selectivity may be empirically exacerbated by international agendas such as the New Urban Agenda and SDGs, particularly SDG9—industry, innovation, and infrastructure, and SDG11—sustainable cities and human settlements, which justify investment flows into the production of new infrastructure for creating sustainable and resilient cities in the context of climate change and increased disasters. While the international sustainable city-making agenda aims to create cities that are inclusive for all citizens, previous studies have shown that the sustainability agenda has often been accompanied by various forms of displacement (Shannon, 2021) and experiences of marginalization in the process of relocation due to infrastructure building and development (Beier et al., 2021).

In this first part of this book, we present eight chapters that delve into the selective patterns of inclusion and exclusion perpetuated by the emerging industry of infrastructure in various cities across the Global North and South. The section opens with a chapter by the Urban Digital Infrastructure (UDI) Writers’ Collective that

explores the process of reproducing inequalities as digital infrastructural urbanism spreads globally. With the rise of smart urbanism, digital infrastructure is increasingly being used to make cities *more efficient*, with infrastructure for electric vehicles, shared transport, and smart metering of public utility services payments, among other connections made between technologies established in cities and our smart devices. While one rationale for this is to make cities more compact and address urban greenhouse gas emissions and pollution (Burgess, 2000), another is to increase the state's control over citizens by accumulating personal data. At the same time, the affordability of these digital services remains a question, and smart urbanism could exacerbate existing social and economic inequalities, particularly in Global Southern cities where the majority of citizens are “informal” urban dwellers with limited access to services. As a result, the benefits of digital infrastructure for the urban poor are ambivalent (van Gils & Bailey, 2023).

Ravi et al. provide further examination of the case of India's Smart Cities Mission—the official national policy which aims to turn cities into digitalized spheres—in light of critical thinking about digital infrastructuring in a particular context. The chapter highlights the increasing use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in Indian cities and the assumptions about citizens' capacities that this requires, including preconditions of citizenship itself. The authors emphasize the mismatch between the government's vision and citizens' feelings about this Mission, which *invites* citizen participation in smart city planning to make the process more inclusive but limits this invitation to the space of endorsement rather than critical engagement with the process. More fundamentally, the availability of ICT requires language skills that many lower educated citizens lack. In India, where the caste system still permeates urban segregation and civic participation in overall planning, imposing smart urbanism can exacerbate the sense of exclusion among already marginalized groups of people (Jha, 2019).

Digital infrastructure and smart urbanism are recent examples that highlight the need for critical observation and analysis regarding inclusive city-making through ICTs, particularly in relation to citizen control and the process of accumulation by capitalist logic, which, after all, tech companies and governments promote as innovation (Datta & Odendaal, 2019). Varghese further explores the process of accumulation and its connection with dispossession in the case of India's Special Investment Regions, which promotes smart urbanization. Along with the building of *new* cities across the Global South to create an image of world cities, progress, and future-oriented prosperity (Watson, 2014), foreign investments often lead to economic and physical displacements (Steel et al., 2017) and unequal access to spaces and infrastructural services among groups of citizens who can afford the new infrastructural services and who cannot. In this vein, chapter of Darak et al. shows that exclusion is inevitable when governments—and researchers like ourselves—neglect the importance of collecting relevant data on citizens' well-being to understand their capacity to access services in the first place.

Reflecting on the experience of COVID-19 in India, Darak et al. problematize the data collected for managing the health conditions of urban dwellers to such an extent that the public health system in cities still fails to address inequities among

citizens in accessing health services. Hossain and Ahmed's chapter then discusses inequality in public transportation in the Dhaka, Bangladesh. Public transport is often viewed as a symbol of urban inclusivity, as it provides access to mobility for those who cannot afford private cars or do not drive. In Latin America, many protests to address urban inequality have started with the rise of public transport tariffs, especially bus fares, as buses are especially used by lower income citizens. However, the recent rise in bus rapid transit (BRT) systems across various cities shows that public transport development is considered a key factor in ensuring sustainable and inclusive city-making. The chapter on Dhaka's case highlights the need to prioritize security, especially for women, and the frequency of public transportation services to ensure that people feel safe using them. Similarly, Bozovic's chapter contemplates the concept of "walkability" and how infrastructure can be designed to a more pedestrian-friendly, less vehicle-oriented environment while also ensuring safety and equal access to mobility in urban areas.

The last two chapters in this part focus on the resurgence of high modernism associated with mega-transport infrastructure projects. The infrastructure that once justified the car-centric society, which led to environmental concerns in cities during the twentieth century, has been reframed as new "development corridors" that facilitate connectivity between urban regions and drive sustainable economic development (Enns, 2018). However, both Suprayoga and Wargyawati's case in Jakarta, Indonesia and Kisembo and Otsuki's case in Kampala, Uganda show that these corridor developments lead to the displacement of particular groups of people, especially those in informal settlements. As Suprayoga and Wargyawati's chapter shows, the benefits of mega-transport infrastructure such as highways, which displace a large number of people to more vulnerable spaces in the urban margins, cannot be justified. Kisembo and Otsuki's chapter further shows how women are affected more severely than men when expressways alter their mobility patterns. Despite this, public consultations and project impact assessment activities often disregard the differences between groups of urban citizens due to standardized processes that are indifferent to cultural contexts.

The case of Uganda's Expressway by Kisembo and Otsuki underscores the importance of inclusion as a deliberate recognition of various groups of citizens with distinct attributes that render them more vulnerable than others. Such attributes may include class, gender, race, income, age, health status, and disability, and they can and they can intersect in complex ways. To envision truly sustainable and inclusive cities that benefit all residents, we must therefore pay close attention to the concept of intersectionality.

Intersectionalities I: Towards Inclusive Infrastructures

As the discussion on inclusive development has generally highlighted, the concept of inclusion represents a wicked problem, as including one group often leads to the exclusion of others, even though this selectiveness is usually unintentional (Otsuki et al., 2017). The chapters presented in this section take a methodological and theoretical approach to examine the unintended consequences of infrastructure as a driver of social exclusion.

The chapters by George et al. and Nagesh et al. both examine how intersectionality analysis is useful to understanding the lived experiences of different groups of citizens in Bengaluru, India. One group is female laborers who require mobility to access work and health care, particularly for tuberculosis treatments. The intersectionality of their daily lives highlights the need for attention to their mobility patterns to address their well-being. The other group is older individuals, whose vulnerability is exacerbated by the intersectionality of poverty and a lack of social policies in low-income neighborhoods in southern cities (Nagesh et al., 2023). Aging itself is an emerging urgent issue in terms of physical infrastructural design and social policy that supports the older adults to be able to afford and access quality services (Jahangir et al., 2022; Joshi & Bailey, 2023). Aging also poses challenges for urban planners and policymakers in the Global North, as shown in van Doorne and Meijering's chapter on "age-friendly" cities in the Netherlands, where limitations to this ideal are encountered even in one of the wealthiest countries in the world.

As Sheller (2018) has discussed, mobility justice is a fundamental principle of modern inclusive city-making, enabling every citizen's human capabilities for development (see also Nassubaum, 2011). However, in practice, this often involves new technology and infrastructures that do not necessarily consider the needs and capacities of the aging population. Once again, infrastructures function in selective manners, but, in this section, the selection is not merely about the division between the rich and poor or formal and informal urban dwellers: an intersectionality lens provides an understanding of how the selection works in more complex ways and has a differential impact on various urban dwellers.

The underlying issue here is that ways in which cities are planned and designed tend to overlook the diverse needs of citizens with varied lived experiences (Beier et al., 2021). Lowe and Sattari's chapter addresses this issue by examining the actual needs of older adults through the use of spatial techniques and participatory monitoring of their mobility. Their chapter reminds us of the importance of including groups of people who are often exposed to uneven urban development in research and planning activities.

Sturge's chapter thus directly addresses the intersection between public health and urban planning by examining how to establish design principles for people facing public health challenges. Using the Netherlands as an example, the chapter specifically looks into the lived experiences of people with dementia and makes a series of recommendations for including the citizens with dementia in all spheres of urban development. The overall issue here is how health infrastructure for older adults and people who need treatment can be interactively planned and implemented in combination with other infrastructure, primarily transportation and digital infrastructure that increasingly comes with it. In this sense, intersectionality is not only about various groups of citizens with different attributes, but also about designing infrastructure that addresses the needs of those specific groups of people.

The final chapter in this part, written by Nadh and Bhan, takes us back to Bengaluru in India where intersectional disadvantages resulting from inaccessible healthcare infrastructure and other aspects of social life in a low-income neighborhood are

observed in detail. One of the interesting aspects of this case is that healthcare infrastructure, which should be in the public policy sphere, is either provided by charitable individuals or private institutions that demand people's ability to afford these services in the low-income neighborhood. This poses the problem of commodification, where access to public health systems or quality life more broadly requires capital (Chatterjee, 2004). Such commodification is increasingly witnessed across continents, revealing the contemporary neoliberal nature of city-making.

Intersectionalities II: Agency and Place-Making in Cities

While the first two sections of this book essentially problematize the current politics of infrastructure and its inclusivity as being paradoxically exclusionary, the rest of the book focuses on the agency of citizens and urban dwellers who navigate through the exclusionary mechanisms to include themselves in the everyday fabrics of urban development. After all, we can contend that global urban transformation stems from the exercise of agency, which works to *structure* systems of infrastructure and ultimately transform the city (cf. Giddens, 1984). Intersectionality in this section works in various ways as citizens themselves take advantage of their own attributes—of being women, older adults, young, ethnic minority, or poor—to further expose the exclusionary mechanisms of the city and make their own places within the city.

Chapter of Steel et al. vividly demonstrates Sudanese women's agency in dealing with family and everyday livelihoods. In this case, digital infrastructure—and social media more specifically—has strengthened women's participation in everyday place-making within Khartoum, as their public sphere is physically limited. Therefore, digital technology helps them transcend physical barriers, conduct business at home, and leverage their physical immobility. A similar process is explored in Andal's chapter, where she examines children's agency in an informal settlement in the Philippines. Living in an especially restricted situation during the pandemic, children navigate their streets in informal settlements to create their spaces to act. Both women and children are often overlooked in city infrastructure planning and design, and these chapters remind us of the existence, bodies of knowledge, and experiences that could be more valued in cities.

Biswas's chapter further draws our attention to the intersectionality surrounding citizenship status. Focusing on migrant laborers who sustain much of a city's functions, the chapter critically reflects on Lefebvre's "right to the city" concept to clarify whose rights we are really talking about. Both locals and migrants in Kolkata, India struggle to secure their rights to live a quality life, which is heavily influenced by the affordability of the infrastructural and welfare services and the persisting segregation of the caste system. The experiences of immigrants in cities are often made invisible as they often work illegally or informally without formal entitlements to public services. Thus, it is the researchers' job to engage in making their experiences visible, especially when immigrants experience difficulties in enjoying urban life.

Chapter of Leung et al. reveals the experiences of Asian immigrants in the Netherlands who faced discriminatory reactions during the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Chinese community across Europe suffered from discrimination

and verbal violence from the host community. The chapter shows how the immigrant community started to engage with the public debate through social media and public protests against “Asian hate.” These processes of counter movements and push for inclusive agenda are witnessed globally. Similarly, Aziz’s chapter focuses on the Rohingya refugee community’s demonstrations of their food practices in the Australian city of Brisbane. Food practices create spaces of inclusion for the immigrant community to identify a territory within the city as part of the larger host community. Likewise, Zimbabwean migrants’ food practices, as detailed in Brouwer’s chapter, shape inclusive foodscapes in the South African city of Johannesburg where xenophobia persists in violent ways. All of these cases demonstrate the strong agency of immigrants who are determined to include themselves in the cityscape through the exercise of their fundamental rights to eat their food, which reflects strong cultural pride and continuity.

All the chapters in this section, to varying degrees, demonstrate the strategic use of digital infrastructure by those who tend to be excluded from city spaces due to discrimination, citizenship status, labor practices, or tradition. Recent protests in Iran are a prime example of how social media, through images and the connections generated, can transcend physical spaces and localized actions, supporting the global movement towards inclusion of women in spaces of freedom. Urban spaces are where the voices demanding inclusion are the loudest, as they constitute “ideoscapes” where large numbers of citizens can gather and share their ideas (Appadurai, 1996). However, whether these ideoscapes become the actual grounds for setting up inclusive cities depends on how seriously decision-making actors listen to the raised voices and meet the demands. If these actors become oppressive, we need to collectively think about how to address the oppression by drawing from various experiences of creative action, designing, and planning in various cities. Only when various groups with different attributes and decision-making capabilities and institutional power come together can we envision inclusive and sustainable cities for all in the long term.

Inclusive Cities for Sustainable Development

How do we learn from different experiences of creative action that demands social inclusion in cities? One answer to this question is through history. Rose’s chapter takes us to the city of Utrecht in the Netherlands where the reinterpretation of the role of the city’s patron saint, which existed since mediaeval times, emphasizes the importance of inclusion and sustainability in the present day. While it can be argued that embracing a particular saint is not applicable to all urban citizens, including migrants and those who are not Christians, the chapter shows that the city had intended to be inclusive through the symbolization of the religious character. Chapter of Raviv et al. on inclusive space design in the city of Utrecht that led to the creation of De Voorkamer demonstrates how the practice of “social design” creates an inclusive space for people from different backgrounds to meet and connect, and what this design entails. The chapter lays out the six basic social design principles: people, program/project, location, space, communication, and online/offline network. We can consciously apply these principles in different experiences and designs in various

cities presented in the rest of this section to evaluate the inclusivity of spaces within each city.

In the Colombian city of Bogotá, Kessler and Hernández-García examine the impact of the HabiARTE urban renewal and beautification project in the city's informal settlement, and whether this project created an inclusive space. Their detailed case study shows that people were not fully identifying their needs with this project, which essentially painted informal settlers' houses in various colors to make the space attractive for visitors. The communication between the beautification promoters and the citizens was lacking, especially when it came to the question of who finds what beautiful, while basic infrastructural services and other needs for the neighborhood remained insufficient. This is a typical example of non-social design and intervention, which stigmatizes already marginalized groups of citizens by forcing them to be visible to the outside through infrastructural intervention (e.g., Baumann & Yakobi, 2022).

Chapter of Madureira et al. takes us to Indonesia to examine an urban development intervention through the use of creative industries in informal settlements as a case study. The chapter shows how keeping traditions alive through creative industries as a part of tourism strategy links community-based management of the project with municipality-led development planning. The case demonstrates the importance of networks—local associations that negotiate with the government to jointly work on development strategies. Cooperation between various actors with strong agency and participation from citizen-community groups can lead to the implementation of new infrastructural initiatives that enhance the city's resilience. Similarly, chapter of Marino et al. examines the public parks program in Bucaramanga, Colombia, where researchers, urban planners, and architects collaborate to design infrastructure that enhances the climate resilience of the city. The public parks work as inclusive spaces where various citizens, including women, children, and older adults, come together. The chapter emphasizes the potential of infrastructure to *activate* citizen agency if planning is inclusive and decision-makers and engineers follow up with the project over time. Researchers also play a vital role in facilitating observation and interaction between citizens and other actors providing hard infrastructure and funding. Design principles should include public health narratives, particularly in addressing climate change, and broader governance that shapes the public sphere of inclusion.

The narratives of public health and governance underlie Sattari's chapter on food planning in Cardiff, UK. The chapter discusses how food planning can transform corporate-led to localized food systems through community mobilization and participatory discussions on the kind of food systems needed in the city. The concept of "food-led governance" offers an interesting perspective on creating more inclusive spaces for deliberation between citizens and decision-makers, as food represents not only cultural identity but also sustainability, livability, and health. The discussion is relevant to widespread conversations on food desserts in Global North cities (Hamidi, 2020) and emerging patterns in the Global South, including Brazil (Honório et al., 2021), Kenya, and Mexico (Wagner et al., 2019).

However, where social inclusion is still a contested arena, more concrete political action by activist movements deserves attention. Trasciani's chapter shows that

civil society activists can play a crucial role in holding authorities accountable for their actions or lack of actions in addressing the precarity of marginalized populations. In the case of Marseille and Naples, activists focused on the quality of asylum seekers' reception centers, demanding better living conditions and more comprehensive support for the asylum seekers. Similarly, chapter of van Gils et al. highlights the importance of political participation in achieving an inclusive city in Penang, Malaysia. If the goal of inclusive city-making is to provide a platform for newcomers and local residents to voice their concerns for urban well-being, then the situations in both EU cities and Malaysia are discouraging. Authorities often overlook or outrightly suppress political action by those demanding inclusion.

Chapter of Rehorst et al. on the reconstruction of Beirut's port after the 2020 massive warehouse explosion highlights the contestation between citizens' views of the city and the design led by international donors. The citizens have experienced new infrastructure and development plans that always benefit the elite instead of average citizens, and they are skeptical about the new proposal for reconstruction, which largely disregards their concerns. Here, inclusive space is not apparent, even as activists start to voice their concerns about what the city actually means for its inhabitants. The chapter illustrates the problem of local politics, which is largely attached to the national authority and centralized power structures that do not allow citizen engagement and social design to take place. In contrast to Beirut's case, Espiñeira and Fernández-Suárez's chapter shows how local governments of Madrid and Barcelona, during their progressive municipal government regimes, could become the leading agents for opening inclusive spaces. These cities instituted the incorporation of undocumented migrants into the official registration so that they can receive public services and permits to work and reside in the cities. This effectively removes the existence of *undocumented* migrants by documenting everyone and eliminates differences based on migration statuses and places of origin. This is a bold step for the cities and shows the potential for establishing inclusive spaces that are politically viable and socially just.

The chapters by Rehorst et al. and Espiñeira and Fernández-Suárez serve as a reminder of the crucial role of local authorities, such as city councils and planning offices, in promoting or hindering social inclusion. This becomes especially important when national governments are indifferent or hostile to certain groups of people, such as migrants, women, youth, or individuals with specific religious or sexual orientations. These actors, together with citizens and other possible stakeholders, can shape the process of local urban transformation. As demonstrated in this book, when cities engage in their own transformation, it contributes to a larger global urban transformation with the potential for further development of sustainability and inclusion.

5 Conclusion

This book presents a comprehensive range of theoretical and empirical examples to provide a systematic understanding of urban forms that can potentially reframe our thinking about social inclusion and exclusion in the process of global urban transformations towards sustainable development. Through an intersectional approach, this book aims to establish a platform where critical urban scholarship and activities can unpack the relationship between urban and social transformations; address questions of power relationships and political equality; and challenge existing vulnerabilities, exclusions, and marginalization of urban dwellers. The book also aims to inspire and support citizen movements and progressive policy practices for designing potentially inclusive cities. We hope this book will instigate discussions on urban social justice and inclusion within not just the academic circles, but also city planning, policy development, and public debates, in order to shape our common urban futures amid the current multiple crises we face.

References

- Aldinhas Ferreira, M. I. (2021). *How smart is your city? Technological innovation, ethics and inclusiveness*. Springer Nature.
- Anand, N., Gupta, A., & Appel, H. (Eds.). (2018). *The promise of infrastructure*. Duke University Press.
- Antiroiko, A. V., & de Jong, M. (2020). *The inclusive city: The theory and practice of creating shared urban prosperity*. Springer Nature.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Bastia, T. (2014). Intersectionality, migration and development. *Progress in Development Studies*, 14(3), 237–248.
- Baumann, H., & Yakobi, H. (2022). Introduction: Infrastructural stigma and urban vulnerability. *Urban Studies*, 59(3), 475–489.
- Beier, R., Spire, A., & Bridonneau, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Urban resettlements in the Global South: Lived experiences of housing and infrastructure between displacement and relocation*. Routledge.
- Burgess, R. (2000). The compact city debate: A global perspective. In M. Jenks & R. Burgess (Eds.), *The compact cities: Sustainable urban forms for developing countries* (pp. 9–24). Spon Press.
- Cassan, G. (2019). Affirmative action, education and gender: Evidence from India. *Journal of Development Economics*, 136, 51–70.
- Castán Broto, V., & Neves Alves, S. (2018). Intersectionality challenges for the co-production of urban services: Notes for a theoretical and methodological agenda. *Environment and Urbanization*, 30(2), 367–386.
- Cernea, M. M., & Maldonado, J. K. (Eds.). (2018). *Challenging the prevailing paradigm of displacement and resettlement: Risks, impoverishment, legacies, solutions*. Routledge.
- Chatterjee, P. (2004). *The politics of the governed: Reflections on popular politics in most of the world*. Columbia University Press.
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society*, 38(4), 785–810.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 1241–1299.

- Dahiya, B., & Das, A. (2020). *New urban agenda in Asia-Pacific: Governance for sustainable and inclusive cities*. Springer Nature.
- Datta, A., & Odendaal, N. (2019). Smart cities and the banality of power. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 37(3), 387–392.
- Enns, C. (2018). Mobilizing research on Africa's development corridors. *Geoforum*, 88, 105–108.
- Espino, N. A. (2015). *Building the inclusive city: Theory and practice for confronting urban segregation*. Routledge.
- Fitzgibbons, J., & Mitchell, C. L. (2019). Just urban futures? Exploring equity in “100 resilient cities.” *World Development*, 122, 648–659.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. University of California Press.
- Goldman, M. (2011). Speculative urbanism and the making of the next world city. *The International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(3), 555–581.
- Gooding, E. (2020). Intersecting hazards, intersectional identities: A baseline critical environmental justice analysis of US homelessness. *Environment and Planning E Nature and Space*, 3(3), 833–856.
- Graham, S., & Marvin, S. (2001). *Splintering urbanism: Networked infrastructures, technological mobilities, and the urban condition*. Routledge.
- Guma, P. (2019). Smart urbanism? ICTs for water and electricity supply in Nairobi. *Urban Studies*, 56(11), 2333–2352.
- Hamidi, S. (2020). Urban sprawl and the emergence of food deserts in the USA. *Urban Studies*, 57(8), 1660–1675.
- Haque, I., Mehta, S., & Kumar, A. (2019). *ORF special report. Towards sustainable and inclusive cities: The case of Kolkata*. Retrieved July 5, 2023, from <https://www.orfonline.org/research/towards-sustainable-and-inclusive-cities-the-case-ofkolkata-48992/>
- Harvey, D. (2007). *The brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Honório, O. S., Pessoa, M. C., Grato, L. H. A., Rocha, L. L., de Castro, I. R. R., Canella, D. S., & Mendes, L. L. (2021). Social inequalities in the surrounding areas of food deserts and food swamps in a Brazilian metropolis. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 20(1), 1–8.
- IDMC. (2022). *GRID—Global Report on Internal Displacement 2022*. Retrieved July 5, 2023, from https://www.internaldisplacement.org/sites/default/files/publications/documents/IDMC_RID_2022_LR.pdf
- Jahangir, S., Bailey, A., Uddin Hasan, M., Hossain, S., Helbich, M., & Hyde, M. (2022). When I need to travel, I feel feverish: Everyday experiences of transport inequalities among older adults in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *The Gerontologist*, 62(4), 493–503.
- Jha, S. (2019). Dalit desires and the city of Surat. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 54(24), 42–49.
- Joshi, S., & Bailey, A. (2023). What happens next? Exploring women's transport motility through the story completion method. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 107, 103547.
- Lacey, A., Miller, R., Reeves, D., & Tankel, Y. (2021). From gender mainstreaming to intersectionality: Advances in achieving inclusive and safe cities. In: M. Mitrašnović & V. Mehta (Eds.), *Public space reader*. Routledge.
- Leite, C., Acosta, C., Millitelli, F., Jajamovich, G., Wilderom, M., Bonduki, N., Somekh, N., & Herling, T. (2020). *Social urbanism in Latin America: Cases and instruments of planning, land policy, and financing the city transformation with social inclusion*. Springer.
- Leitner, H., & Sheppard, E. (2023). Unleashing speculative urbanism: Speculation and urban transformations. *Environment and Planning A*, 55(2), 359–366.
- Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E., Gordon, D., Lloyd-Reichling, E., & Patsios, D. (2007). *The multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion*. Project Report, University of Bristol. Retrieved July 5, 2023, from <https://repository.uef.ac.uk/item/8666q>
- Ma, L., Kent, J. L., & Mulley, C. (2018). Transport disadvantage, social exclusion, and subjective well-being. *Journal of Transport and Land Use*, 11(1), 31–47.
- Mboup, G., & Oyelaran-Oyeyinka, B. (2019). *Smart economy in smart African cities: Sustainable, inclusive, resilient and prosperous*. Springer.

- Nagesh, P., Bailey, A., George, S., Hyde, M., & Subaiya, L. (2023). (Im)mobile ageing: Risks of exclusion in later life in liminal urban peripheries. *Ageing and Society*, 124.
- Najib, K., & Hopkins, P. (2019). Veiled Muslim women's strategies in response to Islamophobia in Paris. *Political Geography*, 73, 103–111.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
- Otsuki, K. (2019). Who is in the “public”? Infrastructure of displacement and urban resettlement in Mozambique. *Built Environment*, 44(4), 493–508.
- Otsuki, K., Schoneveld, G., & Zoomers, A. (2017). From land grabs to inclusive development? *Geoforum*, 83, 115–118.
- Preston, J., & Rajé, F. (2007). Accessibility, mobility and transport-related social exclusion. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 15(3), 151–160.
- Randolph, G. F., & Storper, M. (2023). Is urbanisation in the Global South fundamentally different? Comparative global urban analysis for the 21st century. *Urban Studies*, 60(1), 3–25.
- Rigon, A., & Castán Broto, V. (Eds.). (2021). *Inclusive urban development in the global south: Intersectionality, inequalities, and community*. Routledge.
- Rodgers, D., & O'Neill, B. (2012). Infrastructural violence: Introduction to the special issue. *Ethnography*, 12(3), 401–412.
- Salahub, J. E., Gottsbacher, M., de Boer, J., & Zaaroura, M. (2019). *Reducing urban violence in the Global South: Towards safe and inclusive cities*. Routledge.
- Shannon, M. (2021). Urban infrastructure and displacement: Two sides of the sustainability coin. In A. Zoomers, M. Leung, K. Otsuki, & G. Van Westen (Eds.), *Handbook of translocal development and global mobilities* (pp. 216–229). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Sheller, M. (2018). *Mobility justice: The politics of movement in an age of extremes*. Verso.
- Steel, G., van Noorloos, F., & Klaufus, C. (2017). The urban land debate in the global South: New avenues for research. *Geoforum*, 83, 133–141.
- Stratigea, A., & Kavroudakis, D. (2019). *Mediterranean cities and island communities: Smart, sustainable, inclusive and resilient*. Springer.
- United Nations. (2023). *Global sustainable development report*. Retrieved July 5, 2023, from <https://sdgs.un.org/gsdrgsd2023>
- van Gils, B. A. M., & Bailey, A. (2023). Revisiting inclusion in smart cities: Infrastructural hybridization and the institutionalization of citizen participation in Bengaluru's peripheries. *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 27, 27–49.
- Wagner, J., Hinton, L., McCordic, C., Owuor, S., Capron, G., & Gonzalez Arellano, S. (2019). Do urban food deserts exist in the global south? An analysis of Nairobi and Mexico City. *Sustainability*, 11(7), 1963.
- Watson, V. (2014). African urban fantasies: Dreams or nightmares? *Environment and Urbanization*, 26(1), 215–231.
- Whitzman, C., Legacy, C., Andrew, C., Klodawsky, F., Shaw, M., & Viswanath, K. (2013). *Building inclusive cities: Women's safety and the right to the city*. Earthscan/Routledge.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

