NEW TOWNS - OLD HABITS

Freedom of Information in
New Town Development Corporations

A report prepared for the Scottish Consumer Council by
Frances Allen, Consultant Researcher
INTRODUCTION

In April 1986 the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 comes into force. It gives the public the right to attend local authority meetings, including sub-committees, and access to a variety of local authority documents. In December 1985 Robin Cook MP announced that he would be introducing a Private Members Bill which would extend these rights of access to information to the New Town Development Corporations.

The Scottish Consumer Council, which has been campaigning for some time for greater access to information, then commissioned a brief survey to find out:

* What is the current policy and practice concerning access to information in Scottish new towns?

* How might greater public right of access to meetings and information be received by new town development corporation members and officials and by the public?

* Are there any particular problems that should be addressed and recommendations to make?

This study was compiled following the recent announcement of the Private Members Bill and does not therefore review the major role played by the new towns in Scotland over the last 20 years. Given more time it would have been valuable to have interviewed more people concerned with the running of the new towns and with their residents, and to have compared the policy and practices in the new towns with those in local authorities (the subject of "Open to the Public?" by Eveline Hunter, an earlier study carried out for the Scottish Consumer Council).

Nevertheless this brief survey has confirmed that the five Scottish new towns adopt a fairly consistent attitude to communication with the public. In short the new towns have vigorous public relations departments which maintain a regular flow of publicity materials and some information on development corporation matters, but they do not allow any access to meetings or papers such as agenda, reports or minutes.

This report attempts to show why the development corporations feel it necessary to conduct their affairs in a remarkably private forum, how this is perceived by others, and what could be the effects of exposing them to a more public gaze.
BACKGROUND

New towns

There are five new towns in Scotland today; Cumbernauld, Glenrothes, East Kilbride, Irvine and Livingston. They were set up as an aspect of regional policy to strengthen the economy by providing an environment to which new industry could be attracted and in which it would grow swiftly. They were also conceived as a means to help disperse population and industry from congested urban areas (2).

They are managed by New Town Development Corporations, set up by the Secretary of State for Scotland, and working through the Industry Department for Scotland. Their members are appointed by and answerable to the Secretary of State.

Each development corporation is managed by a board consisting of a chairman and up to 12 other members. These include members of the regional and district councils for the area in which the new town is situated, as well as members picked for their financial, commercial or industrial expertise.

The newly formed development corporations had to submit proposals for the development of the new towns and these have been amended and expanded through the years. They are empowered to acquire - if necessary by compulsory purchase - hold, manage, and dispose of land and other property in order to develop the new towns according to plans agreed by the Secretary of State.

The work of the development corporations has therefore centred round their strategic planning for development of industry and employment. As well as establishing industrial areas and encouraging industries to be set up there, they have had to develop a commercial infrastructure for their towns and to provide housing for the employees of the new town firms. House building by the development corporations for general housing needs has now come to a virtual standstill (although building for special needs continues) as the emphasis is now on private housing development. Compulsory sales to tenants have reduced the total stock of housing owned by the development corporations. Nevertheless housing management remains one of their most important functions.

The Government's intention is that eventually the development corporations will be wound up and their assets and functions passed on either to local authorities or to the private sector. This winding up process will start when the population for each new town reaches a prescribed trigger percentage of the final designated population. In any event this process will not start before 1990 - even if that population figure is reached - and in 1989 the timing of the winding up programme is to be reviewed again (3).
Freedom of information

1. Local authorities

Although the press have had the right of attendance at meetings of local authorities since 1908, it was not until 1960 that the general public was given the same rights. The press and public gained the right of admission to committee meetings in 1973, but still had no statutory right of access to sub-committees or right to receive agendas, background papers or minutes.

The campaign for less secrecy in local government was stepped up in 1983 and achieved a major breakthrough when the local Government (Freedom of Information) Act 1985 was passed. This was a Private Member's Bill, introduced by the Conservative MP Robin Squire, which received all party support and was extended to Scotland at the committee stage.

The Act, which comes into force on 1 April 1986:

* opens up sub-committees as well as meetings of full councils and their committees to the public,

* gives the public access to agendas, reports and minutes for these meetings,

* gives councillors and other local authority committee members right of access to other council papers,

* requires local authorities to publish a register of members and of powers exercisable by their officers.

The Act excludes confidential information, for example information supplied by government in terms intended to exclude publication or information required by the courts to remain confidential. It also excludes exempt information, for example information about a particular council employee or council tenant.

The Act covers all local authorities in Scotland. It excludes central government bodies such as health boards, the Scottish Special Housing Association and new town development corporations.

2. New towns

The Private Members Bill to be introduced by Robin Cook MP on 17th January proposes to extend these rights and requirements to new town development corporations. Access to sensitive commercial information would be protected by the existing protection given to confidential and exempt information.

This Bill comes after many attempts by Scottish MPs to have new town development corporation meetings and papers made accessible to the public. In the past five years the subject has been raised on six occasions during Question Time and also during the
debate on the New Towns and Urban Development Corporations Bill (4). Norman Hogg, MP for Cumbernauld and Kilsyth, has asked four Parliamentary Questions on the subject, David Lambie, (Irvine) has asked two, Willie Hamilton (Glenrothes) one, and Albert McQuarrie (Aberdeenshire E.) one.

Members have spoken repeatedly of a desire for greater public accountability, but also greater public awareness of what the development corporations are doing. They also referred to similar submissions that have been made to the government by the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities and the National Union of Journalists.

The Government's position is represented by the Ministers' answers to these Parliamentary Questions and comments made during the debate on the New Towns Bill.

In April 1981, Alex Fletcher said: "... it would not be right to direct the corporations to open their meetings since so much of their business is with private companies or individuals and is confidential. We nonetheless accept that there is a legitimate interest on the part of the press and public in what the corporations do, and have therefore specifically requested them to develop regular and frequent contact with the press." (Hansard, 27 April, col 362). In July 1981 he confirmed that at his request the development corporations had taken further measures to develop regular and frequent contact with the press.

In November 1982 Mr. Fletcher repeated that the development corporations were largely commercial organisations and nothing should be done to diminish the industrial development they carried out so successfully.

However, since then Mr. Fletcher has been succeeded as Minister by Mr. Allan Stewart, and the Government's position does seem to have shifted since then from outright rejection of the requests to admit the press and public to development corporation meetings to a more neutral stance of not wanting to interfere excessively in the development corporations affairs by directing them to open their meetings (Hansard, 20 June 1984, col 280).
CURRENT POSITION ON ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Development corporation policy on freedom of information

The general position stated very firmly by officials and by the one Chairman questioned was that a development corporation is not a local authority, accountable to the local community, but a government agency answerable to the Secretary of State. "You might think we are like Big Brother", said one Information Officer, "but we have Central Government breathing down our neck."

The development corporations are answerable to Parliament through the Secretary of State. However this form of accountability is a weak one, and rarely used by MPs.

Linked with this belief in a solely bureaucratic central accountability is a strong sense that development corporations are, and must be allowed to operate as commercial organisations and that to expose their deliberations to the public gaze would be inimical to a lot of their functions. One official carried the analogy to the extent of describing the annual report as the report to the "company's shareholder" - the Secretary of State.

Their attitude to the provision of information is very much a commercial one: that it makes good business and management sense to keep people reasonably informed and to allow exchanges of information where there might be potential trouble spots. Above all they see the provision of information as a public relations exercise from the top down.

The only development corporation to offer a written statement of its position on public information was Livingston. This statement of policy on public consultation concentrated on stressing its responsiveness to representations made from a wide range of sources, whether in response to consultation exercises initiated by the Development Corporation or unsolicited representations from community councils, councillors, MPs or directly from residents themselves.

However, the paper also describes how residents and community councils are kept informed of existing and proposed projects and policies, in particular by a public relations section which organises exhibitions and provides a wide range of leaflets; through the corporation newspaper, Livingston Life; by the monthly press conferences following the board meeting, and through issuing an edited version of the minutes to community councils.
Annual reports

The development corporations are required by the New Town (Scotland) Act 1968 to present an annual report to the Secretary of State for Scotland.

All five are incorporated in a single House of Commons Command Paper, which costs £13.90 and is available primarily from outlets for HMSO publications. This inhibits their practical use as a source of information to ordinary residents and others interested in reviewing what has happened in their new town over the past year.

The reports themselves are somewhat disappointing in terms of informative content and difficult to digest. They are presented very much as a commercial company report would be, with the emphasis on the financial accounts and review of the corporation's business activities and other successes. There are reports on housing, planning, and social and recreational issues, for example, but these are often selections of notable achievements of the past year. They tend not to place the achievements into the context of the overall strategies for the development corporation. Problems are rarely highlighted.

There are some interesting and useful factual appendices, in particular the summary statistics on population, housing available, amount of industry, expenditure and income and so on, which is provided by each development corporation (although there was no consistent style for presenting this information, making comparisons between development corporations difficult). There was only one statement of the number of people in employment - in the Livingston report - and even here the current unemployment rate was not mentioned or compared with past levels.

Board meetings

The members of the development corporation tend to be referred to collectively as "the Board". In all five development corporations, the board meets on a regular basis each month. It may also hold ad hoc meetings and in some cases has regular committee meetings.

The meetings of all the boards are closed to members of the press and general public: they are attended only by board members and certain staff.

Papers for board meetings

In all cases the agendas, agenda papers and reports, and minutes of the meetings are confidential and are not made available to either the press or general public.
In Livingston a resume of the minutes is produced and made available to the community councils within about a month of the meeting. These exclude references to individuals (for example tenants or companies in arrears), to commercially confidential matters (such as details of leases) and to domestic administrative affairs. The Chief Executive said that they probably represented a fuller version of the board meeting than would be required under the proposed Bill. Recent board minutes, which included a considerable amount of formal and repetitious as well as confidential material, amounted to 12 pages and the edited version to just over six pages.

Press conferences

All five development corporations' public relations officials claim to hold regular press briefings and to maintain regular and good contact with the press.

There is some variation in the releasing of information following board meetings. Cumbernauld, Irvine and Livingston hold routine press conferences after every monthly meeting. East Kilbride and Glenrothes hold press conferences "when necessary". (This latter practice does not appear to correspond to Alex Fletcher's statement on 13 July 1982 that all development corporation chairmen now offer to meet the press following meetings of the corporations.)

However the end result may not be very different. With the exception of Livingston, where the chairman goes through the agenda with members of the press, albeit selectively, items are selected for announcements at the press conferences by the officials and board members on the basis of their 'newsworthiness'. "We assess what has been discussed for news", said one Information Officer. "The Press don't appreciate time wasted if nothing has happened."

The fact that the board chooses what information to release appears to be more important than whether or not the conferences are on a regular monthly basis.

Public meetings

There are no regular public meetings or conferences convened by the development corporations, but they all do hold ad hoc meetings when they consider these to be desirable or when there is a large or controversial project being planned. For example, Glenrothes had a series of meetings in connection with the administration of a £5 million facelift to housing in one area of the town, where the question of decanting tenants became an issue.

Newsletters

Three development corporations publish quarterly newsletters which go out to all residents in the new town area. Glenrothes
publishes the "Grapevine", Irvine the "Irvine Insight", and Livingston "Livingston Life". These newsletters provide information both on what has happened, current activities and future developments planned.

East Kilbride and Cumbernauld do not produce regular newsletters. There used to be a newsletter in East Kilbride, when the new town was much smaller. The Information Officer felt that this had served a useful purpose at the time but was no longer necessary as it would duplicate the information functions performed satisfactorily by the local press and would also be exorbitantly expensive. While Cumbernauld does not produce a newsletter for residents, it does produce an industrial newsletter which gives regular commercial and industrial news and is distributed to all companies in the new town.

All five new towns produce a variety of information packs for new residents and existing tenants, for visitors, or companies considering moving to the new town, as well as leaflets on activities and organisations in the town.
A number of district councillors, journalists, citizens advice bureaux and other community organisations were asked for their views on the ease of obtaining information about the plans and management of new town development corporations.

**District councils**

There appears to be some tension between district councils and the development corporations which lie within their boundaries, at least in the very limited number of cases where councillors were interviewed.

One of the reasons suggested for this was the competition created by the considerable overlap in functions between a district council and development corporation. The most significant is that both are providers of public sector housing. The development corporation usually has far greater housing resources but fewer statutory housing obligations than the district council. This gives them a greater manoeuvrability in meeting people's housing requirements. Moreover since the housing stock is virtually all post-war, and a high proportion less than 25 years old, problems of renovation are on a much smaller scale.

Secondly, the district councillors are elected and are accountable not only to the electorate but also to their parties, in contrast to the development corporation members who are neither elected nor individually accountable.

Thirdly, all five new towns lie within district councils which are at present Labour-controlled, but the development corporations are not necessarily of the same political composition.

Despite these tensions, there does appear to be regular communication between district councils and development corporations, at both member and officer level. At least two development corporation officials mentioned that regular, formal liaison meetings between the two are open to the public.

However, some councillors still expressed the view that there was an unnecessary amount of secrecy about development corporation matters. Provost McKillop of East Kilbride District Council and a member of East Kilbride Development Corporation said that the Labour group on the district council would welcome greater freedom of information on the work of the development corporation. The party line was that the lack of public access to information was undemocratic. His own view was that much of the secrecy was unnecessary and furthermore prevented people from appreciating a lot of the good things that the development corporation did.
Councillors of all political parties are accustomed to being locally accountable and to making their decisions in a relatively public forum. They are less likely to find this potentially threatening than their fellow board members from a financial or industrial background.

But they may have other reservations about opening up development corporation meetings. One Conservative District Councillor who also is a Board member painted a more favourable picture of decision making by the development corporation than by councils. Because board meetings were in private, he said, members of all political viewpoints tended to act reasonably and often reached compromises rather than taking party political stances. Consensus was the norm, with relatively few occasions when a vote was required.

He also rejected any suggestion that it was solely the privacy of development corporation meetings that restricted the council members of the board from being locally accountable. While someone may have been appointed to the board because he was a councillor, he then sat on the board in an individual capacity and did not represent district council interests or the population of the new towns. Indeed the councillor pointed out that this would be difficult in his case, since he was a Conservative serving on a Labour-controlled council.

Press

The local newspapers are usually well supplied with information and stories by the development corporations. For example, the 'East Kilbride News' appreciates that the corporation provides a lot of information and replies promptly to queries, and there is a good relationship between journalists and individual officials. Although the board meetings are closed, there are regular joint meetings of the development corporation and district council which are open to the press.

In contrast an Irvine journalist complained that there was no access to officials, as all queries were dealt with by the press officer.

All the journalists spoken to, however, were conscious that the initiative is always with the development corporation rather than the press. "They tell us what they want to tell us, only if it benefits them", said one journalist covering Livingston affairs. "We don't know what we are not being told."

It is often difficult to know if there is a story to investigate without having listened to the discussions at a meeting or read the papers prepared for it. One editor complained that while he appreciated the need for some items to be discussed in private, there was an excessive amount of secrecy. When his reporters followed up a lead, they were often refused any comment on the grounds that the information was confidential.
All journalists questioned welcomed the proposal that there should be greater freedom of information in the development corporations. It appears from Albert McQuarrie's Parliamentary Question in 1981 that the National Union of Journalists has also asked for corporation meetings to be in public.

Community organisations

All five Citizens Advice Bureaux said they enjoyed a reasonable working relationship with the development corporations and had easy access to information from officials when required. But the organisers were sometimes aware that it was not necessarily as easy for individual residents to obtain information as for the CAB. If residents were not satisfied with the answer given by an official, they could not seek the help of a board member in the same way as they might approach a councillor with a district council matter. Two organisers said that clients were occasionally met with what they felt to be an attitude on the part of the development corporation that "they had a God-given right to do as they want". This apparently had the result that the clients then developed a sense of grievance not necessarily justified by the original matter at issue.

Community councils appear to be most active in Livingston and to a lesser extent East Kilbride. Livingston Development Corporation places special emphasis on community councils' representative status by distributing to them the partial resume of its board meetings. Indeed much of the tenant activity in Livingston does appear to be channelled through the community councils. For example it was the Craigshill community council which met with the corporation over problems created by rewiring in the area.

Apart from community councils, there appears to be little sign of permanent organisation of tenants or residents: more often there is ad hoc formation of tenants' groups to cope with particular problems facing an area, usually to do with housing renovation, but also with plans or lack of plans for other services or amenities. The Tenant Participation Advisory Service confirms the relative lack of active tenants' groups in new towns. This could be partly explained by efficient management of the new towns and fewer physical problems with housing stock. It might also partly be the result of living in a community where there is not so much open government.

Whatever the causes, the general relationship between development corporations and their residents appears to be one in which once a problem has been identified, the corporation embarks on careful consultation and liaison with residents. But the debate leading up to decisions being made is not public. Therefore residents are most often reacting to proposals at a fairly advanced stage of planning, making modification of proposals more difficult to achieve. Consultation with and influence by residents is thus found more at the stage of policy implementation than of policy-making.
THE CASE FOR AND AGAINST FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Why freedom of information?

The starting point for the Scottish Consumer Council and other supporters of freedom of information is that more open government is a 'good thing'.

It is not openness that has to be justified but secrecy. There may be good reasons for certain decisions being taken in private, but these must be justified. The Local Government (Access to Information) Act already sets out suitable grounds for confidentiality. SCC believes that it is incumbent on others to state what are the reasons for not opening up the corporations to more routine public scrutiny or to state what additional exemptions there need to be, over and above those applying to local government.

Accountability

Almost all corporation officials and board members spoken to referred to the fact that development corporations were central government agencies and were therefore accountable to the Secretary of State for Scotland and not to a local electorate. There were obviously strongly felt views that people mistakenly expected them to behave like local authorities when they were quite a different animal.

Giving the public the right of access to development corporation meetings and papers however is not the same thing as making the boards accountable to a local electorate. Greater public access to development corporation information is not inconsistent with new towns boards remaining answerable to central government, though local people would have a greater opportunity to attempt to influence decisions if they had more information.

Indeed it could be argued that by bringing development corporations within the jurisdiction of the Local Government Ombudsman, the Government has implicitly acknowledged that for functions such as housing, they are similar to local government.

Having local authority members is another indication that there is expected to be some local accountability, although these members are at present constrained from reporting back - at least in theory - by the confidentiality requirements.

The commercial nature of development corporations

The view was also repeatedly put that it was contrary to the nature of a development corporation to force it to operate in the full public view.

This did not appear to be simply a fear that publicity might endanger sensitive negotiations or plans for commercial or
industrial developments in a new town. It was also a perception of how development corporations ought to behave.

The development corporation is seen by many of its officials and members as being essentially a "crypto commercial organisation". It was likened to a company, its members to the board of the company and the Secretary of State to the principal shareholder. As a commercial organisation, board members should expect confidentiality in its operations. This is "proper conduct" for companies.

 Provision of information, discussion and liaison is seen as good management practice in a company and hence the frequent examples of willingness to provide information and hold meetings to explain the corporation's position. But to be forced to do these things is quite another matter.

It was suggested that the many members of the board whose background was business rather than local government might be perturbed at having to work in a public forum and might even decide not to serve on the board.

Proponents of this position appeared unconvinced by the suggestion that the confidentiality of information and discussions of a commercially sensitive nature would be protected by the safeguards for "confidential" and "exempt" information in the existing Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

The local government nature of development corporations

The defence that as a "crypto commercial organisation" the development corporation's meetings should be closed to the public is challenged by the alternative view, that new towns are becoming progressively "crypto-local authorities".

New towns began as agencies recruiting new industries to green field sites, and therefore required power over planning, housing and so on to enable them to do so efficiently.

As these communities have grown and matured however, they have become increasingly like local authorities in their relationship with their residents. Those residents have changed from being newly arrived employees with atypical age and family characteristics, to being long term residents with a wide range of ages, with children, and - in all too many cases - without jobs.

The contemporary new town is inevitably involved in a wider range of activities and responsibilities, activities which overlap with those of the local authorities, and which therefore should be just as open to public scrutiny.
Sufficient information already available

It was also suggested that access to meetings and papers was unnecessary because the development corporation already provided a satisfactory and regular flow of information in the form of press releases, briefings, information packs, public meetings and so on.

This view is obviously not shared by those who felt that the information is offered on a selective basis and that it is often not possible to understand fully the implications of a proposal or announcement unless one is also privy to the papers and debate that led to the decision.

Information and efficiency

One official expressed the view that greater freedom of information would lead to less efficiency and professionalism. He compared the relative ease with which a development corporation can move from plans to implementation of a scheme with the seemingly endless meetings and committees that a local authority proposal has to go through. Again, this official was apparently confusing the right of access to information with the right to be consulted — although obviously greater access to information could well lead to a greater demand to be consulted.

Timescale

The same official also questioned whether it was worthwhile pressing for legislation when the new towns have only a short life left. Against this can be argued that a minimum of five years is too long for new town residents to remain without access to information. Furthermore, the running down period could be prolonged well up to the end of this century.

Organisation problems in opening up meetings and minutes

One Chief Executive highlighted the practical problems that would have to be overcome, particularly in the organisation of meetings (where at present there is no clear division of business into confidential and nonconfidential) but also in written papers where matters might be confidential on a short term basis although subsequently the need for confidentiality would disappear.

A board member suggested that the agenda would probably have to be divided into two sections, one confidential and the other open to the public. He thought even the agenda of the confidential section should remain confidential. He anticipated that the work of the board might become increasingly delegated to sub-committees, some of whose proceedings would then be totally confidential. He was concerned that this devolution of real discussion might lead to board members being generally less well informed.
CONCLUSIONS

The Scottish Consumer Council believes that there should be a presumption that decision making by public bodies should be open to public scrutiny unless there is a good reason for proceedings to be confidential. SCC welcomes the fact that the Government supports this principle in relation to local government, which was embodied in the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985. This private member's legislation was extended to Scotland with the active support of the Scottish Office and Members of Parliament from every party.

The Scottish Consumer Council therefore trusts that the Scottish Office and Members of Parliament will support the extension of this principle to Scotland's five New Towns which, though accountable to central government, carry out several local authority functions in their areas. SCC therefore urges Parliament to support the New Towns (Access to Information) Bill, sponsored by Robin Cook MP.

SCC believes that the New Towns' commercial functions would be largely or entirely exempt from public scrutiny under the existing provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act. It may be, however, that further safeguards are required. These could be added at the Committee stage of the Bill, when more detailed arguments can be heard.

The Scottish Consumer Council accepts that making New Town meetings open and papers freely available may create certain practical difficulties, particularly in the early stages, some of which have been identified in this paper. Many of the arguments about practical problems, however, are similar to those put forward with equal sincerity by local government representatives twelve months ago.

The Scottish Consumer Council recognises that the New Towns have played an invaluable role in the development of Scottish industry and in promoting employment and a good living environment. It is precisely this key role which makes it important that they should be more open to scrutiny of the people who live in the New Towns, and who use the services provided. There are after all around a quarter of a million Scots who live in New Towns - a significant proportion of the country's population.

The fact that the development corporations are funded and accountable to central government is no reason for conducting their affairs entirely in private. In extending the remit of the local government Ombudsman to New Town (and Scottish Special Housing Association) housing, the government has already implicitly accepted the comparability of the corporations' housing functions with local authority housing functions. SCC believes that this comparability extends well beyond matters of housing grievance and redress, which will concern the Ombudsman.
Moreover, however vigorously and conscientiously the development corporations offer information about their policies and decisions once made, this is not a substitute for more open access to their deliberations.

The Scottish Consumer Council hopes that the New Towns (Access to Information) Bill will therefore be seen as a legitimate and practical extension of the public's right of access to public information.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Scottish Consumer Council recommends that the New Towns (Access to Information) Bill should be supported by Government and by Members of Parliament from all parties when it receives its Second Reading on 17 January 1986.

* SCC should also like to see a register of development corporation members, with details such as their addresses, occupations, and any committees on which they serve. This could be the subject of a schedule to the Bill.

* SCC believes that the New Towns' annual reports should be designed to give more detailed information to residents as well as to the Government, should be published separately at a reasonable price, and be made more freely available within the new towns. This could be done by the Secretary for State without the need for legislative amendment.

* There should be further discussions between the Government and development corporations, and other local interests to identify and overcome practical problems raised by more open operation of the development corporations and also to clarify further what would qualify as exempt or confidential information.

Scottish Consumer Council

January 1986
FOOTNOTES

1. List of people contacted

The following is a list of all the people or organisations who were telephoned in December for the information or views expressed in this report:

CUMBERNAULD

David Anderson, Chief Executive, 02367 21155
S.B. Donald, Public Relations Officer, 02367 37267
Cumbernauld Development Corporation

Editor, Cumbernauld News, 02367 25578

Miss Linda Ewart, Organiser, CAB, 02367 23201

EAST KILBRIDE

J. Allan Denholm, Chairman, 041 248 3101
Dan Fleming, Information Officer, 03552 41111
East Kilbride Development Corporation

Hector Stephenson, East Kilbride News, 03552 29261

Provost McKillop, District Council and Board Member, 03552 28777

Mrs Jean Murray-Thomson, Organiser, CAB, 03552 21295

GLENROTHES

T.B. Johnston, Public Relations Officer, 0592 754343
Glenrothes Development Corporation

Glenrothes Gazette, 0592 753205

Councillor D Mason, District Council and Board member, 0592 758766

Mrs. Vi Adamson, Organiser, CAB, 0592 753382

Mrs. Agnes McClaren, Auchmuchty Tenants Association, 0592 759468

IRVINE

A Caldwell, Public Relations Manager, 0294 72431
Irvine Development Corporation

Irvine Herald, 0294 78312

Tom Swinney, Organiser, CAB, 0294 78051
LIVINGSTON

J. Wilson, Chief Executive, 0506 41411
D. McGimpsey, Public Relations Officer, 0506 41477
Livingston Development Corporation

Ian Kyle, Evening News (Bathgate), 0506 633272

Jane Marnie, Organiser, CAB, 0506 32977

OTHER

Mrs. R. Menlow, Scottish Development Department, 556 8400

Annie Flint, Tenant Participation Advisory Service.


3. Population statistics

Written Answer by George Younger, Secretary of State for Scotland, 14 November 1985.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Present population (April 1985)</th>
<th>Population at trigger per cent</th>
<th>Trigger per cent</th>
<th>Designated population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>49,739</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kilbride</td>
<td>70,200</td>
<td>74,250</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenrothes</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>39,550</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20.
4. Parliamentary Questions and Statements

**Written Answers**

24th March 1981, col 277
to Norman Hogg

27th April 1981, cols 361-362
to Albert McQuarrie

13th July 1982, Written Answers, cols 359-360
to Norman Hogg

**Oral Answers**

17th November 1982, col 269
to Norman Hogg

17th November 1982, col 270
to David Lambie

20th June 1984, col 280
to David Lambie

**Debates**

20th November 1984
New Towns and Urban Development Corporation Bill, Second Reading

Norman Hogg: cols 175-177 & 180
Willie Hamilton: cols 202-206
Dr. M.S. Miller: col 217