

**Boundary Commission for Scotland
Minutes of Meeting held at Thistle House, Edinburgh
Friday 5 August 2016**

Present

The Hon Lord Matthews, Deputy Chairman
Professor Ailsa Henderson, Commissioner
Mrs Paula Sharp, Commissioner
Mr Tim Ellis, Registrar General, National Records of Scotland

Isabel Drummond-Murray, Secretary
Colin Wilson, Secretariat
Douglas Campbell, Secretariat

Tricia Couper, National Records of Scotland (observer)

Apologies

1. Ms Michaela Gordon, Ordnance Survey, Assessor to the Commission submitted apologies.

Declarations of Interest

2. Lord Matthews declared an interest in Paper 2016/26 and Mrs Sharp and Professor Henderson declared interests in Paper 2016/31.

Minutes of the previous meeting

3. The minutes of the 18 July 2016 meeting were agreed, subject to minor amendments.

Matters arising

4. The Secretary updated the Commission on the Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland's 5th Reviews of Electoral Arrangements and it was agreed that further consideration would be given to any implications for the 2018 Review at a later stage.
5. The Secretary reported progress with the Scotland Office review of corporate governance, including risk management and financial oversight. A meeting with Scotland Office and Scottish Government would be held on 18 August and a further update given to the Commission at the September meeting.

Constituency grouping – East Ayrshire, North Ayrshire, South Ayrshire, East Renfrewshire, Renfrewshire and Inverclyde (Paper 2016/26)

6. The Commission considered 4 options for 7 constituencies exactly covering the combined extent of East Ayrshire, North Ayrshire, South Ayrshire, East Renfrewshire, Renfrewshire and Inverclyde council areas.
7. The Commission agreed that Option 1 and Option 2 were unsuitable as they broke local ties within the grouping.
8. Option 4 was considered at length by the Commission as they believed it followed existing arrangements closely and created constituencies that do not split any of the large towns in the area. However Option 4 does create a

constituency covering 3 council areas and split communities by Ardrossan, Saltcoats and Stevenston.

9. The Commission were content that Option 3 creates constituencies that do not split Ayr, Kilmarnock or Paisley between constituencies, places Ayr and Prestwick within a single constituency and also creates a number of constituencies with strong local ties.
10. The Commission agreed that the design of Option 3 could be improved by a minor amendment of the boundary of the proposed East Renfrewshire and Irvine Valley ward to the south of Hurlford, that follows a railway line.
11. The Commission agreed to adopt Option 3 – subject to the minor amendment outlined above as its Initial Proposals for constituencies in the combined area of East Ayrshire, North Ayrshire, South Ayrshire, East Renfrewshire, Renfrewshire and Inverclyde council areas, subject to identification of satisfactory proposals elsewhere in Scotland.

Constituency grouping – Midlothian and Scottish Borders (Paper 2016/28)

12. The Commission considered 3 options for 2 constituencies exactly covering the combined extent of Midlothian and Scottish Borders council areas.
13. The Commission agreed that Options 2 and 3 failed to respect local ties in particular around Galashiels and surrounding towns in the Scottish Borders.
14. The Commission therefore agreed to adopt Option 1 as its Initial Proposals for constituencies in the combined area of Midlothian and Scottish Borders council areas, subject to identification of satisfactory proposals elsewhere in Scotland.

Constituency grouping – Fife and Perth and Kinross (Paper 2016/29)

15. The Commission considered 3 options for 5 constituencies exactly covering the combined extent of Fife and Perth and Kinross council areas.
16. The Commission were content that Options 2 and 3 were unsuitable as Option 2 divided 3 wards between constituencies and contained no constituencies comprised solely of whole wards. Option 3 was discounted as it proposed splitting the city of Perth between two constituencies.
17. The Commission agreed that Option 1 split fewer wards between constituencies and appeared to offer the greatest degree of continuity of existing constituency boundaries. The Commission believed the design of Option 1 could be improved and asked the Secretariat to prepare an alternative version that amended the boundary by Ladybank and Methil.
18. The Commission agreed to adopt Option 1 – subject to the suitable alternative design as outlined above as its Initial Proposals for constituencies in the combined area of Fife and Perth and Kinross council areas, subject to identification of satisfactory proposals elsewhere in Scotland.

Constituency grouping – City of Edinburgh and West Lothian (Paper 2016/31)

19. The Commission considered 3 options for 6 constituencies exactly covering the combined extent of City of Edinburgh and West Lothian council areas.
20. The Commission agreed that Options 1 and 3 minimised change to existing ward boundaries, but considered there were few ties between areas in the north-west of Edinburgh with Armadale and Bathgate in West Lothian. The Commission also believed that a large constituency extending deep into the City of Edinburgh

council area with large parts of it also in West Lothian council area would be far from ideal.

21. The Commission preferred Option 2 as it appeared to minimise change from the existing constituency design. The Commission believed the design could be improved further by reviewing the boundaries of the Edinburgh North & Leith and the Edinburgh West constituencies (Appendix C4) in addition to possible revisions of the boundaries between Edinburgh South West & Central and Edinburgh East constituencies (Appendix C5).
22. The Commission agreed to adopt Option 2- subject to the suitable alternative design as outlined above – as its Initial Proposals for constituencies in the combined area of City of Edinburgh and West Lothian council areas, subject to identification of satisfactory proposals elsewhere in Scotland.

Preparation for public consultation (oral update)

23. The Secretary updated the Commission on preparations for Public Consultation and it was agreed that work was on schedule to publish proposals towards the end of October as agreed. A number of details were discussed and the Secretary agreed to provide a progress report at the next meeting.
24. The Deputy Chair agreed to liaise further with Sheriffs Principal over their availability for the public hearings.

Finance Update (Paper 2016 / 27)

25. The Commission noted the finance update.

Any other business

26. The next meeting will be held on Monday 5 September at 10.30am.

Secretariat

**August
2016**