

2018 Review of UK Parliament Constituencies
Draft Revised Proposals for East Dunbartonshire, Glasgow City and West
Dunbartonshire council areas

Action required

1. The Commission is invited to consider responses to the initial and secondary consultations on its Initial Proposals and whether it wishes to make changes to its proposals for constituencies in East Dunbartonshire, Glasgow City and West Dunbartonshire council areas.

Background

2. The constituency designs are based on a UK electoral quota of 74,769.2 electors and parliamentary electorate figures from the December 2015 Electoral Register. The electorate of a constituency has to be within 5% of the electoral quota, namely no fewer than 71,031 and no more than 78,507, unless the area of a constituency exceeds 12,000 square kilometres. No constituency may exceed 13,000 square kilometres.
3. The total electorate in the 3 council areas is 595,205, giving a theoretical entitlement to 7.96 constituencies. Glasgow City council area is entitled to 5.97 constituencies, and together East Dunbartonshire council area and West Dunbartonshire council area are entitled to 1.99 constituencies.
4. The Commission's Initial Proposals for this area, are summarised in Table 1 below, and comprise 8 constituencies which exactly cover the combined extent of the 3 council areas. A map of the constituencies is at Appendix A1 and a comparison of the proposals with other local boundaries is at Appendix A2.

Constituency	Council areas	Wards (2007-2017)	electorate	Difference from EQ / %
Glasgow Central BC	Glasgow City	5, 10(pt), 11, 12(pt)	75,718	1.3
Glasgow East BC	Glasgow City	9, 18(pt), 19, 20	75,433	0.9
Glasgow North BC	Glasgow City	10(pt), 16, 17, 18(pt), 21,	71,443	-4.4
Glasgow South East BC	Glasgow City	1, 2(pt), 6(pt), 7, 8	72,479	-3.1
Glasgow South West BC	Glasgow City	2(pt), 3, 4, 6(pt)	73,477	-1.7
Glasgow West BC	Glasgow City	12(pt), 13, 14, 15	77,803	4.1
Milngavie and Kirkintilloch	East Dunbartonshire	1(pt), 2(pt), 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8;	71,594	-4.2
West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden North	East Dunbartonshire, West Dunbartonshire	1(pt), 2(pt); All	77,258	3.3

*Table 1: Initial Proposals***Responses to consultations**

5. All responses are available to view on the Commission's consultation portal: www.bcs2018.org.uk The number in brackets following a respondent's name refers to the comment identifier to facilitate searching. Paper copies can be made available to the Commission as required.
6. During the two consultation periods approximately 300 responses were received for East Dunbartonshire, Glasgow City and West Dunbartonshire council areas. These responses were made during public hearings during the initial consultation, and via the portal email or other written submission during both the initial and secondary consultation. 17 all-Scotland responses were received. All responses, however received, are available to view on the portal and the number in brackets following a respondent's name refers to a portal ID to facilitate searching. Paper copies can be made available to the Commission as required. The summary below covers all representations received. A more detailed summary of the responses received is in the Annex A.

Main themes in representations

7. **East Dunbartonshire.** Most of the public response focused on the division of Bearsden in the Initial Proposals. The chief concerns were: that Bearsden should not be divided; that it, or part of it, should not be separated from Milngavie; and that no part of it should be in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire.
8. There was some public support for a suggestion by the Scottish Liberal Democrats: avoid dividing Bearsden and keep it in a constituency with Milngavie, by amending the Initial Proposals to create constituencies which cross the Glasgow / East Dunbartonshire and Glasgow / West Dunbartonshire local authority boundaries, and adjust the proposed boundary between Glasgow North and Glasgow West at Ruchill to allow this.
9. There was some public opposition to a suggestion by the Scottish Conservatives to incorporate Milngavie rather than the northern part of Bearsden in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire.
10. The other issue which attracted significant public opposition, including a standard letter with 43 signatories, was the Commission's proposal to use the A809 road to the north west of Milngavie as a constituency boundary, on the grounds of local ties.
11. **West Dunbartonshire.** There was very little response to the Initial Proposals in regards to West Dunbartonshire. Mention of West Dunbartonshire in the responses was almost exclusively in the context of opposition to part of Bearsden or Milngavie forming part of a predominantly West Dunbartonshire constituency; or in regard to the possibility of forming a West Dunbartonshire constituency which also contained Yoker, in Glasgow, in order to avoid dividing Bearsden, or dividing Bearsden and Milngavie.
12. **Glasgow.** There was limited response to the Initial Proposals in regards to Glasgow. The most significant issue was the placing of Craigton and Dumbreck, which border Bellahouston Park, in Glasgow Central constituency. Respondents

questioned this in the context of the recent implementation of the Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland's recommendations for council ward boundaries within Glasgow, which placed the area in Pollokshields ward. Some respondents suggested that the area should now be included within Glasgow South West constituency. A number of respondents also suggested amendments to the Initial Proposals in the south of Glasgow to better reflect local ties in the area, and a community council suggested a change to a boundary in the north west of Glasgow.

13. As with West Dunbartonshire, above, many responses which mentioned Glasgow did so in the context of suggested changes to the Initial Proposals which aim to avoid dividing Bearsden or dividing Bearsden and Milngavie.

A summary of representations received is in Annex 1

Consideration of responses

14. The issues raised by the responses to the public consultation are discussed below. The Secretariat has developed a set of options from which the Commission may choose to address these issues. These include potential changes to the Initial Proposals in East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire, as well as a modified version of the Initial Proposals' boundaries for Glasgow, and an alternative set of constituencies in Glasgow. The options also include a set of constituencies which cross the boundaries between Glasgow City council area and East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire council areas.

Bearsden and Milngavie

15. The Initial Proposals' division of Bearsden was the biggest issue to emerge from the consultations. There were a few suggestions for alternative divisions of Bearsden, but the focus of the responses was overwhelmingly in opposition to the division of the town in principle, rather than to the particular division in the Initial Proposals. Many respondents, in stating their opposition to the division of Bearsden, also stated that they did not wish Bearsden or part of it to be divided from Milngavie.
16. At its meeting of 5 September 2016, the Commission favoured Option 2 of paper BCS 2016/30, which divided Bearsden, over Option 1, which included Milngavie rather than part of Bearsden in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire, because it featured an oddly-shaped constituency boundary at Bearsden. The Commission also favoured Option 2 over Option 3 as that option created 3 constituencies which crossed council area boundaries.
17. The Commission adopted Option 5 of paper BCS 2016/40 (a revised version of Option 2) which retained the division of Bearsden in modified form as its Initial Proposals at its meeting of 3 October 2016.
18. The Commission may wish to reconsider the option of placing Milngavie rather than the northern part of Bearsden in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire. A suggestion from the Scottish Conservatives would incorporate an unpopulated area in the south east of Milngavie in a constituency with Bearsden and

Kirkintilloch, improving connectivity within that constituency, as well as making the shape of the constituency less odd.

19. The Commission may also wish to take into account the argument that the lack of a main road between Milngavie and West Dunbartonshire which lies entirely within a suggested West Dunbartonshire and Milngavie constituency, should not prevent such a constituency being created, as examples of similar constituencies exist in the Initial Proposals. The Commission may also consider that the argument that moving the electorate of Milngavie as a whole better preserves local ties overall than dividing Bearsden.
20. However, the suggestion that Milngavie, rather than part of Bearsden, should form a constituency with West Dunbartonshire is likely to be unpopular with residents of Milngavie. This suggestion attracted 18 opposing responses during the secondary consultation, with only two responses which supported it or made a similar suggestion.
21. The Commission may also consider adopting the Scottish Liberal Democrats' suggestion to address the division of Bearsden by incorporating Bearsden and Milngavie in an East Dunbartonshire constituency. This suggestion would place Auchinairn, a part of Bishopbriggs which borders Glasgow, in a primarily Glasgow constituency in order that the maximum number of electors in the East Dunbartonshire constituency is not breached. As no part of East Dunbartonshire would now be placed in a primarily West Dunbartonshire constituency, Yoker community council area in Glasgow would become part of the West Dunbartonshire constituency to ensure that it has the minimum number of electors permitted. These changes to the Initial Proposals' Glasgow constituencies would also require the boundary between Glasgow West and Glasgow North constituencies to be adjusted at Ruchill to ensure Glasgow West is within 5% of the electoral quota.
22. This suggestion received 21 supporting responses during the public consultations and would preserve local ties in Bearsden and Milngavie. It would however: create an additional constituency which crosses council area boundaries; make changes to constituencies which did not attract opposition in the public consultations and risks breaking local ties at Bishopbriggs / Auchinairn and Yoker, and potentially at Ruchill, in order to preserve them in Bearsden and Milngavie.
23. Some other suggestions were made to avoid the division of Bearsden and the separation of Bearsden, or part of it, from Milngavie. These included: placing Helensburgh in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire; creating a constituency linking Bearsden and Milngavie with Anniesland and Jordanhill; placing Milngavie in a constituency with Stirlingshire and Clackmannanshire or parts of Perth and Kinross; placing Kirkintilloch in a constituency with areas from a different council area; and dividing West Dunbartonshire.
24. While the overwhelming focus of the responses to the public consultation was opposition to the division of Bearsden, a few responses suggested an alternative division of the town. Three of these suggestions included retaining the north east of the town in the primarily East Dunbartonshire constituency, with two of them suggesting that Bearsden North ward be divided along Drymen Road / Stockiemuir Road. This would have the effect of including significantly fewer (around 5,000) Bearsden electors in West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden North

constituency. It would mean, as in the Initial Proposals, that Bearsden North ward is divided between constituencies.

25. Additionally, 2 representations argued that the constituencies which cover East Dunbartonshire council area should follow ward boundaries. In the Initial Proposals, most of these wards are undivided as they are all within Milngavie and Kirkintilloch constituency, apart from those in the Milngavie and Bearsden area. The Commission considered options which avoided the division of wards, but favoured its Initial Proposals.

Craigton Village

26. N.B. In this paper Craigton, to the north west of Milngavie, is referred to as "Craigton Village" to avoid confusion with the Craigton area of Glasgow, which lies to the west of Bellahouston Park, which was also the subject of multiple responses in the consultations.
27. In adopting Option 5 of paper BCS 2016/08 at its meeting of 3 October 2016, the Commission made the A809 which passes through Craigton Village the boundary between West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden North constituency and Milngavie and Kirkintilloch constituency. The Commission considered that this would provide a more easily identifiable boundary to the west of Milngavie. The area affected contains around 50 electors.
28. The responses to the public consultations assert that the proposed boundary to the north west of Bearsden breaks local ties within Craigton Village, and between it and Milngavie. The Commission has the option of amending its Initial Proposals in the area by restoring the boundary between West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden North constituency and Milngavie and Kirkintilloch constituency to the boundary between East Dunbartonshire council area and West Dunbartonshire council area, as in Option 2 of paper BCS 2016/30, presented the meeting of 4 September 2016.
29. The issue of the division of Craigton Village would also be resolved if the Commission were to adopt the suggestions made by the Scottish Conservatives or the Scottish Liberal Democrats discussed above.

Craigton and Dumbreck in Glasgow

30. At its meeting of 5 September 2016, the Commission favoured Option 2 of paper BCS 2016/30, as regards Glasgow because Option 1 divided more council wards than necessary. The Commission also favoured Option 2 over Option 3 as that option created 3 constituencies which crossed council area boundaries.
31. The Commission adopted Option 5 of paper BCS 2016/40 (a revised version of Option 2) at its meeting of 3 October 2016, which amended the proposed boundary in the Southside of Glasgow to ensure Glasgow South East constituency had the minimum number of electors required by legislation.
32. The responses to the consultations show that residents and representatives of the Craigton and Dumbreck question the Initial Proposals' placing of their areas within Glasgow Central constituency, which seems to them to contradict the areas having been placed in Pollokshields ward in the 2017 Review of Electoral

Arrangements for Glasgow City council area by the Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland (LGBCS). They had opposed the area being included in this ward, preferring to remain in a ward with Govan. Some of the respondents note that this is also at odds with their Scottish Parliament representation, where Craigton is the only part of Pollokshields ward in Glasgow Pollok constituency. Scottish Parliament boundaries are now matter for the LGBCS.

33. The respondents to the consultation, where they express a preference, prefer that the areas are placed within Glasgow South West constituency rather than Glasgow Central, for the sake of consistency in representation, and to be in the same constituency as neighbouring Cardonald and Pollokshields, with which Craigton and Dumbreck have ties.
34. More of the responses discuss Craigton than Dumbreck, and those which discuss Dumbreck do so alongside discussion of Craigton. These responses and local geography (Dumbreck lies between Craigton and Pollokshields) suggest that the areas should be considered together in regard to whether they should be in Glasgow South West constituency or Glasgow South East constituency.
35. The total number of electors in Craigton and Dumbreck is approximately 3,800. The Initial Proposals' Glasgow Central constituency is 4,687 electors above the minimum permitted by legislation, and Glasgow South West constituency is 5,030 electors below the maximum permitted by legislation. Therefore Craigton and Dumbreck can be incorporated in Glasgow South West constituency while ensuring both constituencies are within 5% of the electoral quota as required by legislation.

Glasgow Southside

36. A few respondents during the public consultations suggested that the Strathbungo and Waverley Park areas be included in Glasgow South West constituency rather than Glasgow South East constituency. One of these respondents also suggested that all of Pollokshields ward be included in Glasgow South West constituency.
37. They argue that the areas' ties are to the west and to Pollokshields to the north, and that using the railway line between Strathbungo and Pollokshields as a constituency boundary would break local ties. They suggest that Pollokshields road, to the south east of Strathbungo, is a more natural constituency boundary.
38. The Strathbungo and Waverley Park area, defined as including all of the southeast of Pollokshields ward, and including part of Pollokshaws, which is divided in the Initials Proposals, contains around 8,200 electors. Because Glasgow South West constituency is 5,030 electors below the maximum permitted in legislation and Glasgow South East constituency is 1,448 electors above the minimum permitted in legislation, all of the Strathbungo / Waverley Park area cannot be moved into Glasgow South West constituency if no other changes are made.
39. 2 respondents from the Newlands / Mansewood area which is in Glasgow South West constituency in the Initial Proposals suggested that the area be included with neighbouring areas, which are in Glasgow South East constituency. They argue that:

- the area has stronger links with areas to the north and east in Glasgow South East constituency;
- that the boundary between the constituencies in the Initial Proposals does not follow easily identifiable boundaries like major roads or railways;
- and that they are isolated from most of Glasgow South West constituency by the large Pollok Park, and the M77 and railway lines which generally run south west to north east, with few crossing points.

40.2 respondents also suggested that Newlands and neighbouring areas be included in Glasgow South East constituency to better reflect local ties, as well as to facilitate the transfer of Strathbungo and neighbouring areas to Glasgow South West constituency while ensuring both constituencies remain within 5% of electoral quota.

41. The Commission has the option to include this area in Glasgow South East constituency in conjunction with suggested changes to the Strathbungo and Waverley Park areas, and the Craigton and Dumbreck areas. The Newlands / Mansewood area with its western boundary following the boundary of Newlands and Auldhouse community council area, and Mansewood and Hillpark community council area along the White Cart Water and Thornliebank Road, contains approximately 9,400 electors.

42. Since Glasgow South West constituency in the Initial Proposals is 2,446 electors above the minimum permitted in legislation and Glasgow South East constituency is 6,028 below the maximum permitted in legislation, not all of the Newlands /Mansewood area can be included in Glasgow South East constituency unless the other changes are made.

43. One respondent seeks to incorporate the Maxwell Park area in a constituency similar to the existing Glasgow South constituency with neighbouring areas like Strathbungo, Waverley Park and Shawlands rather than areas to the west like Corkerhill, on the basis of local ties. This suggestion is partially accommodated in the Option 2 which places Strathbungo and Waverley Park in Glasgow South West constituency; however, placing Maxwell Park in a separate constituency from Corkerhill would require very extensive changes to the Initial Proposals in Glasgow, and would be difficult to accommodate given the geography of Glasgow and the council area's entitlement to 6 constituencies.

Other Glasgow Suggestions

44. Dowanhill, Hyndland and Kelvinside Community Council wrote to suggest that all of the community council area be included in Glasgow Central constituency. In the Initial Proposals, the part of the community council area which lies north of Great Western Road is included in Glasgow West constituency. The community council argues that its area is a single cohesive community and would benefit from being in a single constituency.

45. They note that following the 2017 Review of Electoral Arrangements for Glasgow City council area, the whole community council area lies within Partick East and Kelvindale ward. The constituency boundary in the Initial Proposals follows a ward boundary in place at the commencement of the Review. There were no

other responses which supported or opposed the community council's suggestion.

46. There are approximately 1,800 electors within the part of the community council area which lies north of Great Western Road. Great Western Road is an easily identifiable constituency boundary; the northern boundary of the community council area, which largely follows the River Kelvin is less easily identifiable. In the Initial Proposals, Glasgow West constituency is 704 electors below the maximum permitted in the legislation, and Glasgow Central is 2,789 electors below the maximum permitted. Therefore both constituencies will be within the limits set in legislation if no other changes are made to the Initial Proposals for both constituencies. If the suggested changes at Craigton and Dumbreck are made, the suggested change in Kelvinside would move Glasgow Central constituency closer to the UK electoral quota of 74,769.
47. This suggestion has been incorporated into Option 2 for Glasgow. It can however be adopted or rejected independently of other suggested changes to the Initial Proposals. The exception to this is if the Commission chooses to adopt Option 4 based on a suggestion by the Scottish Liberal Democrats, which requires the boundary between Glasgow West constituency and Glasgow North constituency to be adjusted at Ruchill so as to ensure that the number of electors in Glasgow West constituency lies within 5% of the electoral quota. This means that the Commission cannot also make the transfer of approximately 1,800 electors from Glasgow West constituency to Glasgow Central constituency suggested by Dowanhill, Hyndland and Kelvinside Community Council.
48. One respondent suggested that the village of Carmunnock be included in a constituency with East Kilbride. He citing feeling isolation from the rest of the council area and that he uses services and resources within the East Kilbride area. There were no similar suggestions during the consultations.
49. Carmunnock lies within Glasgow City council area in the hills to the south of the city, and its community council area contains around 1,100 electors. The area lies within a Glasgow constituency, and it is not evident that what ties it has to the East Kilbride area are stronger than those it has to Glasgow, which may be broken if it were included in an East Kilbride constituency. This suggestion has not been incorporated in the options due to the lack of evidence that it better respects local ties than the Initial Proposals, and because it would create an additional constituency which crosses council area boundaries.
50. One respondent suggested incorporating the Necropolis, Glasgow Cathedral, the Royal Infirmary and the neighbouring Firpark Terrace within Glasgow Central constituency, citing the area's proximity to the centre of Glasgow, the effect upon tourism in these areas if they are considered less close to the centre of Glasgow as a result of not being in Glasgow Central constituency, the effect upon access to grants, and the low number of electors who would be affected.
51. This suggestion has not been incorporated in an option because it would require changes to the Initial Proposals in neighbouring areas, where they have not attracted opposition, the boundary in the Initial Proposals follows a new ward boundary, and the suggested eastern boundary of Glasgow Central constituency would be less easily identifiable than that of the Initial Proposals.

Alternative Options

52. The Commission is invited to consider 6 options which seek to address the issues raised in the public consultations. Only constituencies which differ from those in the Initial Proposals are shown in the table for each option. The options' advantages and disadvantages are described relative to the Initial Proposals.

53. There is little continuity between the options, including the Initial Proposals, and existing constituencies. This is due to the changes in the rules governing the Review which require a reduction in the number of constituencies and all constituencies to be within 5% of the electoral quota.

54. Appendix G shows how the options compare with the council ward boundaries as they are as of 4 May 2017.

Option 1

55. The Commission is invited to consider Option 1, which is the Initial Proposals in East Dunbartonshire, West Dunbartonshire and Glasgow City council areas. Maps of this option are shown in Appendix A1 and Appendix A2.

Option 2

56. The Commission is invited to consider Option 2, shown in Table 2, below.

57. Option 2 combines the Initial Proposals in East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire, modified to incorporate all of Craigton Village in a constituency with Milngavie; with the Initial Proposals in Glasgow, modified to incorporate suggestions made in the consultations to improve local ties. Maps of this option are shown in appendices B1, B2 and B3.

58. In Dunbartonshire: Option 2 uses the boundary between East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire council areas as the western limit of Milngavie and Kirkintilloch constituency.

59. In Glasgow:

- Craigton and Dumbreck are included in Glasgow South West constituency;
- the boundary between Glasgow South West and Glasgow South East constituencies is modified to include Strathbungo and Waverly Park in the former and Newlands and Mansewood in the latter. The boundary between the constituencies follows the eastern boundary of Pollokshields ward (unchanged from 2007) and the boundary between Pollokshaws and Eastwood community council area (in Glasgow South West constituency) and Newlands and Auldhouse community council area and Mansewood and Hillpark community council area (in Glasgow South East constituency).
- The boundary between Glasgow West constituency and Glasgow Central constituency is also adjusted to include all of Kelvinside community council area in the latter.

60. As discussed in the consideration of responses section of the paper, these suggested changes in Glasgow do not depend on each other to ensure that all constituencies have electorates within 5% of the electoral quota, apart from the suggested changes to the boundary between Glasgow South West constituency and Glasgow South East constituency.

Constituency	Council areas	Wards (2007-2017)	electorate	Difference from EQ / %
Glasgow Central	Glasgow City	5 (pt), 10 (pt), 11, 12 (pt), 15 (pt)	73,735	-1.4
Glasgow South East	Glasgow City	1, 2 (pt), 7, 8,	73,621	-1.5
Glasgow South West	Glasgow City	2 (pt), 3, 4, 5 (pt), 6	76,138	1.8
Glasgow West	Glasgow City	12 (pt), 13, 14, 15 (pt)	75,983	1.6
Milngavie and Kirkintilloch	East Dunbartonshire	1, 2 (pt), 3-8	71,642	-4.2
West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden North	East Dunbartonshire, West Dunbartonshire	West Dunbartonshire: all; East Dunbartonshire: 2 (pt).	77,210	3.3

Table 2: Option 2.

61. The advantages of Option 2 are:

- that it retains Craigton Village to the north west of Milngavie, undivided, in a constituency with the town;
- it adopts the council area boundary near Milngavie;
- that it may improve local ties within Glasgow;
- Glasgow City council area ward 6, Pollokshields (2007-17) is no longer divided;

62. The disadvantages of Option 2 are:

- that it does not address the division of Bearsden;
- Glasgow City council area wards: 5, Govan (2007-17) and 15, Maryhill / Kelvin (2007-17) are now divided

Option 3

63. The Commission is invited to consider Option 3, shown in Table 3, below.

64. Option 3 presents the Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party's suggestion for 2 constituencies wholly comprising East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire. Maps of this option are shown in Appendix C1 and Appendix C2.

65. In Dunbartonshire, Option 3 creates a West Dunbartonshire and Milngavie constituency and a Bearsden and Kirkintilloch constituency, including an unpopulated part of Milngavie, a small wedge formed by the A81 and A807, in the Bearsden and Kirkintilloch constituency to improve the connectivity of Bearsden to the rest of the constituency.

Constituency	Council areas	Wards (2007-2017)	electorate	Difference from EQ / %
Bearsden, Bishopbriggs and Kirkintilloch	East Dunbartonshire	1 (pt), 2-8	71, 883	-3.8
West Dunbartonshire and Milngavie	East Dunbartonshire, West Dunbartonshire	1 (pt); All.	76,969	2.9

66. The advantages of Option 3 are:

- that it avoids the division of Bearsden;
- that it retains Craigton Village to the north west of Milngavie, undivided, in a constituency with the town;
- only 1 ward is divided in East Dunbartonshire council area;
- it adopts the council area boundary near Milngavie;

67. The disadvantages of Option 3 are:

- that it divides Milngavie from Bearsden, and places it in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire, with which it has fewer ties;
- there is no main road link between Milngavie and Clydebank within the constituency, though this has been the case in proposals adopted in other areas;
- Option 3 is similar to Option 1 of Paper BCS 2016/30, which was rejected due the odd shape of Bearsden and Kirkintilloch constituency. However, in this option there is a road link along the constituency boundary between Bearsden and the rest of the constituency, which also makes the shape of the constituency less odd;

Option 4

68. The Commission is invited to consider Option 4, shown in Table 4, below.

69. Option 4 is based on the Scottish Liberal Democrats' suggestion which preserves Bearsden and Milngavie, including all of Craigton Village, in a single constituency; and creates constituencies which cross the West Dunbartonshire / Glasgow City and East Dunbartonshire / Glasgow City council area boundaries, as well as a further consequent change to the boundary between the Initial Proposals' Glasgow West and Glasgow North constituencies at Ruchill. Maps of this option are shown in Appendix D1 and Appendix D2.

70. Specifically, Option 4 creates a West Dunbartonshire and Yoker constituency, an entirely East Dunbartonshire constituency which includes all of Bearsden, Milngavie and Kirkintilloch, and a Glasgow North and Auchinairn constituency.

71. This option can accommodate Glasgow City as shown in Option 2, apart from the proposed inclusion of all of Kelvinside community council area in Glasgow West constituency, which is not compatible with Option 4's change at Ruchill.

Constituency	Council areas	Wards (2007-2017)	electorate	Difference from EQ / %
--------------	---------------	-------------------	------------	------------------------

Constituency	Council areas	Wards (2007-2017)	electorate	Difference from EQ / %
Glasgow West	Glasgow City	10 (pt), 12 (pt), 13 (pt), 14, 15, 16 (pt);	72,194	-3.4
Glasgow North and Auchinairn	Glasgow City, East Dunbartonshire	16 (pt), 17, 18 (pt), 21; 6 (pt).	74,093	-0,9
Bearsden, Kirkintilloch and Milngavie	East Dunbartonshire	1-5, 6 (pt), 7, 8.	76,802	2.7
West Dunbartonshire and Yoker	West Dunbartonshire, Glasgow	All; 13 (pt).	75,009	0.3

Table 4: Option 4

72. The advantages of Option 4 are:

- that it avoids the disruption of local ties in Bearsden and between Bearsden and Milngavie by avoiding the division of Bearsden and the separation of the towns into different constituencies;
- that it retains Craigton Village to the north west of Milngavie, undivided, in a constituency with the town;
- Only 1 ward is divided in East Dunbartonshire council area.

73. The disadvantages of Option 4 are:

- that it divides Bishopbriggs by placing Auchinairn in a primarily Glasgow-based constituency;
- that it separates Yoker from the rest of Glasgow by placing it in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire;
- that it creates an additional constituency which crosses council area boundaries;
- that it makes changes in areas where the Initial Proposals had not been opposed in order to accommodate Bearsden and Milngavie;
- 2 additional wards (2007-2017) are divided in Glasgow

Option 5

74. The Commission is invited to consider Option 5, shown in Table 5, below.

75. Option 5 is based on a suggestion received during the consultation for a set of constituency boundaries within Glasgow which are unrelated to those in the Initial Proposals. These boundaries address some of the other suggestions received to improve local ties, but also propose changes in areas where the Initial Proposals were not opposed during the consultations. Maps of this option are shown in Appendix E1 and Appendix E2.

76. N.B. The representation which suggested this option also made suggestion for East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire, which was to incorporate Milngavie ward in a West Dunbartonshire constituency. This is the same suggestion as Option 1 of paper BCS 2016/30, which the Commission did not adopt, and is very similar to Option 3, above.

Constituency	Council areas	Wards (2007-2017)	electorate	Difference from EQ / %
--------------	---------------	-------------------	------------	------------------------

Constituency	Council areas	Wards (2007-2017)	electorate	Difference from EQ / %
Glasgow Bridgeton	Glasgow City	8, 9, 10 (pt), 19	76,115	1.8
Glasgow Cathcart	Glasgow City	1, 2 (pt), 6, 7	74,238	-0.7
Glasgow Craigton	Glasgow City	2 (pt), 3, 4, 5	73,121	-2.2
Glasgow Maryhill	Glasgow City	11, 15, 16, 17(pt)	74,848	0.1
Glasgow Provan	Glasgow City	17 (pt), 18, 20, 21	75,735	1.3
Glasgow Scotstoun	Glasgow City	10pt, 12, 13, 14	72,296	-3.3

Table 5: Option 5

77. The advantages of Option 5 are:

- It includes Strathbungo and Waverley Park in a constituency with Pollokshields;
- It includes the Newlands area in a constituency with neighbouring areas.
- Only 3 2007-17 wards are divided.

78. The disadvantages of Option 5 are:

- It does not include Craigton and Dumbreck in the same constituency as Pollokshields;
- It would significantly change the Initial Proposals in areas which have not attracted opposition during the public consultations, possibly breaking local ties.

Option 6

79. The Commission is invited to consider Option 6, shown in Table 6, below.

80. Option 6 is based on suggestions made during the public consultations for a different division of Bearsden, should the Commission decide that Bearsden must be divided. This option divides Bearsden on a north / south basis, along Drymen Rd and Stockiemuir Rd.

81. This boundary includes a smaller area of Bearsden in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire than in the Initial Proposals, and does not include any areas of Bearsden in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire which were not also included in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire in the Initial Proposals. Maps of this option are shown in Appendix F1 and Appendix F2.

82. It also includes Craigton Village, undivided, in a constituency with Milngavie.

Constituency	Council areas	Wards (2007-2017)	electorate	Difference from EQ / %
Milngavie and Kirkintilloch	East Dunbartonshire	1, 2 (pt), 3-8	76,393	2.2
West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden North	West Dunbartonshire, East Dunbartonshire	All; 2 (pt).	72,459	-3.1

Table 2: Option 6

83. The advantages of Option 6 are:

- Fewer Bearsden residents may feel that they are in a constituency which is primarily based in an area they have few links to.
- It provides a boundary within Bearsden which may be more an easily identifiable than that in the Initial proposals;
- The division of Bearsden North ward may be better than that in the Initial Proposals, in which a small part of the ward near the railway line is separated from the rest;

84. The disadvantages of Option 6 are:

- Those electors who are in the area of Bearsden which is included in West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden constituency may feel more isolated than had a larger area of Bearsden been included in the constituency;

Constituency names

85. The constituency names in this paper are either provisional or have been suggested. The Commission will have the opportunity to review all constituency names and designations prior to the publication of its Revised Proposals.

86. The Commission set out its policy on constituency names in its *Policies and Procedures* booklet for this review.

87. The suggested alternative names for constituencies received during the initial and secondary consultations are shown in Table 6 below:

Initial Proposals	Alternative suggested name
Glasgow Central	Glasgow Govan
Glasgow East	Glasgow Baillieston
Glasgow North	Glasgow Dennistoun
Glasgow South East	Glasgow Langside
Glasgow South West	Glasgow Crookston
Glasgow West	Glasgow Kelvinside; Glasgow Great Western; Glasgow Dawsholm; Glasgow Gartnavel; Glasgow River Kelvin;
Milngavie and Kirkintilloch	East Dunbartonshire; Kirkintilloch and Milngavie; Bishopbriggs (to be included in name); Campsie Hills; Strathkelvin; Dunbartonshire East
West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden North	West Dunbartonshire; Dunbartonshire West.

Table 5: Option 5

88. The constituency name which attracted most comment during the public consultations was "Milngavie and Kirkintilloch". 4 respondents suggested that the constituency should be called or refer to "East Dunbartonshire" as it contains

most of East Dunbartonshire council area. However, the Commission's Policies and Procedures booklet states "not to use the same name for a constituency and council area unless the two are coterminous".

89. 3 respondents felt that the name "Milngavie and Kirkintilloch" did not reflect the size and precedence of the towns in the proposed constituency, and suggested alternatives.
90. Alternative constituency names have been suggested based on the Commissions Initial Proposals but these will depend on whether Commission retains its Initial Proposals or adopts one of the other options.

Conclusion

91. The vast majority of responses in this grouping focused on Bearsden and Milngavie. There is strong opposition to the division of Bearsden and the separation of Bearsden, or part of it, from Milngavie. The responses focus on the perceived damage to local ties in the area which would be caused by implementation of the Initial Proposals.
92. Most of the responses do not suggest alternative sets of constituency boundaries to avoid the proposed division, and those that do give limited attention to the consequences for areas elsewhere.
93. There was considerable opposition to, and no stated support for, the proposal to use the A809, which divides Craigton Village to the north west of Milngavie, as a constituency boundary. All of the options, with the exception of Option 1 (the Initial Proposals) include Craigton Village in a constituency with Milngavie.
94. If the Commission decides to adopt proposals which divide Bearsden, it may wish to consider whether Option 6 provides a better division of the town than the Initial Proposals.
95. If the Commission does not adopt Option 4, which creates constituencies which combine Glasgow City council area with East Dunbartonshire council area and West Dunbartonshire council area, the Commission may choose to address East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire as a unit, separately from Glasgow. For example:
- The Commission may wish to adopt Option 2 or 3 for East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire council areas, as well as adopting the Option 1 (the Initial Proposals) or Option 5 in Glasgow.
 - Similarly, the Commission may wish to adopt Option 1 in East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire, while adopting Option 2 or Option 5's boundaries in Glasgow.
96. If the Commission chooses to adopt Option 4, it may do so while retaining its Initial Proposals in the rest of Glasgow City council area, save for the change at Ruchill, upon which Option 4 depends.

Recommendations

97. Taking into account all of the evidence arising from the public consultations on the Initial Proposals, the Secretariat invites the Commission to decide whether:

- to adopt without amendment the Initial Proposals (Option 1) for East Dunbartonshire, Glasgow City and West Dunbartonshire council areas (Appendix A), subject to consideration of all other constituencies;
- adopt the alternative boundaries from Options 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 or a combination of part of them and its Initial Proposals;
- to amend its proposals for constituency names.

**Secretariat
June 2017**

Annex 1 - Summary of representations received during public consultations

Initial Consultation

Political parties

Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party

98. The Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party responded at the Glasgow public hearing (ID9039), and submitted alternative suggestions in the Initial Consultation (ID9330). It agreed that Glasgow City council area should be covered by a whole number of constituencies and sought to avoid the division of Bearsden. It offered an alternative to the Initial Proposals which included Milngavie in constituency with West Dunbartonshire, and Bearsden, undivided, in a constituency with Kirkintilloch. This suggestion included an unpopulated area of Milngavie, which is a small wedge formed by the A81 and A807, within its suggested Bearsden and Kirkintilloch constituency, in order to have an A-road connecting the towns within the constituency.
99. It argued that this would avoid dividing the electorate of any town within East Dunbartonshire and that Milngavie was large enough that its electors could feel they would play a part in electing an MP in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire. It noted that this would retain 48 electors in a constituency with the rest of Milngavie, which in the Initial Proposals are in West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden constituency. They also noted that Milngavie currently shares an MSP with Clydebank, and that the towns have been in the same UK Parliament constituency in the past.
100. It opposed creating a constituency which crosses the Glasgow City / West Dunbartonshire council area boundary. It argued that although Clydebank is likely to have greater ties to Yoker than it does to Milngavie or Bearsden, creating a constituency which crosses the Glasgow / West Dunbartonshire boundary would unnecessarily disadvantage the people of Yoker by linking them with Clydebank rather than to neighbouring areas of Glasgow; and that this would not be justified in order to avoid dividing Bearsden.
101. It considered that such a constituency would conflict with the Commission's aim of minimising the number of constituencies which cross council area boundaries, since West and East Dunbartonshire could be combined to form 2 constituencies without either having to share a constituency with Glasgow, whereas combining Glasgow and West Dunbartonshire would still leave East Dunbartonshire with too many electors to form a single constituency: part of it would also have to be combined with another council area.
102. It noted that the Commission had considered, but not adopted, a West Dunbartonshire and Milngavie constituency, and a Bearsden and Kirkintilloch constituency (Option 1 in BCS Paper 2016/30). It did not think that the shape of a Bearsden and Kirkintilloch constituency would be a problem, and argued that the Commission's reluctance to create a Milngavie and West Dunbartonshire constituency, due in part to the lack of a major road link wholly within the constituency, was inconsistent with the Initial Proposals in other areas. It noted that that the Initial Proposals included constituencies in which the major road

link between areas passed through another proposed constituency: in Hamilton and Motherwell where the main road between the towns passes through Airdrie and Shotts constituency; and at Argyll, Bute and Lochaber, where the road connecting Mallaig to the rest of the constituency passes through Highland North constituency.

103. It also suggested creating 2 alternative constituencies incorporating Milngavie (apart from the small wedge formed by the A81 and A807), with Stirlingshire, citing Milngavie's proximity to Stirlingshire, and its transport links to Stirlingshire villages. It would advocate these if the Commission intends to propose a constituency which crosses the Glasgow City / West Dunbartonshire council area boundary, as an alternative to a consequent decision to divide a town in East Dunbartonshire.
104. The first suggestion is based on part of a wider suggestion which involves a different set of council area groupings of constituencies to that which underpins the Initial Proposals; in this case a group comprising Argyll & Bute, Falkirk, Highland, Moray, Perth and Kinross and Stirling. It would place Milngavie in a Milngavie, Kinross-shire and Stirlingshire constituency consisting of Perth and Kinross wards 1, and 6-9, and Stirling wards 1 and 2, and part of ward 3, Dunblane.
105. The second suggestion places Milngavie in a Clackmannanshire, Dunblane and Milngavie constituency. They argue that as well as accommodating the "surplus" electors of East Dunbartonshire, this would allow the Stirling itself to be in one constituency.
106. The Scottish Conservatives were also supportive of suggested changes to the Initial Proposals within Glasgow City council area by Cllr Meikle.

Scottish Liberal Democrats

107. The East Dunbartonshire Liberal Democrats responded at the Glasgow public hearing (ID9014), and submitted two proposals in the Initial Consultation (ID8958). The Scottish Liberal Democrats also submitted an official response which supported the East Dunbartonshire Liberal Democrats' alternative proposals (ID9357). The Liberal Democrats opposed the principle of dividing Bearsden and Milngavie, and the Initial Proposals' division of Bearsden, citing local ties. They also opposed Option 1 in LGBCS Paper 2016/30, which combined Milngavie and Clydebank in a constituency, citing the lack of a road link.
108. In Proposal One, they suggested that the problem of East Dunbartonshire council area having too many electors to form a single constituency could best be resolved by placing the Auchinairn area of Bishopbriggs in Glasgow North constituency. They argued that voters in Auchinairn meet voters from Glasgow every day, unlike voters from other areas of East Dunbartonshire with respect to voters in other council areas. They also note that there are rail and road transport links between Auchinairn and Springburn, which is in Glasgow City council area. They suggested this constituency be called Glasgow North and Auchinairn or Glasgow North and Huntershill, as 2015 was celebrated locally as the 250th anniversary of the birth of political reformer Thomas Muir of Huntershill, whose home, Huntershill House, is in the centre of Auchinairn.

109. In Proposal One they also suggested an alternative arrangement in which the problem of West Dunbartonshire having an insufficient number of electors to form a single constituency, would be resolved by incorporating Yoker community council area, which is in Glasgow City council area, within a West Dunbartonshire and Yoker constituency. They argued that Clydebank and Yoker, which both have a history of shipbuilding, as well as having sporting and transport links, have more in common with each other than either does with Bearsden.
110. They suggested that the Initial Proposals' Glasgow North and Glasgow West constituencies could accommodate these changes and be within 5% of the electoral quota by amending the boundary between them, by placing Ruchill within Glasgow West constituency.
111. As further evidence in favour of creating an additional constituency which crosses council area boundaries, the Liberal Democrats argued that "supervision of councils and their services has been devolved to Holyrood and so nowadays involves very little interaction with Westminster. This means that representing parts of two very different council areas does not make an MP's job any more complicated".
112. At the public hearing they criticised the visibility of the Initial Proposals' boundary in Bearsden, and argued that multi-member wards are too large to be used as a basis for constituency design for small council areas like East Dunbartonshire, and that the Commission should instead look to polling districts and the wards that existed before multi-member wards were created.
113. In Proposal Two they suggest an alternative division of Bearsden based on polling districts rather than wards, believing this would produce a less disruptive pair of constituencies. This would place the north west of Bearsden, areas to the north and south of Duntocher Road which is the main road link between Bearsden and West Dunbartonshire, in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire.
114. They advocate Proposal Two, only if Proposal One is rejected and the Commission decides that it is necessary to divide Bearsden.
115. The Scottish Liberal Democrats also supported amending the Initial Proposals to ensure that all of Craigton Village remains in a constituency with Milngavie. This change is reflected in both of their proposals.
116. They suggested that any constituency that lies only in East Dunbartonshire council area should be called "East Dunbartonshire".
117. They state that they have received 822 postcards signed by 1383 citizens who live in the part of Bearsden which is proposed to become part of West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden North constituency, which object to the proposed constituency, and express a preference for being in a constituency with the rest of Bearsden and Milngavie. Their postcards state that "In terms of public services and local issues, people in this part of Bearsden have much more in common with those in the rest of Bearsden and Milngavie than with West Dunbartonshire and Clydebank". The Scottish Liberal Democrats believe that they would have had a similar response from people in the rest of Bearsden and Milngavie had they asked them.

Scottish Labour Party

118. The Scottish Labour Party (ID9038) supported the Initial Proposals of East Dunbartonshire, West Dunbartonshire and Glasgow council areas. They expressed support for the allocation of six seats to Glasgow. With respect to East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire, they supported the allocation of two constituencies within the grouping and considered that the Initial Proposals achieved the division of the council areas while retaining local ties.

MPs and MSPs

119. John Nicolson MP (ID8936) argued that the name of "Milngavie and Kirkintilloch" constituency in the Initial Proposals is inappropriate, as it only includes part of Milngavie and does not include the names of other East Dunbartonshire towns. He considered this geographically inaccurate and potentially confusing, and likely to leave electors in other part of East Dunbartonshire feeling disenfranchised and excluded. He suggests that as the constituency contains 80% of the existing East Dunbartonshire constituency's area and 90% of its population, that the constituency be called "East Dunbartonshire or "Dunbartonshire East". This would also complement the use of "West Dunbartonshire" to name a constituency, and would ensure continuity with the historic county.

120. He supported the inclusion of Kirkintilloch in a single constituency, and supported the inclusion of Lennoxton, Milton of Campsite and Twechar in a constituency which ensures that by far the greater part of East Dunbartonshire has a single representative in Parliament. He opposed the division of Bearsden, and requested that the whole of the town be retained in the new constituency. He also opposed the division of Craigton Village to the north west of Milngavie, describing the boundary as "arbitrary and artificial".

121. He considers that the new constituency boundaries should follow the line of council ward boundaries (which have not changed since 2007) between Bearsden North and South and in Milngavie. He argues that there are clear advantages in terms of voter recognition, community identity, and the relationship with the council and other local services in the various electoral boundaries being contiguous.

122. Ross Greer MSP (ID8863) opposed the division of Bearsden, and the argued that Bearsden and Milngavie form an integrated community. He argued that dividing them would not be in the interests of effective representation, and should be entirely within one constituency, preferably with other areas of East Dunbartonshire council area. He argued that if it were necessary to include them in a West Dunbartonshire constituency, this would still be preferable to the proposed division. He also opposed the reduction in the number of MPs under the terms of the Review.

Councillors

123. Milngavie ward Cllr Eric Gotts (ID 8137) objected to the proposed constituency boundary along the A809 which would divide the village of Craigton

to the north west of Milngavie. He said that the village was part of the wider Milngavie ward and should remain so.

124. Govan ward Cllr Fariha Thomas (ID8910) expressed concern about the proposed inclusion of Craigton and Dumbreck (the area between the east side of Bellahouston Park and the motorway) within Glasgow Central constituency. She advised that Dumbreck is seen as part of west Pollokshields. She considers that including these areas in Glasgow Central constituency does not make sense, in the light of their being included in Pollokshields ward in the revised council area boundaries from 2017. She considered that this would be particularly harmful for Craigton, as it would not only be the only part of the Pollokshields local government ward within Glasgow Pollok Scottish Parliament constituency, but Craigton and Dumbreck would be the only parts of Pollokshields ward in Glasgow Central constituency. She consider that it makes more sense, given the local government boundary changes, for Craigton and Dumbreck to be included in Glasgow South West constituency alongside Cardonald and Pollokshields.
125. Pollokshields ward Cllr David Meikle spoke at the Glasgow public hearing (ID9010) and responded in the initial consultation (ID8612). He suggested that 3 polling districts covering the Waverley Park, Shawlands and Strathmore areas be placed in Glasgow South West constituency, rather than Glasgow South East constituency, in order to include all of Pollokshields ward in a single constituency. He suggested that as a compensating transfer, Muirend, Newlands and Mansewood be included in Glasgow South East constituency, noting that they are separated from most of the electors in Glasgow South West constituency by Pollok Park. He considered that these changes would benefit local ties in both areas, and reduce the number of wards divided between constituencies.

Local Authorities

126. East Dunbartonshire Council (ID8620) would have liked all of the council area to be within a single constituency, but acknowledged that this would not be possible. It argued that a constituency which contains 6/7th of the council area should be renamed "East Dunbartonshire county constituency". It took the view that electoral parity should be maintained by applying the principle that existing wards should be retained in one UK Parliament constituency, and that towns and existing natural communities should be preserved and retained within one UK parliamentary constituency.
127. Glasgow City Council (ID8363) noted the Initial Proposals. It noted that the proposals relate to council wards in place prior to May 2017 and that a Polling District and Polling Place review would be required.
128. West Dunbartonshire Council (ID8480) wrote in support of the Initial Proposals with respect to West Dunbartonshire.

Community Groups

129. Dowanhill, Hyndland and Kelvinside Community Council (ID8387) suggested that the boundary between the Glasgow Central constituency and Glasgow West constituency be adjusted to incorporate all of the community council area within Glasgow Central constituency. It argued that the area is a single cohesive and

uniform community, and that this change would match the new ward 23 boundary (Partick East & Kelvindale), effective from May 2017.

Others

130. There were 13 general responses from members of the public that covered all of Scotland. Of these: 2 provided alternative constituency boundaries across Scotland.

131. The first one of these (ID8896) suggests that West Dunbartonshire council area and ward 2 (Milngavie) of East Dunbartonshire council area should form a single constituency: West Dunbartonshire. It suggests that the remaining 7 wards in East Dunbartonshire council area form a constituency: East Dunbartonshire. This is the same constituency formation in East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire council areas that the Commission considered, but did not choose in Option 1 of paper BCS 2016/30, and is very similar to the suggestion made by the Scottish Conservatives and supported by one other respondent to the public consultations: that Milngavie rather than part of Bearsden form a constituency with West Dunbartonshire.

132. It suggests that the wards of Glasgow City council area form 6 constituencies. These are:

- Glasgow Provan, comprising: North East, Baillieston, City Centre and Springburn (part);
- Glasgow Bridgeton, comprising: Calton, Shettleston, Anderston / City (part);
- Glasgow Maryhill, comprising: Maryhill / Kelvin, Canal, Hillhead, Springburn (part);
- Glasgow Scotstoun, comprising: Garscadden /Scotstounhill; Drumchapel / Anniesland, Partick West, Anderston / City (part);
- Glasgow Cathcart, comprising: Linn, Langside, Pollokshields, Newlands/ Auldburn (part);
- Glasgow Craigton, comprising: Greater Pollok, Craigton, Govan, Newlands / Auldburn (part).

133. The second of these (ID9105) aims to demonstrate that it is possible to construct a set of constituencies across Scotland which are entirely comprised of complete council area wards, more than to suggest an alternative to the Initial Proposals. It contains constituencies which combine parts of: West Dunbartonshire council area with Argyll and Bute council area; East Dunbartonshire council area with Glasgow City council area and North Lanarkshire council area, as well as combining parts of Glasgow City council area with parts of South Lanarkshire council area and Renfrewshire council area.

134. Two responses supported a reduction in the number of MPs (7570, 7578); and 9 made comments opposing the review or made comments out-with the legislation (8276, 8171, 7682, 7664, 7662, 7632, 7575, 7549, 7562).

135. Members of the public submitted 186 responses to the initial consultation for these areas, not including all-Scotland responses.

Responses Primarily Concerning East Dunbartonshire

136. Two members of the public made comments outwith the scope of the legislation criticising the reduction in the number of MPs (ID8836) (ID8839)
137. One member of the public supported the Initial Proposals as regards East Dunbartonshire (ID8289).
138. Three responses from members of the public had non-specific opposition to the proposals in East Dunbartonshire (ID8753) (ID8843) (ID8542).
139. Around 140 responses to the initial consultation opposed the division of Bearsden, with around 75 responses opposing the division of Bearsden, or part of it from Milngavie.
140. Many of the responses which opposed the division of Bearsden also opposed dividing Bearsden, or part of it from Milngavie. These responses also mentioned links to Milngavie alongside their opposition to division from the rest of Bearsden.
141. The respondents considered that the division of Bearsden would break local ties in the area. They cited:
- lack of community ties between Bearsden and West Dunbartonshire;
 - the breaking of links within Bearsden and between Bearsden and Milngavie;
 - the breaking of links within East Dunbartonshire as a whole;
 - different public services, local issues and welfare needs;
 - lack of public transport between north Bearsden and West Dunbartonshire;
 - problems of co-operation between MPs, MSPs and local authorities;
 - that West Dunbartonshire and Bearsden North would be too large and diverse to be represented by a single MP, citing social and economic differences between rural, suburban and ex-industrial areas;
 - the breaking of local established connections in areas such as sports facilities, recycling and waste disposal.
142. Some respondents also emphasised the strong connections Bearsden has with Milngavie and contrasted these to the weaker connections it has to West Dunbartonshire, citing: the integrated nature of the community, shared community resources and the strong transport links between the towns.
143. Some respondents also wrote opposing changes to the existing East Dunbartonshire constituency, or dividing East Dunbartonshire council area (ID8769) and (ID7817).
144. A number of the respondents to the consultation appeared to be under the impression that their area would fall under the jurisdiction of West Dunbartonshire Council, and that local services, school catchment areas and house prices would be negatively affected.
145. One member of the public suggested that the Initial Proposals in Bearsden are problematic and could lead to confusion at polling stations with small

pockets of electors having different boundaries. They suggested an alternative north-south boundary in Bearsden, along the A809 Drymen Rd / Stockiemuir Rd. (ID8146). They suggested that this would cut Bearsden North ward "cleanly" in half, not leaving "orphan pockets" of electors.

146. Another member of the public suggested that if Bearsden must be divided, then the natural dividing line would be in the Castlehill area, which lies in the north west of the town (ID8379).
147. One member of the public argued that Bearsden should not be divided through Old Bearsden Conservation area, which lies in the west / centre of the town. (ID8809)
148. One member of the public suggested that Kirkintilloch should be placed in a constituency with Cumbernauld and Kilsyth, which would allow Bearsden and Milngavie to remain together, and would have the benefit of avoiding the extension of the Cumbernauld seat into Coatbridge and Airdrie, as these are communities which have had little shared representation (ID8739).
149. One member of the public suggested that the current East Dunbartonshire constituency be expanded to include areas such as Anniesland and Jordanhill which it is closer to and has more in common with than West Dunbartonshire, and suggests linking Bearsden and Milngavie with these areas (ID8279).
150. One member of the public suggested that Bearsden and Milngavie be united in a constituency with a large part of Kirkintilloch (ID7623).
151. One member of the public suggested including Milngavie in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire (ID7680), arguing that: by this change the whole of Bearsden will be in one constituency, and that Milngavie shares its MSP with Clydebank and Holyrood so the boundaries will be more consistent. Also, that Milngavie shared its MP with Clydebank from Feb 1974 to 2005.
152. One member of the public appears to support a West Dunbartonshire constituency which includes Helensburgh rather than Bearsden (ID8578). Another member of the public suggested it would be easier to divide West Dunbartonshire rather than Bearsden (ID8335).
153. Two respondents wrote in regards to the proposals in Bearsden without clearly expressing support for or opposition to the proposals (ID7693) (ID7699).
154. 43 members of the public signed a standard letter opposing the division of Craigton Village north west of Milngavie (ID7993). They emphasised Craigton's links with Milngavie as regards shopping, doctors, schools, libraries and social contacts. 5 members of the public submitted separate responses on this issue or responded at the public hearing. As well as discussing the breaking of local ties with Milngavie, they also noted that the area is separated from West Dunbartonshire by a range of hills.
155. 6 responses from members the public suggested alternative constituency names for East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire constituencies. These were:
 - rename the Dunbartonshire constituencies in the Initial Proposals "East and West Dunbartonshire" (ID8146);

- use constituency names “East Dunbartonshire” and “West Dunbartonshire and Milngavie” (having included Milngavie rather than part of Bearsden in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire (ID7680));
- include the town of Bishopbriggs in the name of the proposed “Milngavie and Kirkintilloch” constituency as it has the largest population in the area (ID7655);
- change “Milngavie and Kirkintilloch” to reflect all of the town in the area by referring to the area’s situation at the foot of the Campsie hills in the name (ID7652);
- replace “Milngavie and Kirkintilloch” with “Strathkelvin” (ID7628);
- replace “Milngavie and Kirkintilloch” with “Kirkintilloch and Milngavie” to reflect the balance of population, and that Kirkintilloch is the administrative and cultural centre of East Dunbartonshire (ID7589).

Additionally, two respondents wished that Bearsden should remain in a constituency name (ID8835), (ID8090).

Responses Primarily Concerning Glasgow

156. Glasgow Youth Council (ID8768) felt that a number of the Initial Proposals failed to take into consideration long-existing ties between communities within the city, and criticising the reduction in the number of MPs in the city.
157. Two members of the public made comments outwith the scope of the legislation criticising the reduction in the number of MPs (ID7611) (ID7573).
158. One member of the public supported the Initial Proposals for Glasgow City council area (ID7677).
159. One a member of the public had non-specific opposition to the proposals for Glasgow (ID7580).
160. One member of the public suggested that Craigton and Dumbreck should be in Glasgow South West constituency with Cardonald and the rest of Pollokshields ward, rather than Glasgow Central constituency: this would be consistent with the areas being included in Pollokshields ward in the recent changes to local government wards in Glasgow. (ID8884)
161. Three members of the public expressed puzzlement at the contrast between the Craigton area being include in Pollokshields ward in the recently reviews boundaries for Glasgow City council area wards, but being included in Glasgow central constituency in the Initial Proposals (ID8701), (ID8704) and (ID8744).
162. A member of the public argued that Maxwell Park ought to be in an urban Glasgow South constituency with Strathbungo, Waverley Park and Shawlands rather than a suburban constituency (Glasgow South West) with areas like Corkerhill with which it has no geographical, social or transport links (ID7577).
163. A member of the public wrote to say that in the Initial Proposals the Mansewood /Newlands area in Glasgow is split from its neighbouring local areas of Shawlands, Langside and Battlefield (ID7581). He argues that the proposed Glasgow South West constituency would effectively be split into two by the M77

and the large Pollok Country Park and two railways, and that these follow roughly the same south west to north east direction, with few crossing points.

164. One respondent suggested that the village of Carmunnock, which lies to the south of Glasgow but within Glasgow City council area, should form part of a constituency with East Kilbride, citing isolating from the rest of the council area and that he uses services and resources within the East Kilbride area (ID7556).
165. A member of the public suggested Firpark Terrace, the Royal Infirmary Glasgow Cathedral and the Necropolis be included in Glasgow Central constituency rather than Glasgow East constituency (ID7605). He argued that: the proposed boundary could cause problems in applying for building refurbishment grants only available to those in Glasgow Central; tourists could be discouraged from visiting the area by perceiving it as being further from the city centre than it is, that the name Glasgow Central would not be geographically accurate as western parts of the constituency are further from the centre of Glasgow than the areas he would wish to incorporate in the constituency, and that the number of electors affected by the change he proposes would be low.
166. 2 responses from members of the public suggested alternative constituency names for Glasgow constituencies. One suggestion was that area names rather than compass points should be used:
- "Glasgow Central" should be "Glasgow Govan";
 - "Glasgow East" should be "Glasgow Baillieston";
 - "Glasgow North" should be "Glasgow Dennistoun";
 - "Glasgow South East" should be "Glasgow Langside";
 - "Glasgow South West" should be "Glasgow Crookston"
 - and "Glasgow West" should be "Glasgow Kelvinside" (ID7677).
167. The other suggestion was that "Glasgow West" was too bland and should be replaced by a name like "Glasgow Great Western" after the road, "Glasgow Dawsholm" after the park, "Glasgow Gartnavel" after the old mine and hospital, or "Glasgow River Kelvin"; and that this would be preferable to names based on compass points, or names based on local areas which would only appeal to certain residents (ID7594).

Secondary Consultation

Political parties

Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party

168. With respect to Glasgow City, the Scottish Conservatives (ID9916), suggested that it should be allocated 6 constituencies broadly as outlined in the Initial Proposals, which they say maximise continuity. They took the view that unnecessarily crossing the Glasgow City council area boundary would breach the Commission's rules on the allocation of seats. They suggested that such crossings would have no benefit to residents of Glasgow, and there was no evidence of support within Glasgow for such changes.

169. With respect to East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire they acknowledged the level of opposition to division of part of East Dunbartonshire from the rest of the council area, but noted that this could not be avoided. They continued to oppose the division of Bearsden, and restated their alternative suggestion of including Milngavie in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire, with Bearsden being in a constituency with the rest of East Dunbartonshire.
170. They agreed with respondents at the Glasgow public hearing, that Craigton Village should not be divided from Milngavie, and said that to do so would breach the rule on local ties.
171. They agreed with East Dunbartonshire Council that no town in East Dunbartonshire should be divided, and on this basis opposed the Liberal Democrats' suggestion that Auchinairn be combined with the north of Glasgow in a constituency. They argued that Auchinairn has long been part of Bishopbriggs, and that its inclusion in a constituency with the part of Glasgow would divide Bishopbriggs. They argued that Auchinairn's electors would be marginalised in such an arrangement, and that the division of Bishopbriggs instead of Bearsden would merely be moving the problem of dividing a town, not solving it.
172. They took issue with the Scottish Liberal Democrats' argument that people from Auchinairn meet people from Glasgow more often than people from other areas of East Dunbartonshire meet people from other council areas: arguing that people from Bearsden will meet people from Glasgow at the Waitrose supermarket on Glasgow road, the West of Scotland Rugby ground and Bearsden Golf Club. They do not consider this an argument for creating a cross-council constituency. They suggested that the Liberal Democrats have not provided a reason why Bishopbriggs electors rather than those from Bearsden or Lenzie should be linked to Glasgow. They further stated that they do not believe Bearsden residents want to be added to a constituency based on Drumchapel and Maryhill any more than Bishopbriggs residents would want to be linked with Springburn rather than their own town.
173. They also disputed the Liberal Democrats' view on MPs, arguing that they are have an important role as constituency leaders which legitimately involve them in council and Scottish Parliament issues. They do not consider that MPs should have a subsidiary role to MSPs in forming electoral boundaries - which are informed by local government boundaries - because MSPs have greater involvement with councils.
174. They note that both Bearsden wards and Milngavie wards are in the same Scottish Parliament constituency as Clydebank in West Dunbartonshire, and argue that the logic of the Liberal Democrats' position is that one ward or the other should be linked to West Dunbartonshire.
175. They argued that issues regarding the crossing of boundaries between Glasgow City council area and East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire council areas were raised in the 6th Review of Constituency Boundaries, saying that the Commission did not then adopt a suggestion made by the Liberal Democrats to link Drumchapel in Glasgow, and said that nothing has changed fundamentally.

176. They reiterated their suggestion that Milngavie is the only community within East Dunbartonshire which could be treated separately, and that the whole electorate of the town can be placed in a constituency with West Dunbartonshire, on the basis, in part, that it has always been linked in living memory with Clydebank in Scottish or Westminster constituencies. They argued that moving the whole of the electorate of Milngavie best respects local ties in East Dunbartonshire, by avoiding the need to divide a town or other clearly definable community, and reflects local ties to the extent that both areas are in the same Scottish Parliament constituency.
177. They restated their idea of including an unpopulated segment of Milngavie ward with Bearsden, in order to improve connectivity between Bearsden and the rest of East Dunbartonshire in their alternative proposals.
178. They took the view that the Initial Proposals for the division of Bearsden better reflect local ties than the alternative suggestions made by the Liberal Democrats with regards to boundaries at Yoker and Auchinairn. They would prefer that these be adopted if the Commission does not wish to adopt their suggestion to link Milngavie and Clydebank, or their other suggestions which link Milngavie with Stirling.

Scottish Labour Party

179. The Scottish Labour Party did not wish to make further comment on the Initial Proposals for East Dunbartonshire, Glasgow and West Dunbartonshire council areas.

MPs and MSPs

180. Chris Stephens MP (ID9831) comments in relation to the proposed Glasgow South West constituency. He suggests that the constituency boundaries should follow the new local authority ward boundaries. He comments in particular with regard to the Craigton community, which the Initial Proposals place within Glasgow Central constituency, despite its having been included in Pollokshields ward following the implementation of new council area ward boundaries in 2017.
181. He notes that the community was opposed to it being removed from Govan ward and being included in Pollokshields ward, and that this is an error which has been compounded by the proposal to place Craigton in Glasgow South West constituency. He believes this is a clear inconsistency which requires to be addressed. He also opposed the reduction in the number of MPs under the terms of the Review.
182. Humza Yousaf MSP (ID9697) also comments on the proposed Glasgow South West constituency, stating that there is an apparent contradiction between the Initial Proposals' placing of Craigton and Dumbreck within Glasgow Central constituency, and their being moved from ward 5 (Govan) to ward 6 (Pollokshields) in the new Glasgow City council area ward boundaries.

Councillors

183. Bishopbriggs North ward Cllr Billy Hendry (ID 9934) was critical of the Liberal Democrats' suggestion to incorporate Auchinairn in a constituency with the north of Glasgow. He argues that the area was in the old Bishopbriggs burgh and that the people there see themselves as living in Bishopbriggs. He notes the high level of local opposition to the Initial Proposals' division of Bearsden, and suggests that this is due to the Liberal Democrats having distributed 5000 postcards in the area. He argues that the people of Bishopbriggs have not similarly been made aware of the Liberal Democrats' suggestion for their area, and urges the Commission not to divide Bishopbriggs as a consequence.
184. Govan ward Cllr Fariha Thomas (ID9548) restated her view that Craigton and Dumbreck should be included in Glasgow South West constituency.
185. Govan ward Cllr Stephen Dornan (ID9549) said he felt that the proposed constituency boundaries were more about numbers than natural communities and that there was no political alignment with Holyrood and Westminster boundaries.
186. Pollokshields ward Cllr David Meikle (ID9690) responded supporting Craigton Community Council's view. He argued that there is a disconnect in that Craigton and Dumbreck are in Pollokshields ward in Glasgow City council area, but are in Glasgow Central constituency in the Initial Proposals, and are also the only part of Pollokshields ward in Glasgow Pollok Scottish Parliament constituency. He argued that Craigton should be placed in Glasgow South West constituency along with the rest of Pollokshields ward.

Local Authorities

187. No local authorities responded during the secondary consultation.

Community Groups

188. The Strathbungo Society (9850) objected to the inclusion of the Strathbungo and Waverley Park areas of Glasgow in Glasgow South East constituency and suggested they should be placed in Glasgow South West. They argued that the area has ties to the west and Pollokshields; and that the railway, via a well-used footbridge which people use to access Pollokshields West station for commuting and to access local shops and services in the Kildrostan St/ Nithsdale Road area, acts as a link rather than a division. They suggest that Pollokshaws Road and Kilmarnock Road would be a stable natural boundary for the eastern extent of Glasgow South West constituency.

Others - Secondary Consultation

189. There were four general responses from the public that covered all of Scotland. All four (ID9979, ID9951, ID9519 and ID10037) opposed the proposed reduction of MPs in Scotland.
190. Members of the public submitted 58 responses to the secondary consultation for these areas, not including all-Scotland responses.

Responses Primarily Concerning East Dunbartonshire

191. 26 responses from members of the public in the secondary consultation expressed opposition to the proposed division of Bearsden. 24 responses opposed the division of Bearsden, or part of it, from Milngavie. They opposed it for the same reasons as in the initial consultation.
192. 3 responses from members of the public wrote to oppose the use of the A809 in Craighton Village as a constituency boundary, arguing as in the initial consultation, that this would break local ties and that the village should be undivided, and in the same constituency as Milngavie.
193. 21 respondents agreed with the Liberal Democrats' proposal which avoids dividing Bearsden and retains it in constituency with Milngavie by creating constituencies which link West Dunbartonshire with Yoker, as well as Auchinairn with the north of Glasgow, and changes the Initial Proposals' boundary in the north west of Glasgow at Ruchill.
194. These responses largely focussed on the benefits of avoiding breaking local ties in Bearsden, and between Bearsden and Milngavie, although one respondent suggested the Liberal Democrats' proposal would not produce significantly problematic issues in the constituencies adjoining East Dunbartonshire (ID9723). One respondent also suggested that Bearsden and West Dunbartonshire have no common ground, and that Clydebank and Yoker have ties dating back to pre-war days (ID9582).
195. 18 responses to the secondary consultation opposed the Scottish Conservatives' suggestion that Milngavie, rather than part of Bearsden should form a constituency with West Dunbartonshire.
196. These responses emphasised Milngavie's close links with Bearsden, contrasting these with its lesser links to West Dunbartonshire. They cited in particular:
- the geographic proximity to Milngavie and Bearsden;
 - social and economic ties between the towns, including churches, schools, sports clubs and shopping facilities;
 - the much stronger transport links Milngavie has with Bearsden than West Dunbartonshire;
 - the similarity between the demographics of Milngavie and Bearsden compared to Milngavie and West Dunbartonshire and the contrast between Milngavie's residential nature and Clydebank's industrial nature;
197. One member of the public criticised the Scottish Conservatives' description of Milngavie as "self-sufficient" arguing that it depended on population movements in particular with Bearsden, saying the new primary school for Milngavie is in Bearsden (ID9676).
198. Some respondents also appeared to believe that Milngavie would become part of West Dunbartonshire council area if the suggestion was adopted, and were opposed to this.

199. One respondent wrote to oppose the Scottish Conservatives' alternative suggestion to link Milngavie with Stirling in a constituency, citing the distance between the towns, the poor public transport connections and the lack of social, business or cultural connections (ID9681).
200. One respondent wrote in regards to Bearsden but his view on the proposals or responses to the initial consultation was not clear (ID9573).

Responses Primarily Concerning Glasgow

201. One member of the public wrote to support the Initial Proposals' boundaries in Glasgow (ID9641).
202. Four responses argued that Craigton community council area should be included in Glasgow South West constituency, highlighting the area's recent inclusion in Pollokshields ward, and Craigton being the only area in Pollokshields ward in the Glasgow Pollok Scottish Parliament constituency, meaning that if the Initial Proposals were adopted, Craigton would be represented at MP, MSP and councillor levels by 3 quite different geographical areas with little overlap (ID9755) (ID9745) (ID9743) (ID9741). One of these respondents also clearly suggested that neighbouring Dumbreck should also be included in Glasgow South West constituency (ID9741),
203. A member of the public wrote to suggest that Strathbungo should be included in Glasgow South West constituency rather than Glasgow South East constituency. She argued that: Strathbungo has strong links via community organisations with Pollokshields; that the footbridge over the railway to Pollokshields unites the communities rather than the railway line dividing them; that many Strathbungo residents shop or attend medical or dental appointments in Pollokshields and use the post office and library there; and that Pollokshaws Road is the traditional and customary boundary in the area (ID9753).
204. A member of the public also suggested that Strathbungo be included in Glasgow South West constituency, noting that it is part of Pollokshields ward, and has close links with east Pollokshields. He also suggested that the Newlands area relates little to other areas in Glasgow South West constituency, and that the boundary between Glasgow South West and Glasgow South East should be at Pollokshaws Road rather than the railway line (ID9751).
205. A member of the public wrote to suggest that the proposed boundary between Glasgow South West and Glasgow South East constituencies in the Newlands area does not follow a natural boundary such as a railway or an A road, and that it is separated on three sides from neighbouring constituencies with well utilised "town centres" nearby. He suggested there is little connection between the area and the areas to the west of Pollok Park, which forms a large natural barrier. He suggests that the area be incorporated in a neighbouring constituency that is more utilised on a day-to-day basis by residents in the area (ID9516).