BCS Paper 2023/10

2023 Review of UK Parliament Constituencies
Final recommendations – Glasgow City, Inverclyde and Renfrewshire Council areas

Action required

1. The Commission is invited to agree its Final Recommendations for constituencies in Glasgow City, Inverclyde and Renfrewshire council areas.

Background

2. At its meeting of 14 February 2023 the Commission agreed paragraphs 2 to 16 of Paper 2023/05 as part of the text for its Final Report.

3. When considering responses to the Revised Proposals at its February meeting the Commission agreed to adopt the alternative suggestions at Dargavel in Renfrewshire and Port Dundas (first suggestion) in north Glasgow as its Final Recommendations subject to consideration of all other constituencies.

4. The Commission considered the suggestions to revert to the Initial Proposals in the east of Glasgow. The Commission asked the Secretariat to draft a paper with further analysis of the initial and revised boundaries and responses to those consultation stages, in the east of Glasgow. The Commission wished to establish which particular aspects of the Initial and Revised Proposals were popular with respondents within this area.

5. A map of the revised proposals and other boundaries (Scottish Parliament, wards, initial proposals and existing constituencies) is at Appendix A.

Glasgow East - Initial Proposals

6. The Initial Proposals proposed nine constituencies within this grouping. There are currently ten constituencies.

7. At its meetings of 23 July 2021 and 23 August 2021, the Commission considered its Initial Proposals for these areas in Paper 2021/15 and Paper 2021/24. All of the options had proposed a Glasgow East constituency, that followed ward boundaries and included the communities of Baillieston, Easterhouse and Shettleston. Appendix A (top left map) shows both the initial proposals and revised proposals.

Glasgow East - Initial Proposals – Consultation responses

8. The Commission published its initial proposals for public consultation in October 2021 and February 2022. The Commission considered responses to the initial consultations at its meeting of 6 June and 18 July 2022, see meeting papers 2022/17 and 2022/19 respectively.

9. The Commission received 45 responses commenting on the initial proposals for Glasgow City council area. In summary the comments included:
    - 12 responses which opposed the proposed boundary at Strathbungo;
    - nine responses which opposed the proposed boundary at Cardonald;
    - five responses which wished no change to the existing boundaries;
    - three responses which commented on the east of Glasgow;
    - two responses which were broadly supportive of the initial proposals;
    - two responses which commented on the proposals in Yoker;

- two responses which suggested Possilpark and Springburn should be in the same constituency; and
- there were a number of individual responses commenting on other areas.

10. The three responses which commented on the initial proposals in the east of Glasgow stated:
    - "I think it is better for two 'west to east' seats to be created than 'north to south'. Two Holyrood seats (Provan and Shettleston) currently straddle most of this area and have a similar composition. Transport links; buses, rail, the M8 tend to run along east-west arteries. Traversing North to South at in this part of the city, is more difficult." (10982)

    - "Under these proposed changes, the area of Parkhead (and parts of Tollcross) in the East of Glasgow will be split between the constituencies of Glasgow Central and Glasgow East. If the boundaries followed London Road and Springfield Road, instead of Tollcross Road and Muiryfauld Road, the communities of Tollcross and Parkhead would remain whole. There are vital community centres serving both Parkhead and Tollcross which would be in a different constituency to their communities in these changes." (11716)

    - "The residences around Springfield road, and perhaps also a large area of Dalmarnock Road , should be placed within Glasgow East instead of Glasgow Central.
      While the area already is under Glasgow Central I have a lot more affinity with an individual who stays in Baillieston, or Tollcross, than I do with individuals who stay in Kelvingrove or Govanhill. In this way the "central"/town of Glasgow acts as a barrier to these areas.
      Additionally, the proposed boundary of Glasgow central in general are impracticable and do not reflect the district identity within the city. The M8 motorway should be used as a clear boundary and the area north of the motorway should be removed from central and added onto another constituency. The same should be done with the river Clyde as it is another distinct marker that provides a clear boundary between constituencies.
      As a constituency called Glasgow Central it should contain locations/areas which are considered to be part of the "central" location of Glasgow. These include both Glasgow Central Station and Queen Street Station. Preferably this should extent further west to border the M8 motorway which turns southbound towards Kingston/Tradeston area." (11123)

11. When considering responses to the initial consultation the Commission noted the suggestion for a constituency boundary along the M8 motorway would present a "Glasgow North East" constituency with approximately 38,000 electors and a Glasgow South East constituency with approximately 107,000 electors. Both out-with the electorate quota for the 2023 Review.

12. The Commission agreed on an option for its revised proposals that proposed a Glasgow North East and a Glasgow South East constituency by following the North Clyde railway line, also an existing ward boundary, rather than the M8. The option was similar to the boundary between the Glasgow Shettleston and Glasgow Provan UK Parliament constituencies in place between 1983 and 1997

and the current Scottish Parliament boundary between Glasgow Shettleston and Glasgow Provan. The Commission noted the option:

- partially followed existing ward boundaries, Scottish Parliament boundaries and historical UK Parliament boundaries;
- addressed concerns raised regarding local ties in the proposed Glasgow Central constituency; and
- minimised change elsewhere by amending only two constituency boundaries.

13. The Commission agreed to adopt the revised boundaries in the east of Glasgow because there were no obvious disadvantages to this option.

Glasgow East - Revised Proposals - Consultation responses

14. The Commission published its revised proposals for consultation in November 2022. The Commission considered responses to the revised consultation at its meeting of 14 February 2023, see meeting paper 2023/05.

15. There were 44 responses regarding the revised proposals for Glasgow City council area. In summary the comments included:
    - six responses which wished no change to the existing boundaries;
    - five responses which opposed the proposed boundary at Cardonald;
    - four responses which preferred the initial proposals;
    - three responses which commented on constituency names;
    - two responses which commented on the proposals in the proposed Glasgow South East constituency; and
    - there were a number of individual responses commenting on other areas.

16. The four responses which preferred the initial proposals are copied in full below.

17. Comment 12730 and 12683 were submitted by the same individual.

- "I find the observations of this process complex and uneasy to understand. I was however able to view proposal maps a while ago that showed constituencies involved for change in Glasgow showing an expansion of Glasgow central and taking away Glasgow North East. I agree with these plans and think it's the most sensible approach going forward and hope the boundary commission are still planning for this outcome." (12683)

- "This process keeps changing all the time. First we had an end to Glasgow north east to increase Glasgow central. Now we are back to Glasgow North East taking up loads of Glasgow east zones. I can't keep up! I originally thought getting rid of Glasgow north east was the best way forward but not there has been a change with Glasgow north east remaining. I am fully against Glasgow north east being extended for all sorts of community reasons which I would have enough space to list on here. Increasing Glasgow central was much more sensible and that proposed boundary map was much fairer. One MP has to lose out here and surely it should be the MP with the less votes who is Anne McLaughlin. I can't figure out why the commission are now planning to take away Glasgow Central who have an MP sitting on quite a high majority. It makes no sense!" (12730)

- "I would like to know why you have changed the Glasgow Central plans to give the North East a larger slice of the voting pie. I live in Dennistoun and

would be quite happy to be in a large Glasgow Central constituency. I would like to object to your plans to create a bigger North East as that would give the SNP candidate with a slender advantage a much greater advantage. I don't think you should be playing with politics." (13006)

- "I stay in Carntyne on and currently in the Glasgow East constituency. I also go to Stepps every day. Prior to moving to Carntyne I stayed in Dennistoun for more than 40 years. I feel like I am very much a Dennistoun person and on that basis I offer my view regarding the proposed extension of Glasgow North East to include my address.
  When the boundary commission initially set up their map plan proposals for Glasgow, I was quite pleased to see Dennistoun would become part of Glasgow central. Dennistoun is a central location in many ways and not just geographically. Since I can remember the Dennistoun area has its tentacles firmly fixed in the centre of Glasgow. George square is only a 15 minute walk. Many people communicate to universities and the Glasgow Royal infirmary for study and work. Living in Dennistoun also gives residents easy access to the city centre for socialising. It therefore makes sense having a Glasgow central constituency instead of Glasgow North East.
  When accessing your website I notice that there are no dates recorded to the comments. It is therefore impossible to know whether the comment relates to your initial map proposals for Glasgow Central or your secondary proposal for Glasgow North East. In fact an example of this would be my own submission which was positive for Glasgow Central but has now changed with your new map proposal for Glasgow North East. I would also like to raise concern regarding your navigation of the comment section. When it asks you to type in your post code, one would expect other comments from my area to be grouped together. However I found I had to trawl through comments from the entirety of Scotland!
  In my opinion the views of the public should be paramount in this debate. Not the views and influence of standing elected representatives and their employed staff who have their own personal agendas. So that is why your website needs to be easy for the public to contribute to in a meaningful way but I would argue it is not.
  Places such as, Greenfield, Springboig, Barlarnock and Easterhouse could never be described as North East of the city. So keeping an existing Glasgow East seat makes more sense. Equally Springburn, Robroyston, Sighthill and Dennistoun to name but a few comfortably fall geographically into a central position.
  I have read many of the submissions listed from Glasgow politicians and the council. The current city administration appear to oppose the concept of an extended Glasgow Central Constituency and the boundary commission seem to be swayed more by their opinions than the general public. It concerns me that they seem to have more clout when it comes to influencing decisions and as a direct result the initial plan of an extended Glasgow Central Constituency sounds like it's going to be ditched!
  I would also like to point out the ludicrous situation of someone living in Dunlop Crescent in Stepps, registered as Glasgow council tax payers but lose out on voting for a Glasgow member of parliament. Instead they will be voting in the bizarrely named new constituency of 'Bearsden and Campsie Fells'. To summarise the new Glasgow North East proposal excludes some council tax payers in Glasgow which doesn't seem very democratic.
  I am a creator and admin of several community Facebook groups in Glasgow. The largest being in Dennistoun with around 14,000 members. I was

interested to gauge some of the views of the members. So I created a poll asking the question; would they rather be in a new extended Glasgow Central or an extended Glasgow North East? The resounding outcome was they would prefer to be in a new Glasgow Central. I am fairly confident that none of the voters will have participated in the boundary commission's online comments portal.
Thank you for giving me the opportunity to record my observations and concerns regarding this matter. I am hoping you will revert back to your initial good idea of extending Glasgow Central as this seems to be more in line with the general public." (13007)

Summary

18. The Revised Proposals proposed two constituencies in the east of Glasgow of similar design to the existing Scottish Parliament constituencies in the area and similar to previous UK Parliament constituencies. These constituencies were altered from those in the initial proposals for the area following comments made during the initial consultation.

19. Four responses to the revised consultation commented on the revised proposals in the east of Glasgow. One individual supported the revised proposals but later changed their minds. The other two responses were more concerned with the constituency names and the areas of Glasgow they identify with rather than the proposed boundaries. One suggested renaming a constituency Glasgow East instead of Glasgow North East and another would like to remain in a Glasgow Central constituency.

20. The initial proposals retained Glasgow Central as a constituency name. The revised proposals did not name a constituency Glasgow Central. The Commission will have the opportunity to review all constituency names and designations prior to the publication of its Final Recommendations.

21. There are currently ten constituencies within this grouping. The initial and revised proposals have proposed nine constituencies, therefore there have been significant changes to constituency boundaries and as a result constituency names.

Conclusion and Recommendations

22. Taking into account all of the evidence arising from the public consultation on the Revised Proposals, the Secretariat invites the Commission to decide whether: to adopt without amendment the Initial Proposals or Revised Proposals as its Final Recommendations in the east of Glasgow, subject to consideration of all other constituencies (see Appendix A).

Secretariat
March 2023

Appendix A
Revised Proposals and other boundaries