

**Second Review of Scottish Parliament Boundaries
Consultation Responses to Further Proposals for regions and Supplementary
Proposals for constituencies**

For discussion

1. The formal consultation on Further Proposals for regions and Supplementary Proposals for constituencies closed on 14 April 2025.
2. There were no objections from a Council. There was no opposition from a body of 100 electors regarding the proposals for constituencies or from a body of 500 electors regarding the proposals for regions.
3. Appendix A includes all responses to both consultations.
4. Papers BS176 and BS177 discuss and analyse the consultation responses.
5. There were three responses out-with the formal consultation. These included a representation from Falkirk Council regarding the Falkirk West and Falkirk East and Linlithgow constituency boundaries and two comments regarding the Aberdeen Deeside and North Kincardine constituency name. These are included in Appendix A.

Conclusion

6. The Commission is invited to note the consultation responses on the Further Proposals for regions and the Supplementary Proposals for constituencies.

**Secretariat
April 2025**

Note – Appendix A not published. Responses that we were permitted to publish are available here <https://consult.boundaries.scot/>

Further Proposals for Regions

A member of the public:

Schedule 1 to the Scotland Act 1998 (section 13) states ""The regional electorate of a region must be as near the regional electorate of each of the other regions as is practicable, having regard (where appropriate) to special geographical considerations."" , it is unreasonable to suggest that special geographic considerations apply to the country's largest city so this region should have 9 constituencies to ensure votes are worth a relatively equal amount across the country: a key democratic principle.

This means that a constituency would need added to the region, as the South Scotland and West Scotland regions both have 10 constituencies it is logical that this extra constituency comes from these.

Renfrewshire North and Cardonald includes part of the Glasgow City Council area, but its inclusion would divide West Scotland into non-contiguous parts north and south of the Clyde, so would be sub optimal.

Strathkelvin and Bearsden in part shares a contiguous urban area, but this would involve splitting the town of Bearsden between regions, which would be sub optimal.

Eastwood shares a contiguous urban area, but its inclusion in a Glasgow constituency would be despite opposition from East Renfrewshire council.

East Kilbride does not share a contiguous urban area, and its inclusion would be despite opposition from South Lanarkshire council.

Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse is geographically the most distant from Glasgow but shares a contiguous urban area with Blantyre (part of the Rutherglen and Cambuslang constituency).

In truth, none of these options are ideal, but without redrawing the constituencies or splitting Glasgow between 2 regions they are what we are left with. In my opinion the best option for inclusion is Hamilton, followed by Eastwood, then Strathkelvin and then East Kilbride but the imperative is that one of them is included.

A member of the public:

East Kilbride should go back to the Glasgow region, or move to Central. Putting it in the south is ludicrous.

A member of the public:

It is not appropriate to exclude from the Glasgow Region several areas (including Hillington, Cardonald, Mosspark and Penilee) which have for many years been part of the city of Glasgow.

Glasgow City Council

Glasgow City Council have reviewed the proposals for the Region boundary changes, we accept that the Cardonald Ward will be returned by a different local authority for both constituency and regional papers . We therefore have no comments to submit.

A member of the public:

"I won't re-hash my previous submissions to the review, but on balance, I agree that this is the best possible arrangement for Glasgow within the confines of the proposed and now largely finalised constituency boundaries.

Whilst I believe it is unhelpful and detrimental to local representation for Cardonald, part of Glasgow City Council, not to be part of the Glasgow region, on balance I consider this to be less disruptive than including a large stretch of Renfrewshire in the Glasgow region. It must however be noted that the creation of a second 8-constituency region will have slight negative consequences for proportionality of representation within Glasgow, even if the counterbalance is to slightly increase proportionality in the corresponding 10-constituency region.

Similarly, although I remain of the view that including East Kilbride (and Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) in South is detrimental to local representation and alters the character of that region, concentrating the bulk of South Lanarkshire in one region (whilst Rutherglen and the Uddingston area remain in others) is the best outcome under these circumstances.

As in previous submissions, I strongly urge the Commission to formally note in its report to Ministers the undue difficulties posed to their work by the inflexibilities inherent to both the use of First Past the Post for constituencies and the requirement for all regions to be roughly equally sized. Removal of both of these aspects from the system are not within the powers of the Commission, but are within the gift of Scottish Ministers subject to approval by the Scottish Parliament.

The net result of these requirements has been the proposal of a set of boundaries that, whilst conforming to the legislative and technical requirements of the review, in many respects poorly reflect the human and other administrative geography of Scotland. As ever, I emphasise that this is not a criticism of the good work of Boundaries Scotland, who do the best job possible within an imperfect system."

Supplementary Proposals for Constituencies

West Lothian Council

West Lothian Council supports moving the community of Polbeth from Bathgate constituency to Almond Valley constituency by amending the boundary between the two constituencies. This change better respects the community ties between Polbeth and West Calder.

West Lothian Council appreciates that the position of the council was accepted previously in respect of Fauldhouse, Whitburn and Greenrigg remaining within West Lothian constituencies, but would note its extreme disappointment there will not be a further Local Inquiry for the proposals as they affect Linlithgow, depriving local people, community organisations and relevant stakeholders the opportunity to express their views on the proposal.

Linlithgow Constituency Association - Scottish National Party

Consultation Response: Second Review of Scottish Parliament Boundaries.

Following the revised Constituency boundary proposals, we would ask that consideration be given to changing the name of the proposed "Bathgate" Constituency.

We understand that the attention of the Commission will have, of course, been more focused on the redrawing of the boundaries to date, however, we would request the following change:

- Change from "Bathgate" to "West Lothian Central"

As the Constituency lies geographically central to the south of Linlithgow in West Lothian and north of Almond Valley. We would suggest that it may be more appropriate to attribute the known, popular and familiar County identifier of West Lothian, rather than only have one town as the identifier. The issue of using an individual town is that it will make voters feel less connected to the new Constituency especially the towns of Whitburn, Armadale, Broxburn and Uphall and the nearby villages with their West Lothian history and character.

Our current Constituency name of "Linlithgow" is an example of the problem as many Constituents who do not live in the town of Linlithgow do not relate to the current Constituency name which is also the name of a Council ward. This has often presented challenges in engagement and sense of community.

Furthermore, the name Bathgate is also the same name of a Council ward area and may lead to confusion in differentiating a Member of the Scottish Parliament with local ward Councillors.

Thank you for your consideration.

Out-with consultation

Falkirk Council

Second Review of Scottish Parliament Boundaries

I am writing to you to request that you consider an adjustment we propose to your revised proposal [24 January 2025] for the two constituencies of Falkirk East & Linlithgow and Falkirk West.

While the Council's preference remains that the current constituencies are retained, we accept at this stage that the outcome will be two constituencies that fall within the Falkirk Council area, along the inclusion of part of the Linlithgow ward; however, we would like to propose an adjustment to the internal boundary line that splits Falkirk between east and west. Our proposal has no impact on the overall electorate as per your revised proposal, and we believe it helps address some of the minor issues your revised proposal creates.

I include a GIS project file that sets out our proposed amendment. In summary, our proposal creates:

Falkirk West (66,984) from wards 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 (part)

Falkirk East & Linlithgow (69,188) from wards 1, 2, 7 (part), 8, 9, and Linlithgow (part)

The key was to follow the ward boundaries with only ward 7 requiring a split. This split was to help balance the populations. We believe this is a more appropriate split within the Falkirk Council area.

It removes the need to create a new unpopulated polling district,
It removes the need to redraft the boundaries for four other polling districts, and
It more closely correlating the local elected members with their constituency MSP, with only the members of ward 7 linking with both MSPs.

I would be grateful if you could consider our proposal. If you require any further information, you can contact Ewan McWilliams who will be happy to help.

Kenneth Lawrie
Chief Executive – Falkirk Council

A member of the public:

I have only just realised that the name of my Scottish Parliament constituency is set to change from "Aberdeen South & North Kincardine" to "Aberdeen Deeside & North Kincardine", even though no changes to the boundary are to take place.

I realise there have been opportunities to lodge representations in previous stages of the review, but I was wondering if it is still possible to do so?

It seems odd to change the name when the constituency is remaining the same, especially as the current name is a far better description for the constituency than the proposed new one, given that "Deeside" is a term generally associated with Royal Deeside, the majority of which is not in this constituency.

A member of the public:

I am concerned about the proposed name change of the constituency where I live. It is largely urban consisting mostly of South Aberdeen within the city boundaries and one semi rural ward in North Kincardine mostly in small towns, notably Portlethen. Misleadingly your chart refers to this as a county constituency rather than a burgh constituency mostly being part of Aberdeen City. Locally Deeside is a term used to describe rural hinterland in West Aberdeenshire and changing the name will cause confusion amongst the electorate.

On your web site I cannot find the rationale for the proposed name change. It only says you have changed it because of a suggestion. From whom and why?

I would be grateful if this could be reconsidered.