

Second Review of Scottish Parliament Boundaries Summary of responses to consultation on Provisional Proposals for constituencies

Action Required

1. The Commission is invited to consider a summary of responses to the consultation on its Provisional Proposals for constituencies. This summary is provisional at this stage as the Secretariat are still working through the responses received. All of the consultation responses will be shared with the Commission at later meetings
2. Responses for each council area grouping are summarised in Appendix A.

Summary of Responses

3. The statutory one month consultation period ran from 17 May to 17 June 2023.
4. Some respondents raised issues with the brevity of a one month consultation and late responses were permitted where these had been requested in advance. These were primarily from councils whose meeting schedule fell outwith the one month period. In most cases an interim response was submitted by 17 June with formal sign off after the council had met.
5. A total of 3,200 representations were submitted. 2,500 were submitted using the consultation site with the remaining 700 responses by email or letter. One telephone response was received. No responses were accepted via social media.
6. The constituency grouping of East Renfrewshire, Inverclyde, Renfrewshire and Glasgow City Council areas was the most commented on area with approximately 2,600 responses received. The majority of these followed local campaigning in Eastwood by the constituency MSP.
7. The next most popular response areas were:
 - Argyll and Bute; East Dunbartonshire; North Lanarkshire; and West Dunbartonshire Council areas where 330 responses were received.
 - City of Edinburgh; East Lothian; Midlothian; and West Lothian Council areas received 230 responses.
 - South Lanarkshire and Scottish Borders Council areas received 50 responses.
8. All other areas, which cover the remaining 15 council areas or 32 constituencies, had fewer than 50 responses combined.
9. There were four requests for a local inquiry: Fergus Ewing MSP for Inverness and Nairn; East Lothian Council; East Renfrewshire Council; and Renfrewshire Council. Scottish Borders Council did not request a local inquiry but objected

to the proposals. The Secretariat had a meeting with Mr Ewing and an update will be given.

10. The Commission is required to hold a local inquiry if representations objecting to the Provisional Proposals are received either from a local authority for part or all of the area of the affected constituency, or from a body of 100 or more parliamentary electors for the affected constituency. The Commission can also choose to hold one in a particular area if it thinks it would be helpful.
11. 19 MSPs and one MP responded to the consultation.
12. Over 100 alternative boundaries were drawn by respondents, using the consultation site mapping functionality.

Next steps

13. The Secretariat will fully analyse all responses received during the provisional consultation stage and develop further recommendations for consideration by the Commission at its forthcoming meetings later in 2023.

Conclusion

14. The Commission is invited to note this summary of responses to the first consultation on constituency boundaries.

**Secretariat
July 2023**

Aberdeen City, Aberdeenshire, Angus and Moray Council areas

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission retained the overall number of existing constituencies at nine. Seven of these were unchanged with only a minor boundary change between the Aberdeenshire East constituency and Banff and Buchan Coast constituency (previously named Banffshire and Buchan) at Mintlaw.

Press Coverage

There were no press articles or features in these areas.

Number of responses

10

Main issues raised by respondents

- Concern over the size of the constituencies.
- Suggestion to amend the proposed boundaries in Aberdeenshire and avoid dividing the village of Longside between two constituencies.
- Suggestion for alternative constituency names.
- Suggestion for an alternative boundary in Moray.

Council/MSP response

Aberdeenshire Council wish to avoid the division of Longside between two constituencies.

Moray Council supported the proposals but suggested a minor change to align with ward boundaries.

Request for local inquiry received

None.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

The existing arrangements in the area are all within 10% of variation from the electoral quota so the Commission could consider reverting to the existing boundaries and constituency names.

The suggestion to amend the boundary by Longside would affect very few electors, Longside is divided by the A950 road with about 250 electors on the northern side of the village.

Argyll and Bute, East Dunbartonshire, North Lanarkshire and West Dunbartonshire Council areas

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission proposed eight new constituencies. There are currently eight constituencies within this grouping but part of the existing Bellshill and Uddingston constituency sits within South Lanarkshire Council area.

Press Coverage

- [Dumbarton Scottish Parliament seat could be set for radical shake-up – Daily Record](#)
- [Scottish Parliament: Dumbarton constituency consultation ends soon | Helensburgh Advertiser](#)
- [Plan to split Helensburgh and Lomond 'clearly flawed' – The Lochside Press](#)
- [MSP blasts boundary proposals which would see Wishaw wiped off electoral map – Daily Record](#)
- [A stronger voice for Argyll and Bute at the Scottish Parliament. \(argyll-bute.gov.uk\)](#)
- [Boundaries Scotland plans for Helensburgh and Lomond criticised | Helensburgh Advertiser](#)
- [Council split on Holyrood constituency change – The Lochside Press](#)
- [West Dunbartonshire councillors slam radical plan to change Holyrood boundaries – Daily Record](#)

Number of responses

330

Main issues raised by respondents

- Mainly opposition to Clydebank being split between two constituencies.
- Opposition to proposals by Wishaw, Kilsyth/ Cumbernauld, Helensburgh and Baldernock (Milngavie).

Council/MSP response

Argyll and Bute Council and East Dunbartonshire Council both made no comment on the proposed boundaries. East Dunbartonshire suggested alternative constituency names.

West Dunbartonshire Council opposed the proposals and wish to retain the existing boundaries.

North Lanarkshire Council did not respond to the consultation.

Rona Mackay MSP for Strathkelvin and Bearsden was generally supportive of proposals in East Dunbartonshire.

Fulton MacGregor MSP for Coatbridge and Chryston opposed the proposals by Chryston and Coatbridge and submitted an alternative suggestion to retain most of the existing Cumbernauld and Kilsyth constituency.

Boundaries Scotland

Jamie Hepburn MSP for Cumbernauld and Kilsyth opposed the proposals by Cumbernauld, Kirkintilloch and Kilsyth because they break historical ties.

Marie McNair MSP for Clydebank and Milngavie opposed the division of Clydebank between constituencies.

Request for local inquiry received

None.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

Two existing constituencies have variation from the electoral quota over 10% (Argyll and Bute -17% and Cumbernauld and Kilsyth -15%) and the existing constituencies include 14,000 South Lanarkshire electors out-with this grouping, therefore some changes to the existing constituency boundaries are inevitable.

The Commission could consider retaining the existing Argyll and Bute and Dumbarton constituencies to avoid dividing Clydebank but the existing constituency divides Bearsden. Analysis of the Lanarkshire responses has yet to be undertaken.

Other suggestions are untested.

City of Edinburgh, East Lothian, Midlothian and West Lothian Council areas

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission proposed 12 new constituencies. There are currently 11 constituencies in this grouping but part of the existing Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale constituency is in Scottish Borders Council area.

Press Coverage

- [Plea not to 'break ties' with Midlothian amid Parliamentary boundary change proposal – Midlothian View](#)
- [Plea not to 'break ties' with Midlothian amid Parliamentary boundary change proposal | The Southern Reporter](#)
- [Colin Beattie MSP column: Proposed constituency changes | East Lothian Courier](#)
- [Paul McLennan MSP: I don't want to lose Prestonpans from constituency | East Lothian Courier](#)
- [Proposals for Scottish Parliamentary constituencies | East Lothian Council](#)
- [Plans to redraw Edinburgh's Scottish Parliamentary boundaries make no sense to MSPs or voters – Angus Robertson | Edinburgh News \(scotsman.com\)](#)
- [Bid to remove Prestonpans from county constituency labelled 'madness' | East Lothian Courier](#)
- [Scottish Parliament boundary changes – The Grange Association](#)
- [Boundary Scotland must rethink proposed changes to Holyrood constituencies after public opposition to its plans – Angus Robertson | Edinburgh News \(scotsman.com\)](#)
- [New East Lothian boundary change for Scottish Parliament 'will confuse voters' – Edinburgh Live](#)
- [Council opposing moving Prestonpans out of East Lothian constituency | East Lothian Courier](#)
- [East Lothian Council call for inquiry over plans to move thousands of residents to new constituency – Edinburgh Live](#)
- [Call for new Midlothian constituencies to be renamed to avoid 'confusion' for residents – Edinburgh Live](#)
- [Public inquiry requested into 'nonsensical' boundary change plan | East Lothian Courier](#)
- [Parts of Edinburgh could join West Lothian in new Holyrood parliament constituency – Edinburgh Live](#)

Number of responses

230

Main issues raised by respondents

- Lack of links between the west of Edinburgh and Linlithgow in the proposed Edinburgh Forth and Linlithgow constituency.
- Opposition to Prestonpans being removed from an East Lothian constituency.

- Opposition to proposed changes in central and southern Edinburgh.
- Opposition to a constituency partly covering three council areas.

Council/MSP response

Midlothian Council did not object to the proposed boundaries but suggested alternative constituency names.

Edinburgh Council and West Lothian Council did not respond to the consultation.

East Lothian Council opposed a constituency covering three council areas and formally requested a local inquiry.

Angus Robertson MSP for Edinburgh Central opposed placing Gorgie, Dalry and Fountainbridge in an Edinburgh Southern constituency.

Colin Beattie MSP for Midlothian North and Musselburgh opposed a Midlothian North and Musselburgh constituency covering parts of three council boundaries.

Ben Macpherson MSP for Edinburgh Northern and Leith opposed the inclusion of Muirhouse in an Edinburgh Forth and Linlithgow constituency.

Ash Regan MSP for Edinburgh Eastern suggested Portobello be kept in an Edinburgh constituency.

Daniel Johnson MSP for Edinburgh Southern opposed the proposed Edinburgh Southern constituency boundary because it will break local ties.

Ian Murray MP for Edinburgh South opposed the proposed Edinburgh Southern constituency due to practical, geographical and cultural grounds.

Request for local inquiry received

Yes, from East Lothian Council.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

Possible issues in West Edinburgh / West Lothian could be resolved by linking Balerno and Juniper Green with West Lothian instead.

The Commission could consider combining this grouping with other neighbouring groupings such as: Scottish Borders and South Lanarkshire. This may allow constituencies to be designed more closely to the existing constituency boundaries.

The Commission could consider creating three constituencies for East Lothian and Midlothian (entitlement to 2.8 constituencies); and nine constituencies for Edinburgh and West Lothian (entitlement to 9.1 constituencies). This would avoid a constituency covering three council areas.

Clackmannanshire, Falkirk and Stirling Council areas

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission retained the overall number of existing constituencies as four. The boundary between the existing Clackmannanshire and Dunblane constituency and Stirling constituency was amended by Doune. The existing Falkirk East and Falkirk West constituencies were unchanged.

Press Coverage

There were no press articles or features in these areas.

Number of responses

11

Main issues raised by respondents

- Opposition to Doune being removed from a Stirling constituency and argument that there is little to connect rural Stirlingshire with Alloa.
- Alternative boundary suggested by Causewayhead, north Stirling.
- In Falkirk one comment suggested Falkirk be split north-southwards rather than east-westwards.

Council/MSP response

Stirling Council responded with no comment.

Clackmannanshire Council and Falkirk Council did not respond to the consultation.

Keith Brown MSP for Clackmannanshire and Dunblane, opposed the proposals arguing they would break local ties. He suggested an alternative boundary by Causewayhead (north Stirling) and an alternative constituency name.

Request for local inquiry received

None.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

The existing Clackmannanshire and Dunblane constituency has variation from electoral quota at -13% so Commission likely to make some changes to its boundary.

Alternative suggestion by Causewayhead is untested.

Dumfries and Galloway Council area

Summary of Proposals

In Dumfries and Galloway the proposals retained the two existing constituencies unchanged.

Press Coverage

There were no press articles or features in these areas.

Number of responses

None.

Main issues raised by respondents

- None

Council/MSP response

None.

Request for local inquiry received

None.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

NA

Dundee City Council area

Summary of Proposals

In Dundee the proposals retained the two existing constituencies unchanged.

Press Coverage

There were no press articles or features in this area.

Number of responses

One.

Main issues raised by respondents

- One suggestion to add Monifieth (Angus) to a Dundee East constituency.

Council/MSP response

None.

Request for local inquiry received

None.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

There are approximately 7,500 Monifieth electors. If Monifieth was added to the Dundee City East constituency it would result in an Angus South constituency with 51,122 electors and variation from the electorate quota at -15% and a Dundee City East constituency with 63,530 electors and variation from the electorate quota at 6%.

East Ayrshire, North Ayrshire and South Ayrshire Council areas

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission retained the overall number of existing constituencies at five. The Commission retained three of the existing constituencies but amended the boundary by Stewarton between the existing Cunninghame South and Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley constituencies. The Commission retained the existing constituency names.

Press Coverage

There were no press articles or features in this area.

Number of responses

7

Main issues raised by respondents

- Opposition to the proposed boundary by Stewarton.
- Suggestions for alternative constituency names.
- Suggestions for an alternative boundary by Irvine and Stewarton.

Council/MSP response

East Ayrshire Council and North Ayrshire Council both opposed the proposals. Both councils submitted the same alternative suggestion by Stewarton.

Willie Coffey MSP for Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley opposed the proposals and submitted an alternative suggestion, south of Irvine.

No response was received from South Ayrshire Council.

Request for local inquiry received

None.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

The alternative suggestion from East Ayrshire Council and North Ayrshire Council proposed constituencies with variation from the electoral quota within 10%.

Suggestion from Willie Coffey MSP, south of Irvine, is untested.

East Renfrewshire, Glasgow City, Inverclyde and Renfrewshire Council areas

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission has proposed 12 new constituencies. There are currently 13 constituencies.

Press Coverage

- [Residents urged to 'save' Eastwood as parliamentary boundary | Barrhead News](#)
- [East Renfrewshire boundary changes 'not acceptable' as call for inquiry expected – Glasgow Live](#)
- [East Renfrewshire Council set to call for inquiry into boundary change | The National](#)
- [Ground News – East Renfrewshire Council says constituency boundary changes 'not acceptable'](#)
- [Council call to find 'better solution' for planned boundary changes | Barrhead News](#)
- [East Renfrewshire boundary change concerns dismissed as 'scaremongering' – Glasgow Live](#)
- [Council call to find 'better solution' for planned boundary changes | Glasgow Times](#)
- [Councillors disagree on risks created by proposed boundary changes | Barrhead News](#)

Number of responses

2,600

Main issues raised by respondents

- Opposition to splitting the existing Eastwood constituency and the proposed Glasgow Priesthill and Giffnock constituency which includes parts of Glasgow and East Renfrewshire.
 - There was a local campaign in Eastwood opposing the proposals but this led some respondents to believe their council area boundary may be changing with consequent concern about service provision, council tax and so on.
- Opposition to the proposed boundaries in Renfrewshire such as Johnstone and Paisley.

Council/MSP response

Glasgow City Council opposed the proposals because of the significant changes to the existing boundaries that do not consider ward or polling district boundaries. They also stated the proposals do not consider new housing developments. They asked for the Commission to engage with the Returning Officer community to discuss the reasons behind the changes and explore alternative options that are less disruptive.

East Renfrewshire Council opposed the proposals because they do not take account of local authority boundaries or local ties. They submitted an

alternative suggestion which proposes linking East Renfrewshire with Renfrewshire rather than with Glasgow City Council area. East Renfrewshire Council also requested a local inquiry.

Renfrewshire Council opposed the proposals and requested a local inquiry.

Inverclyde Council supported the proposals in Inverclyde. The proposed Inverclyde constituency follows the Inverclyde council area boundary.

Jackson Carlaw MSP for Eastwood opposed the proposals. He sought no changes to the existing Eastwood constituency arguing that its current electorate is close to the electorate quota, the proposals do not take account of local authority boundaries, Eastwood's identity would be lost, the proposals do not reflect local community ties, the proposed constituencies in East Renfrewshire and Renfrewshire lack transport links and do not share any local amenities.

Natalie Don MSP for Renfrewshire North and West opposed the proposed changes to her Renfrewshire North and West constituency because they break local ties.

Bob Doris MSP for Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn opposed the proposed Kelvin and Maryhill; and Springburn and Provan boundaries and stated the proposals make no consideration of new housing developments.

George Adam MSP for Paisley opposed the proposed changes to his Paisley constituency because there is little to connect Paisley with Renfrew and it splits Paisley between two constituencies.

Nicola Sturgeon MSP for Glasgow Southside opposed the proposals because they break local ties in the south of Glasgow, a constituency crosses the Clyde and the new boundaries do not align with UK Parliament constituency boundaries.

Tom Arthur MSP for Renfrewshire South opposed the division of Johnstone between constituencies and submitted an alternative suggestion.

Neil Bibby MSP for West Scotland (Region) supported the proposed Inverclyde constituency but opposed the division of Johnstone between constituencies.

Request for local inquiry received

Yes, from both East Renfrewshire Council and Renfrewshire Council.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

The Commission could consider combining this grouping with other neighbouring groupings such as: the Ayrshires; Scottish Borders, South Lanarkshire; and Argyll and Bute, East Dunbartonshire, North Lanarkshire and West Dunbartonshire Council areas. This may allow more flexibility with constituency design with a Renfrew–Ayrshire constituency and/ or a Glasgow–Dunbartonshire constituency and/ or a Glasgow–Lanarkshire constituency.

Boundaries Scotland

Entitlement to constituencies: Glasgow (7.7); East Renfrewshire (1.3); Renfrewshire (2.4); Inverclyde (1.0). Total 12.4.

All of the alternative suggestions are untested.

Fife Council Area

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission retained the overall number of existing constituencies as five. The Commission retained one existing constituency boundary but renamed it Fife North East (currently named North East Fife). The Commission amended the boundaries of the other four constituencies but retained their constituency names.

Press Coverage

There were no press articles or features in this area.

Number of responses

5

Main areas raised by respondents

- Opposition to the proposed Fife North East constituency name.
- Opposition to the proposed boundaries by Burntisland and Kirkcaldy.

Council/MSP response

None.

Request for local inquiry received

None.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

If the Commission believes there is strong opposition to the Provisional Proposals it could revert to the existing arrangements as all of the existing constituencies are within 10% of variation from the electoral quota.

Highland Council area

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission retained the overall number of existing constituencies as three. The proposals retained the existing Caithness, Sutherland and Ross constituency boundary but made changes to the existing Inverness and Nairn; and Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch constituency boundaries south of Inverness by Grantown-on-Spey and Strathdearn.

Number of responses

6

Press Coverage

- [Give the neglected Highlands another Holyrood seat \(thetimes.co.uk\)](http://www.thetimes.co.uk)
- [Give Highlands more parliamentary seats says Fergus Ewing | HeraldScotland](http://www.heraldscotland.com)

Main issues raised by respondents

- Concerns regarding the size of constituencies.
- Suggestion to add Black Isle to a Caithness, Sutherland and Ross constituency.
- Alternative boundary suggested at Strathspey.
- Suggestion for four Highland MSPs.

Council/MSP response

Highland Council opposed the proposed boundary in Strathspey and submitted an alternative suggestion.

Fergus Ewing MSP expressed a hope that the Commission could hold a local inquiry and argued for a rebalancing across Scotland to provide four Highland MSPs, on the basis of geography, with a consequent reduction somewhere else in the country.

Request for local inquiry received

Yes, Fergus Ewing MSP. The legislation states a local inquiry is only automatically required if an objection is received from a local authority or a body of 100 or more electors.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

There are no statutory area limits for Scottish Parliament constituencies. Highlands and Islands region is over-represented:

- Highlands and Islands region has 7 MSPs with an electorate of 359,316.
- Lothian region has 7 MSPs with an electorate of 617,420.

The Highland Council alternative suggestion follows a ward boundary and improves variation from the electorate quota but other suggestions are untested.

Perth and Kinross Council area

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission retained two constituencies but amended the constituency boundaries by Perth to follow ward boundaries.

Press Coverage

There were no press articles or features in this area.

Number of responses

None

Main issues raised by respondents

None

Council/MSP response

None.

Request for local inquiry received

None.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

NA

South Lanarkshire and Scottish Borders Council areas

Summary of Proposals

In this area the Commission proposed six new constituencies. There are currently seven constituencies in this grouping but part of the existing Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale constituency is in Midlothian Council area; and the existing Uddingston and Bellshill constituency is partly in North Lanarkshire Council area, therefore some changes to the existing constituency boundaries are inevitable.

Press Coverage

- [Warning over Borders parliamentary boundary change proposal | Border Telegraph](#)

Number of responses

50

Main issues raised by respondents

- No links between the Borders and South Lanarkshire.
- Wish to retain the existing boundaries.

Council/MSP response

Scottish Borders Council objected to the proposals because there are no community or transport links between the Borders and South Lanarkshire. They suggested an alternative constituency name.

South Lanarkshire Council did not respond to the consultation.

Request for local inquiry received

None but Scottish Borders Council objected to the proposals therefore the Commission will wish to consider whether it wishes to hold a local inquiry there.

Initial Secretariat thoughts

The Commission could consider combining this grouping with other neighbouring groupings such as; Edinburgh/ Lothians; Argyll and Bute, East Dunbartonshire, North Lanarkshire and West Dunbartonshire Council areas; or Dumfries and Galloway. This may allow constituencies to be designed more closely to the existing constituency boundaries but the entitlement to constituencies for South Lanarkshire is 4.3 and Scottish Borders at 1.6.

The current Dumfriesshire, Clydesdale and Tweeddale UK Parliament constituency includes parts of Scottish Borders, South Lanarkshire and Dumfries and Galloway Council areas so has some links between the Borders and South Lanarkshire.