

# **Third Statutory Review of Electoral Arrangements**

## **Dundee City Council Area**

**Report to the Secretary of State for Scotland**

**Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland**

Report Number E98008  
August 1998

## **Third Statutory Review of Electoral Arrangements Dundee City Council Area**

### **Introduction**

1. The Local Government etc. (Scotland) Act 1994 determined that on and after 1 April 1996, Scotland should be divided into local government areas as named and described in Schedule 1 to the Act and that, for each area, there should be a council consisting of a convener and councillors. It further determined that each council should have all the functions exercised immediately before 1 April in relation to their area by any existing regional, islands or district council.

2. On 1 April 1996 all local government areas existing immediately before that date which were regions and districts and all regional and district councils ceased to exist.

3. Schedule 2 of the Local Government etc. (Scotland) Act 1994 also established that every local government area (other than areas of the old islands councils) should be divided into such electoral wards as may be specified in a direction made by the Secretary of State after carrying out such consultations as he considered appropriate. Those wards were to apply for the purpose of any election of councilors held before 'the relevant year of election' (defined as meaning the first year of ordinary election of councillors for the area in question occurring after the making of an order constituting the new electoral wards of that local government area in consequence of the review currently being undertaken by the Commission). In accordance with procedures that applied prior to the reorganisation in 1975, the views of councils were invited. Thereafter, the Secretary of State determined that, for the purpose of any election of councillors before the relevant year of election, 36 electoral wards were appropriate for Dundee City local government area. Additionally, the proposed wards should be as described in the report of the Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland to the Secretary of State for Scotland on its second statutory review of electoral arrangements for the City of Dundee District dated 9 February 1994 subject to modifications to Wards 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 27, 29, 35 and 36 described in the schedule to the direction.

### **Origin and Commencement of the Review**

4. The Commission has a statutory duty under section 14 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 to undertake periodic reviews of local authority electoral arrangements. The Local Government etc. (Scotland) Act 1994 amended section 20 and schedule 5 of the 1973 Act, directing that:

as soon as practicable after 1 April 1996, the Boundary Commission shall-

review the electoral arrangements for all local government areas for the purpose of considering the future electoral arrangements for those areas; and

formulate proposals for those arrangements.

5. This, therefore, is one of the statutory reviews required in terms of section 16(2) and Schedule 5 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, as amended.

6. On 22 March 1996, the Scottish Office Development Department gave local authorities advance notice of the intention of the Commission to carry out a third statutory review of electoral arrangements. On 29 March 1996, we wrote to all councils to announce the commencement of the third statutory review of electoral arrangements and to explain the procedures to be followed. We also gave notice of the commencement of the review to all Community Councils, Electoral Registration Officers, Members of Parliament with a constituency interest and the Scottish headquarters of the political parties. In addition, public notice of the commencement of the review, which included an invitation to interested parties to apply to us for a copy of our consultation letter to councils, was given in newspapers.

## **Background**

7. During the passage through Parliament of the 1994 Act, there was cross-Party understanding that we would review the number of councillors and boundaries of electoral wards for each council in time for changes to be implemented for the 1999 local elections. This was seen to be important because at the time of reorganisation, as mentioned above, the Secretary of State defined the electoral wards for the new councils and to a great extent based these on existing district wards. It was, however, recognised that using the existing district wards led to some councils being significantly over-represented in relation to other areas. Further, it also led to councillors within the same local authority areas representing wards with significantly different numbers of electors. Accordingly, our review was seen as important to ensure equity in representation across and within all local authorities. Further, the new authorities were now responsible for the provision of the full range of all services and, accordingly, consideration had to be given to determining an appropriate number of councillors for service provision to be effectively managed.

8. This review is, therefore, the first conducted by us which sets out to determine the appropriate number of councillors required for councils to operate efficiently and to establish the boundaries of electoral wards. To achieve both objectives our review was conducted in 2 main stages:

identification of a suitable methodology for determining numbers of councillors which, applied across all local authority areas, would be seen to be equitable and consistent; and

the division of each local authority area into the appropriate number of electoral wards in accordance with the statutory rules.

9. A copy of the statutory rules to be employed by us and the Secretary of State in considering proposals for electoral arrangements is provided at Appendix A.

## **Number of Councillors**

10. In formulating proposals for the number of councillors we have been guided by two main principles:

effective management of councils; and

equity amongst electors.

11. We recognised that the number of councillors is crucial because there is, undoubtedly, some number below which it would be impossible for a council to discharge its duty to deliver services to its population and, conversely, there is also some number above which a council becomes unwieldy and cumbersome. We were influenced in this respect by the prior considerations of two other bodies.

12. The Royal Commission on Local Government In Scotland 1966-69, under the Chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. Lord Wheatley, provided a basis by which the number of regional councillors and the size of constituency to be represented might be determined by taking into account the fact that population density varies widely in Scotland as a whole and within regions. The then accepted view was that council size should not generally exceed 75 members. In England and Wales the Redcliffe-Maude Commission, which reported to Parliament in 1969, also drew attention to the management problems of large councils and endorsed the recommendation of The Committee on the Management of Local Government that a maximum number of 75 councillors should be set.

13. After careful consideration we concluded that, in the Scottish context and to provide additional flexibility, an upper limit of 80 councillors should be set. We also concluded that a minimum number of councillors should be set, recognising that even the smallest local government areas are now responsible for a wide range of functions. Accordingly, we decided that the minimum number of councillors should be 18. Further, these limits should apply to all councils.

14. Regarding equity as between voters, we considered that ideally each elector's vote should possess the same weight and significance in local government elections throughout the country; furthermore, ideally, there should be similar mutual accessibility between electors and councillors. However, since Scotland is a country of great diversity, both geographically, and demographically, a fact reflected in the areas for which councils created by the Act of 1994 are responsible, and since we are satisfied that, in the interests of good local government, the number

of councillors in any council must fall within certain limits, we concluded that these ideals are unattainable in practice. In this situation, recognising that a fair degree of homogeneity exists within certain groups of councils, which exhibit broadly similar geographic and demographic characteristics, we resolved to strive for equity in the senses mentioned within these groups, so far as that is possible within the constraints of the legislation under which we operate.

15. We, therefore, proposed a methodology which initially categorised council areas by density and distribution of population using data available from the 1991 Census of Population. Having classified council areas according to these criteria and adjusted the ratio of electors to each councillor to take account of similar characteristics, we have been able to achieve a broad equity of electorate across and within all council areas.

16. In our letter of 29 March 1996, all councils were informed of the proposed methodology and future pattern of representation for their council area. Councils were requested to make any representations they wished on numbers of councillors by 29 April 1996 so that a meeting could be arranged with the Deputy Chairman and Secretary to discuss the pattern of representation and any matters regarding our review that the Council wished to raise. Following visits to all councils by the Deputy Chairman and Secretary to discuss the proposed methodology and to consider alternatives which could be applied across Scotland, no alternative methodologies were offered but a number of councils suggested that the underlying classification should be amended to include an additional category.

17. At our meeting of 17 June 1996, we re-examined the criteria to be used to categorise mainland councils with similar characteristics in light of the representations made by a number of councils. We concluded that there should be 6 rather than 5 categories. The final categorisation of similar mainland councils was then agreed as follows:

- Category 1 Large Cities Glasgow and Edinburgh
- Category 2 Cities Aberdeen and Dundee.
- Category 3 Authorities with less than 60% of the population living outwith settlements of 10,000 or more persons AND an overall population density of one person or more per hectare.
- Category 4 Authorities with EITHER 60% or more of the population living outwith settlements of 10,000 or more persons OR an overall population density of less than one person per hectare.
- Category 5 Authorities with 60% or more of the population living outwith settlements of 10,000 or more persons AND an overall population density of less than one person per hectare.

- Category 6 Authorities with 60% or more of the population living outwith settlements of 10,000 or more persons AND an overall population density of less than 0.2 persons per hectare.

18. In addition to the 6 categories we then determined the ratio of councillors to electorate for mainland councils that would allow for efficient management and appropriate representation, as set out in paragraphs 11 - 14 above, and considered that the following would be appropriate:

• Category 1	1:6,000
• Category 2	1:4,000
• Category 3	1:3,500
• Category 4	1:3,000
• Category 5	1:2,500
• Category 6	1:2,000

19. On 20 June 1996 we wrote to all mainland councils informing them of the revised criteria for determining councilor numbers and inviting them to prepare a draft scheme of electoral arrangements for their Council area. Following upon that, Aberdeen City Council brought a petition for Judicial Review of the decision taken by us at our meeting of 17 June, 1996 in the Court of Session. In it they sought a decree of declarator that that decision in relation to them was unlawful, ultra vires and null and void; they also sought a decree of reduction of the decision in relation to them and certain ancillary remedies. We resisted this petition, which was dismissed by the Court on 20 December 1996 after a hearing.

20. We considered the ratio of councillors to electors for the 3 islands councils at our meeting of 26 August 1996 and concluded that the appropriate ratio would be 1:750. On 28 August 1996 we wrote to these councils informing them of our decision.

21. On 2 July 1996 Dundee City Council wrote to express its disappointment that representations made at a meeting with the Commission's Deputy Chairman and Secretary on 1 May 1996 which were included in the report unanimously agreed by the Council on 7 May had failed to alter the outline proposals for 29 Councillors made by us in our letter of 29 March 1996. The Council continued to question the underlying rationale by which we had arrived at a figure of 1:4,000 electors for the revised number of Councillors proposed for Dundee. Council members were unanimous in the view that a representation of 1:3,500 would be far more realistic. It suggested that the number of bands in our proposals seemed inadequate and that to compare Dundee City, with its significantly smaller population, and Aberdeen City was inappropriate. The Council suggested a band for a medium City (Aberdeen) and a small City (Dundee) with ratios of councillors to electorate of 1:4,000 and 1:3,500 respectively, which it considered perfectly reasonable and logical. We were formally asked to review our recommendations on Council size.

22. Nevertheless, the Council instructed its officers to prepare a draft scheme of electoral representation which provided for 29 wards. However, the Council did not believe that, given the

guidelines regarding fixing of boundaries and community ties, it could do other than start the exercise with a blank sheet of paper, with the result that consultations with the public were likely to take longer. It was, therefore, likely that the Council would not be in a position to provide a draft scheme until 31 May 1997 and, even then, that date might not be attainable.

23. We wrote to the Council on 12 July, saying that we had carefully considered the comments and representations received on the matter of councillor numbers, that we remained of the view that our proposals were fair and equitable and that further consideration of the issue on the lines suggested by the Council was not appropriate. On 1 August 1996, we were informed by the Council that our proposals were unreasonable and unfair and that it intended to appoint Counsel with a view to requesting a Judicial Review.

24. On 20 December 1996, Dundee City Council brought a petition for Judicial Review, of the decision taken by us at our meeting of 17 June 1996, in the Court of Session. In it they sought a decree of declarator that that decision in relation to them was unlawful, ultra vires and null and void. The Council also sought a decree of reduction of the decision in relation to them and certain ancillary remedies. We undertook to take no further action on our letter of 20 June 1996, referred to in the petition, until 20 January 1997. On 15 January 1997, we were informed that the Council had withdrawn its petition.

## **Dundee City Council's Proposals**

25. The Council provided details of its draft scheme of electoral arrangements for 29 wards on 5 February 1997. The Council advertised the scheme in local newspapers on 7 February 1997. Interested parties were invited to view proposals at numerous locations throughout the City. The Council asked that representations on the proposals should be made directly to us.

26. Eleven representations were received.

27. Broughty Ferry Community Council observed that Broughty Ferry was an area of growth and was concerned that it had two of the largest wards - comprising 4,538 and 4,381 electors - in the Council area, compared with wards elsewhere which had barely 3,300 electors. The Community Council thought also that the draft proposals breached natural boundaries by, for example, including part of Whitfield with Balgillo. Further planning permission already existed for the construction of over 500 homes, therefore the proposals for revised boundaries were unnecessary. It was also felt that the name of Ward 17 (Dawson) did not describe a locality and the ward might be better named 'West Ferry'. Further correspondence from the Community Council enclosed maps of the changes proposed and suggested that the Council's proposals for the Whitfield Ward, which removed owner-occupied housing, was 'naked gerrymandering'.

28. Fintry Community Council had no objections to the boundaries of Wards 9 and 11 but considered that Ward 11 should be renamed 'Fintry'.

29. Hilltown and District Community Council noted that, when the new wards came into effect, it would have three councillors to deal with rather than two but offered no other comment.

30. Dundee City Council Conservative Group wrote to say that if one of the priorities in producing boundaries was the retention of existing communities then this had not been achieved. It was stated that the Deputy Leader of the Administration had admitted to performing only a number crunching exercise, not having had enough time to do a proper job. As a result no heed had been taken of Community Council boundaries, school catchment areas, postal boundaries or existing and previous electoral boundaries. The Group had reservations about a number of boundaries but quoted two examples of why it thought the Council's proposals were unacceptable.

31. The Council's proposals put part of the current Whitfield Ward into the current Balgillo Ward which was considered ridiculous because Whitfield had nothing in common with Balgillo and was very distant from the bulk of housing in the recognised area of Balgillo. Further, regardless of how property developers may choose to name an area for marketing purposes, the new housing development was in an area which had always been known as Whitfield. Draft proposals for Community Councils included that part of Whitfield contained in the Balgillo Ward in the Whitfield Community Council area. It was contended that, if the Council had thought it was not part of the Whitfield area, it would have included it in the Broughty Ferry Community Council area. It was further suggested that cynics might say that the Administration made the proposal for political gain because the current Wards 29 and 35 are represented by SNP and Conservative Councillors, although voting trends indicated that the proposed Whitfield Ward would elect a Labour Councillor. The Group asked that we remove Whitfield from Balgillo.

32. The Council's proposals also meant that Craigie would be associated with Craigiebank Housing Estate, which had nothing in common with Craigie but everything in common with Taybank. Craigie is currently in the Douglas Ward, the housing in Craigie and Douglas are identical and it is impossible to tell where Craigie begins and Douglas stops. Further, the population of Craigie is mixed whereas that of Craigiebank and Taybank is predominantly elderly. Although Craigie falls within the Craigiebank and District Community Council area, this has been in the past a cause of great conflict in the past because of the differing social needs of the two areas. The Group asked that Craigiebank and Taybank be included in the same ward. It was also suggested that the name of Ward 17 (Dawson) should be changed to 'West Ferry'.

33. The Group further wrote to provide maps which clearly set out the changes it proposed but was unable to provide counts of electors at 1996 or 2001.

34. Dundee East Conservative and Unionist Association wrote to object to the Council's proposals because they made no attempt to reflect existing communities. Further, it was concerned that Ballumbie had been included with Balgillo because the two areas had nothing in common and that no heed had been taken of 450 houses which had recently been given planning consent. It was also noted that the proposed Whitfield Ward had a very low electorate compared with some other proposed wards and it would be more realistic if Ballumbie was left as part of Whitfield. The Association also asked to rename Ward 17 (Dawson), 'West Ferry'.

35. A letter was received, in respect of Wards 25,28 and 29, which expressed alarm at the splitting of recognised long-standing communities. For example, the boundary between Wards 28 and 29 separated housing in Barnes Avenue from the remainder of Woodside but the entire area was within Stobswell Community Council area and had always been preserved as one ward by the Commission. The correspondent proposed revised boundaries which were thought to meet the requirements of electoral parity and preserve the community that constituted the former Clepington Electoral Division. Alterations were also suggested to the boundaries of Ward 25 and it was thought that the name 'Maryfield' or 'Baxter Park' was more appropriate.

36. A letter suggested that the boundaries of the Logic Ward were unrealistic and that retaining the name was taking away from the area known as Logie in Dundee. It suggested a rethink of the boundaries, perhaps taking in Hawkhill and Perth Road.

37. A letter suggesting a revised boundary for the Logic Ward at Hawkhill/Perth Road was received.

38. A letter considered that the inclusion of an area south of Hawkhill in the Logic Ward was a serious anomaly. The ward should stop at Hawkhill and the residual area should be included in one of the neighbouring wards. There were substantial housing developments in the Blackness area and it was thought that there should be some way of balancing the removal of the area south of Hawkhill from the Logic Ward. It was also suggested that the ward name be changed to 'Logie/Blackness'.

39. A letter was received which suggested substantial changes to the Council's proposals for Wards 3 and 4, 4 and 20, 10 and 11, 10 and 15, 14, 15 and 16, and 9, 24, 26 and 27, based on an analysis of historical ties, community association, similarity of housing stock/tenure and parliamentary constituency boundaries. A number of changes were also proposed to ward names: 'Bowbridge' should become 'Coldside', 'Dawson' should become 'West Ferry' and 'Craigie' should become 'Craigiebank'. (Early in the review process, before the Council's draft proposals were submitted, we received, for our consideration, an alternative scheme for the whole of the Council area from the same correspondent.) Further correspondence suggested that the Council had drawn boundaries for political gain. It drew attention to Ward 10 (Whitfield), Ward 18 (Craigie), Ward 19 (Strathmartine) and Ward 28 (Stobswell). It was accepted that boundary changes by nature have a political impact and are open to calls of gerrymandering but all the changes in Dundee City Council's scheme appeared to be beneficial to the Administration and the correspondent requested that the Council's proposals be rectified to remove perceived discrepancies.

40. A letter objected to the inclusion of part of Whitfield in Broughty Ferry, which was over a mile away, because the proposal had no basis in geographic or historical links. The remainder of Whitfield was a few hundred yards away from the housing in question. Our attention was drawn also to the proposals to include an area in what was said to be the former Rockwell/Fairmuir Regional Division because there was no obvious historical link. It asked that

we look closely at alternative proposals which it believed had attempted to maintain community ties and traditional ward boundaries.

41. To assess the likely impact of modifying the Council's proposals and take account of the representation received which offered alternative boundaries, we asked the Council to provide counts of electorate. However, it should be noted that we recognised that many of the suggestions for change were not tightly defined and, in some instances, there was considerable ambiguity. It is, however, worth noting that in the areas of concern our initial analysis of the Council's proposals had led us to conclude that the boundaries in a number of areas mentioned needed close examination. Officers of the Commission, therefore, met with Council officials to discuss a number of the issues raised.

42. In considering the representations received in respect of Brought Ferry and West Ferry which involved Wards 10, 14, 15, and 17, we concluded that the counterproposals and representations, which we refer to above, were not acceptable because of the adverse effect on electoral parity according to the data provided by the Council. Similarly, we were unable to accept the alternative proposals for Wards 25, 28 and 29. We were unable also to accept the alternative scheme for the Council area because the Council's draft proposals produced better electoral parity overall. We accepted the alternative proposals for the Logic Ward, subject to further adjustments which we believed produced better boundaries and parity. However, we were not able to accept the proposals to change the name of Ward 22 to Logic/Blackness.

43. We wrote to the Council and asked for details of the methodology used to produce the forecasts of electorate at 2001 in wards where we were concerned by the magnitude of change. Following a response from the Council, officers of the Commission discussed aspects of the methodology with Council officials. Thereafter, data provided to the Commission were further reviewed by Council officials. Council officials were also asked to provide details of assumptions made regarding proposed demolition across the Council area because it was evident that, whilst new housing provision had been incorporated into the Council's methodology, no realistic account seemed to have been taken of demolition. Indeed, we noted that the Council had assumed in its calculations substantial new house build, equivalent to the five years up to 1996, but had made no similar allowance for demolition - only housing identified for demolition by the end of 19% was included in the Council's forecasts. We further noted that the net new housing gain in the 5 years to 1996 was less than 100 houses but the assumptions made in forecasting electorate for this review assumed a net new build of approximately 1,700 houses. In further explaining its methodology, the Council was of the view that substantial demolition was likely but determining where this may take place was not straightforward. The Council further believed that, even if decisions on future development were imminent, its scale would mean that incorporating it into ward boundary calculations would effectively require the review to be started afresh.

44. We noted the Council's statement on the methodology applied to forecast electorate at 2001. Clearly, however, the Council considered that it could not provide additional data in respect of the possible housing demolition between 1997 and 2001 at ward level. We were concerned that a substantial programme of demolition could have a significant effect on electoral parity should it

prove to be concentrated in only a few localities. However, in the absence of any other source of data regarding likely housing demolition, we reluctantly agreed to proceed with the review of electoral arrangements on the basis of the electorate forecasts prepared by the Council. We further agreed that statistics arising from revised electoral arrangements in the Council area should be carefully monitored and, if significant deviation from electoral parity is observed, then an interim review of electoral arrangements for the Council area may be considered necessary before the next cyclical review within the statutory timetable.

45. We made a number of minor amendments to the boundaries of Wards 1 - 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14- 17, 19,20 and 27 which reduced the divergence from parity obtained in the Council's draft scheme.

### **Publication of Commission's Provisional Proposals**

46. Public notice was given of the publication of our provisional proposals on 12 February 1998. Dundee City Council was asked to make copies of the electoral ward boundary descriptions, electoral statistics and illustrative maps available for inspection at its offices. Additionally, copies of our proposals were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had expressed an interest. We asked that any comments should be made to us by 12 March 1998.

### **Consideration of Representations**

47. Twenty one representations were received:

- **The Council** asked that we adopt its original proposals for Wards 11, 12, 19, 20 and 27 and requested that the names of Wards 18, 20, 21,25 and 29 be altered to 'Craigiebank', 'Balfield', 'Tay Bridges', 'Baxter Park' and 'Fairmuir' respectively. We concluded that our provisional proposals should not be altered for Wards 11, 12, 19,20 and 27. We agreed to the changes in names proposed for Wards 18, 20,21,25 and 29.
- **Councillor R Presswood** wrote to express his strong concern about our proposals for Ward 20 in that the east side of Glenprosen Terrace and the north side of Glenmoy Avenue had been removed from the existing ward. Whilst Councillor Presswood was aware that parity was a consideration, he felt that strong community identities had been ignored.
- Thirty eight residents of Glenmoy Avenue (north side) and Glenprosen Terrace signed a petition objecting to our proposals for The Glens scheme.

Having asked the Council to provide electorate data which would enable us to assess the likely outcome of the changes requested, we were unable to adopt the amendments because of their adverse impact on electoral parity.

- **Stobswell and District Community Council** expressed disappointment and frustration that we had been unable to accept any of the points it had raised earlier with regard to Dundee City Council's draft proposals. The Community Council stated that our proposals which split Barnes Avenue and the boundary of Wards 28 and 29 at Graham Street and Cardross Street had never before been suggested by the Commission. Also, Ward 25 should be renamed 'Baxter Park' and the boundary should be realigned at Morgan Street and Arbroath Road.
- A letter was received which claimed that our boundaries for Wards 28 and 29 divided long-standing communities and that the proposals may confuse voters by splitting Barnes Avenue from Woodside. We were asked to reconsider. It was also thought that, whilst the boundaries for Ward 25 were commendable, changes should be made to improve the line at Morgan Street and Arbroath Road in order to make the line more easily identifiable. Further, Ward 25 should be named 'Baxter Park' rather than 'Cleington East'.

We consulted the Council and were informed that amendments necessary to meet both representations in respect of boundaries would significantly alter the divergence from parity in Wards 28 and 29 from -1% and -3% to 17% and 23% respectively. Compensating changes could be made but, if accepted, the divergence from parity at 2001 for the respective wards would be 6% and -10%. Figures provided by the Council also indicated that the proposed change to Ward 25 would result in a parity figure of -16% compared with -1% in our provisional proposals and we were, therefore, not prepared to accept the amendment. We noted that the Council agreed that Ward 25 should be named 'Baxter Park'.

- **Broughty Ferry Community Council** wrote to say that the forecast increase in electorate in Ward 15 ignored the fact that planning permission had been granted for 450 new houses and, therefore, there was no need to include houses in Whitfield North Ward which, being a different postcode and separated by over a mile of countryside, has no affinity with Broughty Ferry. The Community Council further considered that Broughty Ferry had the largest wards in the City, that the needs of the area were being ignored and as the area is expanding it was now seriously under-represented. It thought also that the ward name should be 'West Ferry' and not 'Dawson' as we proposed.
- Fourteen letters were received which made representations relating to the Broughty Ferry, Whitfield and Balgillo areas. Generally, concerns arose from proposals to include part of Whitfield in a ward with Balgillo which many considered breached natural community boundaries. Correspondents mentioned that the areas were in different Community Council areas, church parishes, postal

districts and, because they had had distinct identities for many years, it would be more appropriate that they remained in separate wards.

There were concerns about the high number of electors in wards in the Broughty Ferry area. Further, it was claimed that the Council, in preparing its draft scheme, had not included substantial housing developments which were in progress, and that this would further exacerbate the already large divergences from parity, it was suggested that if proper account was taken of these housing developments there would be no need for the boundary changes. It was also claimed that parts of Whitfield were being named Broughty Ferry in order to allow builders to sell houses more easily.

A number of representations proposed changes to the boundaries of Wards 14-18 and maps showing proposals for alternative boundaries were received. To compensate for the revisions to Wards 14 - 18, consequential changes were proposed to other wards. There were suggestions that our proposals had ignored community ties in Wards 28 and 29 by dividing natural communities and boundary changes which were thought to maintain good electoral parity were offered.

A number of correspondents also claimed that the proposed boundary changes were simply unnecessary, had been clearly drawn by Dundee City Council in the interests of the Labour Party and did not allow for fair representation within Dundee City. It was suggested that, because people in the area tended to elect Conservative Councillors, our proposals interfered with fair representation in a traditionally Conservative area.

Many correspondents requested that the ward name 'Dawson' should be changed to 'West Ferry' which more appropriately described that community. Concern was also expressed that the name 'Cleington East' did not properly reflect the area covered by Ward 25.

We mention earlier in our report that we have some concerns regarding a number of the ward level forecasts of electorate at 2001 prepared by the Council, largely because of an under-assessment of the impact of housing demolition. With regard to the representations above concerning the building of between 200 and 450 houses at Balgillo Park, when we consulted the Council regarding its forecasts of electorate at 2001, the information provided to us indicated that a substantial volume of new housing was included in the area. The figures made clear reference to the major greenfield site at Balgillo which many representations claimed had not been included in the Council's forecasts. Having consulted the Council we were content that, apart from our concerns in a number of areas regarding demolition, the forecasts were made using data for the Council area as a whole which was available at that time. Further, whilst planning permission for new housing had been granted, some assessment was made of the expected volume of

completed new build and likely occupancy rates at 2001. In forecasting electorate the Council also took account of other demographic factors which, for example, indicated that, although the number of houses in the council area would increase, the number of electors would decrease.

We noted that one representation proposed considerable amendments to the provisional proposals in the areas covered by Wards 14- 17. It was suggested that compensating changes could be made elsewhere across the Council area which would accommodate the effect of these amendments. We plotted the proposed changes and noted that significant alterations would need to be made to wards across the full Council area if electoral parity was to be reasonably maintained. We further believed that making such radical alternations across the Council area would undoubtedly lead to controversy in areas where there had been little or no reaction to either the Council's draft proposals or our provisional proposals.

Having considered the representations which we received, examined the base data used by the Council in preparing its forecasts of electorate and assessed the impact of any which would be required to meet these representations, we were not prepared to make changes to the boundaries set out in our provisional proposals. We noted, however, that the Council agreed that the name 'West Ferry' should replace 'Dawson'.

A letter suggested that Wards 4 and 20 be named Lochee West and Lochee East. Ward 20 (Glens) was clearly known as Lochee East by residents and the change of name would maintain community identity. Our general policy on the naming of wards is that this should be a matter for the Council. We consulted the Council which did not support the proposal and we were, therefore, not prepared to accept the change.

## **Final Recommendation**

48. Having conducted the third statutory review of electoral arrangements for Dundee City Council area in accordance with the procedures described above, we recommend that future electoral arrangements for the said Council should provide for a Council of 29 members.

49. The designation of the electoral wards that we recommend for Dundee City Council, together with information which we have received from the Council as to the 1996 electorate and forecast 2001 electorate of the proposed wards are set out at Appendix B to this report.

50. The boundaries of the proposed electoral wards are described in Appendix C and the following illustrative maps accompany this report:

<b>Map</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Scale</b>
A	Dundee City Council Area	1:10,000
B	Dundee City Council Area	1:10,000

## Appendix B

### Dundee City Council Area Proposed Electoral Wards

<b>Electorate Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>1996 (Actual)</b>	<b>2001 (Estimated)</b>
<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>d</b>
1	Ninewells	3,956	3,753
2	Camperdown	4,386	4,123
3	Balgay	4,149	3,990
4	Lochee	4,200	3,986
5	Riverside	3,958	3,859
6	Brackens	3,855	4,000
7	Ardler	3,747	3,866
8	Balgowan	4,096	3,941
9	Claverhouse	3,662	4,031
10	Whitfield	3,341	3,790
11	Longhaugh	4,463	4,072
12	Pitkerro	4,094	3,924
13	Douglas	4,390	4,131
14	Barnhill	4,245	4,116
15	Balgillo	3,912	4,040
16	Broughty Ferry	4,214	4,044
17	West Ferry	4,383	4,185
18	Craigiebank	3,911	3,789
19	Strathmartine	3,921	3,786
20	Balfield	4,143	4,053
21	Tay Bridges	4,144	4,150
22	Logie	3,624	3,716
23	Law	3,826	3,902
24	East Port	3,704	3,922
25	Baxter Park	4,052	3,907
26	Hilltown	4,006	3,916
27	Bowbridge	3,708	3,777
28	Stobswell	3,928	3,894
29	Fairmuir	4,020	3,847
Total		116,038	114,510