

# **Third Statutory Review of Electoral Arrangements**

## **Glasgow City Council Area**

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

**Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland**

Report Number E98018  
August 1998

# **Third Statutory Review of Electoral Arrangements Glasgow 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 councillors 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, 83 electoral wards were appropriate for Glasgow 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 City of Glasgow District, District Wards 1 -78 and 82 - 84, Electoral Ward 82 (Polling Districts RUO1 and RUO2) and Electoral Ward 83 (Polling District CC23).

## **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 SO 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 councilors 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 councilors 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 councillor 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.

## **Glasgow City Council's Proposals**

21. On 16 August 1996 Glasgow City Council informed us that the level of representation we proposed for the Council had been considered by the Council's General Purposes Committee at its meeting on 30 July 1996, that representations were being made to the Secretary of State and, as a consequence, the Council would not be in a position to participate in the review in the proposed timescale. We noted that, following our letter of 29 March 1996, the Council had responded to say that it considered that our proposed review of ward boundaries within Glasgow was both unnecessary and inappropriate.

22. Officers of the Commission had regular contact with the Council regarding its position vis-a-vis the preparation of draft proposals for revised electoral arrangements and on 17 January 1997 the Council informed us that it had not yet formally agreed to participate in the review and asked that we provide a revised timetable. Our Secretary wrote to the Council on 20 January

1997 setting out an overview of our timetable for completing the review, asked that the Council give an early indication of when draft proposals would be available and offered to meet Council officials to discuss a way forward. The Council responded to our Secretary saying that the matter would be discussed further within the Council and we would be informed of the outcome. On 12 February, Council officials informed our Secretariat by telephone that the Council had agreed to produce draft proposals but that it would not be in a position to submit a scheme of electoral representation by early May 1997.

23. Council officials informed our Secretariat that a draft scheme of electoral arrangements would be debated by the Council's General Purposes Committee on 10 June. Thereafter there would be an internal consultation exercise. On 4 June our Secretariat wrote to the Council to say that we were disappointed to learn that it was unlikely that the Council would provide a draft scheme of electoral arrangements until after 5 August 1997 and asked that the position be reviewed. The Council responded saying that the exercise had been complex, was controversial and that the Council had made further representations to the Secretary of State for Scotland about the need for a review at this time.

24. Our Secretariat was informed by telephone on 31 July that Council officials hoped that a meeting could be arranged during mid August to give further consideration to its draft proposals. At our meeting on 4 August 1997 we reviewed progress on the review and directed our Secretary to inform the Council that, if its draft proposals were not made available to us for consideration by 1 September, we would proceed to publish provisional proposals for the Council area.

25. The Council submitted a scheme of electoral arrangements for 79 wards on 29 August 1997, made arrangements for all Community Councils within the City to be consulted through the Community Council's Resource Centre and published details of its proposals in local newspapers asking that representations be made to both the Council and Commission.

26. As a result of the public consultation, Knightswood North/Templar Community Council wrote to say that the present boundaries for Anniesland were satisfactory and should not be altered. It considered that the proposal to include an area to the east would be inappropriate as it seemed to be proposed only as a way of compensating for a loss of population arising from a change in boundaries to the west. It asked if the proposals took into account population increases at new build sites.

27. The Council wrote to us on 12 September to provide some additional information and asked that we consider minor amendments to the boundaries of Wards 69, 70 and 74. The Council further wrote on 21 November to ask that we note the electorate involved in the amendments to Wards 69, 70 and 74, and a proposal to rename Ward 35 (Dalmarnock) 'Bridgeton/Dalmarnock'. We were also asked to disregard the representation from Knightswood North/Templar Community Council which could not be accommodated without adversely affecting electoral parity.

28. We considered the various amendments to the draft scheme and agreed to adopt the changes proposed by the Council.

## Publication of Commission's Provisional Proposals

29. Public notice was given of the publication of our provisional proposals on 24 March 1998. Glasgow 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 21 April 1998.

## Consideration of Representations

30. Twelve representations were received:

- **Knightswood North/Templar Community Council** wrote to reiterate the points made in its comments on the Council's draft proposals and to comment on our provisional proposals. The Community Council was concerned that boundary changes made before the previous local government elections were still causing confusion amongst the electorate in connection with voting locations and the identification of ward boundaries. It was felt that another change would be badly received and would lead to yet more confusion. Alternative boundary descriptions for Ward 3 and Ward 7 were offered for our consideration. We considered the Community Council's proposals and, because there was no adverse impact on electoral parity, we agreed to implement the suggested amendment to the boundary between Ward 3 and Ward 7.
- **Pollok Community Council** supported our provisional proposals. We noted the support.
- **Barlanark/Easthall/Wellhouse Neighbourhood Forum** wrote to point out, with regard to the Wellhouse Ward, that there was an increase in house refurbishment and plans to build new houses which it considered would take the population above the minimum level. Further, we were asked to note the work of the Wellhouse Development Plan and asked that we attend a public meeting regarding these issues as part of our consultation process. Ten proforma letters issued under the Barlanark/Easthall/Wellhouse Neighbourhood Forum were received. The importance of retaining the Wellhouse Ward, which the correspondents considered had produced increased social cohesion, was stressed.

No alternative proposal was offered by the Neighbourhood Forum or others. We carefully considered whether it would be possible and practicable to amend our proposals in this area but concluded that no change, which would be acceptable to

the group, could be effected without considerable revision of adjoining wards which would be likely to prove controversial. Accordingly, we decided not to amend our provisional proposals.

- **Wellhouse Housing Co-operative** stated that the new ward boundary cut through the Wellhouse neighbourhood which meant that the Housing Co-operative residents would have two local councillors which was clearly an unsatisfactory position. It proposed that the ward boundary be redrawn in such a way as to ensure that the Wellhouse Neighbourhood, which was designed as one entity, was contained either within the Queenslie Ward or the Barlanark Ward (the latter being the favoured option as it is the residential area to which Wellhouse relates).

We considered the proposal to wholly locate the housing concerned in either the Queenslie Ward or the Barlanark Ward but electorate data provided by the Council indicated that both proposals would result in significant deviation from electoral parity. In our proposals parity in the wards concerned is -4% and -1% respectively. Adopting either of the proposed changes resulted in parity of -17% and 13% or 8% and 12% respectively. Accordingly, we were not prepared to amend our provisional proposals.

- **Deaconsbank Residents Association** were concerned to find that Darnley Community Council had not informed them of our proposals. The Association did not believe that they had much in common with the new ward and believed that this was highlighted by the failure of the Community Council to alert it to the changes. The Association gave notice of its intention to appeal to the Boundaries Commission for relocation from Glasgow into East Renfrewshire. We noted that the Association considered that it had little in common with the other communities in Ward 62 but, because of the community's location, concluded that alternative electoral arrangements were not possible. We noted also the intention to request an administrative review of local authority boundaries in the area.
- **Councillor E Fitzgerald JP** asked that we reconsider our proposals for Ward 12. It was considered that Broomhill Ward was a hybrid, divided physically and socially by a massive railway embankment, and that an elected member could not represent two geographical areas divided by the railway line. The name 'Broomhill' would cause great confusion as it did not relate to residents east of the railway line and the name 'Hayburn' would be more appropriate.

We considered whether or not it would be possible or practicable to revise boundaries in the area in order to address this representation but a detailed examination determined that there was no acceptable alternative which would not involve very substantial amendments to surrounding wards and we were, therefore, not prepared to revise the boundaries in our provisional proposals. However, the Council agreed that 'Hayburn' would be a more appropriate name and we agreed to the change in designation.

- **Councillor W O'Rourke JP** wrote to say that he had seen our proposals for the existing Ward 64. He intimated that he had been informed that previous proposals for the area in question had been refused by us because of one odd egg-timer shaped ward and was astounded at what we now proposed. In particular he referred to the dissection of the Househillwood housing scheme at Peat Road which had obviously been used as a boundary line. He considered that this was going against tradition as originally the Barrhead Road and Nitshill railway line were considered the natural boundaries. As a consequence, he wished to protest in the strongest manner.

We noted the protest made by Councillor O'Rourke but were not able to identify an alternative which would not have a significant impact on the boundaries and electorate of adjoining wards.

- **Mohammad Sarwar MP** was greatly concerned that Drumoyne Community Council had been omitted from the consultation. A further letter from the MP enclosed correspondence from the Chief Executive of Pollokshaws Community Forum which stressed that the Forum was dismayed at the decision to separate the Wellmeadows area from the rest of Pollokshaws. It was thought that the local community focused on amenities and services and that Newlands Ward had no connection with the people of Wellmeadows. Mr Sarwar supported the view expressed.

We noted that Drumoyne Community Council was not included in the list of Community Councils provided to us by Glasgow City Council and rectified the anomaly.

We noted the support for Pollokshaws Community Forum. However, service provision and the determination of polling places within a Council area are not for our consideration. We asked the Council to provide electorate data which would enable us to assess whether our provisional proposals could be amended to associate Wellmeadows with Ward 71. However, the data provided indicated that there would be a significant increase in the deviation from electoral party in the wards concerned from 3% and 4% respectively in our proposals to 15% and -8% if the changes were effected. The Council pointed out also that the boundaries we proposed for Ward 71 and Ward 72 were those presently in place. Accordingly, we were not prepared to amend our provisional proposals.

- **Pollok Constituency Labour Party** wrote to say that it was unhappy about the proposed boundary of Ward 57 as it affected a number of addresses in Bullwood Drive and Bullwood Gardens and divided an existing community. It suggested that the boundary of Ward 59 be extended to include the addresses in question with their neighbours, which would mean that they used the same polling station. It was also concerned that there will shortly be a review of Parliamentary

constituency boundaries and, whilst it was recognised that there was a need to address changes in the population, there was concern that a stable population could be disadvantaged by premature action on boundaries changes. The organisation was concerned also that changes in boundaries would see some of Ward 62 being absorbed by East Renfrewshire Council area which would be detrimental to the tax base for Glasgow.

We were informed by the Council that reference to Ordnance Survey Landline large digital map data indicated that all the addresses in the streets mentioned lay within Ward 59. We were aware that the Boundary Commission for Scotland will be likely to conduct a review of parliamentary constituency boundaries in the near future but noted that our statutory duty is to determine boundaries for local government electoral arrangements. Parliamentary boundaries are, therefore, not for our consideration. We noted the concerns vis-a-vis Ward 62 and observed that administrative boundaries of Council areas are not a subject of this review.

- **The Scottish National Party Govan Constituency Association** expressed concern at the proposals as they applied to the Govan Constituency. It queried the accuracy of the forecast electorate and considered that ward boundaries should not cross constituency boundaries. It stated that, in May 1999, elections would be held on the same day for both the Council and the Scottish Parliament and believed that, if there were no suitable polling stations, which seemed to be the case, then our proposals would result in electors in some areas voting in different polling stations for local government and parliamentary elections, other electors from two different constituencies voting at the same polling place, or electors for two different wards voting at the same polling place. It proposed that if the number of electoral wards in Glasgow were to be reduced then the four largest constituencies should have 9 wards and the five smallest constituencies 8 wards.

We asked the Council to comment on the accuracy of the forecast electorate. It was stated that the forecast of electorate for the previous review was considered to have been adversely affected by under enumeration following the introduction of the Community Charge and we concluded that there was evidence from other official sources of population estimates and projections to support this view. It was stated also that increases in the numbers registered since the replacement of the Community Charge and prior to the 1997 elections suggested that those who had deliberately removed themselves from the electoral register were re-registering. Data indicated that, whilst the number of electors in Glasgow increased between the 1995 and 1996 registers, other demographic indicators pointed to a decrease in the 18+ population. The Council acknowledged that there may be some underestimation of the electorate at 2001 but we noted that, overall, the forecasts provided by the Council were broadly in line with our own forecasts, based on data available from other sources, and were content that the data provided were acceptable.

We noted the concerns regarding administrative problems which could occur because we have not been constrained by the boundaries of parliamentary constituencies. We concluded that concerns regarding administrative arrangements for elections are not for our consideration and should be addressed to the Council and appropriate Electoral Registration Officer.

With regard to proposals for electoral wards designed within the constraints of existing parliamentary constituencies, we draw attention to the rules concerning the consideration of revised electoral arrangements for local elections which are set out at Appendix A to our report. In considering local electoral arrangements, the primary rule concerning electoral parity clearly states that the number of electors in electoral wards within a local government area shall be, as nearly as may be, the same. The proposals by the Scottish National Party Govan Constituency Association indicated that electoral parity in wards designed within the constraints of the Govan Constituency would result in divergences from electoral parity ranging between -5% and 15%, which we concluded are wholly unacceptable. Further, we noted that similar large divergences from parity would occur in other wards within the Council area if our considerations for local electoral arrangements were similarly constrained by boundaries devised by others for other purposes. Accordingly, we were not able to adopt the proposals for revised electoral arrangements submitted by the Scottish National Party Govan Constituency Association.

- **Central Pollok Residents Association** confirmed that it was in agreement with our proposals for Ward 60.
- A representation was received in respect of Wards 59,60 and 61. The correspondent understood the argument regarding parity and the need for this issue to be addressed but argued that the changes so soon after local government reorganisation would lead to unnecessary inconvenience to electors who were still coming to terms with the new structures. There was concern that we had failed to take into account the effect of splitting a community and the Rosehall Housing Cooperative by using Peat Road as the boundary. The correspondent offered alternative proposals which, it was believed, provided clarity with limited change and took account of natural boundaries. It was recognised that the proposed revision would affect surrounding wards but the correspondent disputed our electorate data particularly as it was considered that the figures should reflect demolition and housing replacement.

We consulted the council on the question of forecast electorate and noted the view that the representation was correct in observing the amount of demolition in the area and the effect that this had had on the number of electors. However, whilst account had been taken of actual and approved demolition, the projected forecast electorate at 2001 included electorate in new housing expected to be completed and occupied between 1996 and 2001. We also asked the Council to provide

electorate data which would allow us to assess the impact of the proposed changes. We noted that implementing the proposals would have a significantly adverse effect on electoral parity and, accordingly, were unable to adopt the suggested amendments.

## **Final Recommendation**

31. Having conducted the third statutory review of electoral arrangements for Glasgow 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 79 members.

32. The designation of the electoral wards that we recommend for Glasgow 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

33. 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>
1	Glasgow City Council area	1:25,000
2-4	Glasgow City Council area detail	1:10,000

## Appendix B

### Glasgow City Council Area Proposed Electoral Wards

Number	Name	Electorate	
		1996 (Actual)	2001 (Estimated)
a	b	c	d
1	Drumry	5,438	5,831
2	Summerhill	6,040	5,673
3	Blairdardie	6,094	5,794
4	Knightswood Park	6,201	5,868
5	Knightswood South	5,670	5,603
6	Yoker	6,052	6,023
7	Anniesland	6,025	6,006
8	Jordanhill	6,002	5,766
9	Kelvindale	5,929	5,690
10	Scotstoun	6,193	5,937
11	Victoria Park	6,307	6,086
12	Hayburn	6,318	6,053
13	Hyndland	6,358	6,062
14	Hillhead	6,167	6,064
15	Partick	6,107	5,941
16	Kelvingrove	6,056	5,903
17	Anderston	5,355	5,623
18	Woodlands	5,877	5,958
19	North Kelvin	6,097	5,935
20	Wyndford	6,147	5,866
21	Maryhill	5,430	5,559
22	Summerston	5,739	5,528
23	Milton	5,922	5,580
24	Ashfield	5,755	5,642
25	Firhill	5,781	5,653
26	Keppochhill	5,664	5,612
27	Merchant City	5,839	5,635
28	Royston	6,173	6,053
29	Cowlairs	5,572	5,577
30	Springburn	5,964	5,797
31	Wallacewell	5,913	5,829
32	Milnbank	5,877	5,875
33	Dennistoun	6,068	5,742
34	Calton	5,089	5,599
35	Bridgeton/Dalmarnock	5,877	5,680

36	Parkhead	5,873	5,592
37	Carntyne	6,296	5,968
38	Robroyston	4,834	5,888
39	Gartcraig	5,671	5,641
40	Queenslie	5,736	5,583
41	Greenfield	5,811	5,713
42	Barlanark	6,042	5,769
43	Shettleston	6,088	5,831
44	Tollcross Park	6,253	6,015
45	Braidfauld	5,818	5,901
46	N4ount Vernon	6,259	5,963
47	Baillieston	5,975	5,863
48	Garrowhill	6,141	6,015
49	Garthamlock	6,156	5,698
50	Easterhouse	5,933	5,706
51	Drumoyne	6,088	5,847
52	Govan	6,254	6,015
53	Ibrox	6,061	5,856
54	Kingston	6,193	6,056
55	Mosspark	5,844	5,530
56	North Cardonald	5,815	5,532
57	Penilee	6,107	6,011
58	Cardonald	5,820	5,529
59	Pollok	5,459	5,928
60	Crookston	6,331	6,073
61	Nitshill	6,503	5,962
62	Darnley	5,523	5,968
63	Carnwadric	5,798	5,827
64	Maxwell Park	6,085	5,775
65	Pollokshields East	5,861	5,585
66	Hutchesontown	5,249	6,075
67	Govanhill	6,186	5,923
68	Strathbungo	6,104	5,776
69	Battlefield	5,985	5,698
70	Lan2side	6,028	5,728
71	Pollokshaws	6,255	5,986
72	Newlands	6,254	6,027
73	Cathcart	6,247	5,911
74	Mount Florida	5,848	5,558
75	Toryglen	6,465	5,650
76	King's Park	5,895	5,579
77	Castlemilk	5,525	5,635
78	Carmunnock	6,032	5,551
79	Glenwood	5,451	5,582
	Total	471,794	460.363