

Third Statutory Review of Electoral Arrangements

Midlothian Council Area

Report to the Secretary of State for Scotland

Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland

Report Number E98020
August 1998

Third Statutory Review of Electoral Arrangements Midlothian 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 councilors 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, 15 electoral wards were appropriate for Midlothian 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 Midlothian District dated 16 February 1994.

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.

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 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.

21. On 24 June 1996, Midlothian Council acknowledged our decision that 18 members would provide the appropriate level of representation for its area but considered that such a level of representation was inadequate for the needs of Midlothian. The Council stated that, prior to reorganisation, Midlothian had 15 District Councillors and 5 Regional Councillors compared with currently only 15 elected members and, as such, was suffering a democratic deficit. The Council was also mindful that our decision to set the minimum number of electoral wards for any council area at 18, resulted in Midlothian having the same number of members as the much smaller Clackmannanshire Council and 3 fewer than the adjoining East Lothian Council, which it considered not too dissimilar from Midlothian. It was also pointed out that Midlothian Council expected to accommodate a further 10,000 houses and 40 hectares of new business land during the period up to 2005. The Council requested that we reconsider the matter of councillor numbers in light of the points raised.

22. The Council also considered that, notwithstanding the matter of councillor numbers, the proposed timetable for the submission of a draft scheme did not allow sufficient time for the process to be carried out properly.

23. In considering the number of councillors proposed for each council area it should be noted that the number for Clackmannanshire Council area was determined by our views on minimum council size, which we set out at paragraphs 10- 13 above. In comparing council areas, we noted that in Midlothian the density of population is 2.22 persons per hectare compared with 1.24 per hectare in East Lothian. Further, in Midlothian Council area approximately 86% of the population is resident in settlements of 10,000+ population whereas the comparable figure for East Lothian Council area is 15%. Having considered the representation made by the Council, we concluded that the number of councillors we proposed for Midlothian was, within the overall Scottish context, equitable. We, therefore, notified the Council that we remained of the view that 18 councilors would provide appropriate representation for Midlothian Council area.

24. On 2 July Midlothian Council wrote to express 'disappointment at our response to its request for an increase in the proposed number of councillors to 20. The Council also indicated that it had instructed officials to bring forward a draft scheme of electoral arrangements for its consideration and thought that a Council scheme could be submitted to us by mid-November 1996.

Midlothian Council's Proposals

25. The Council submitted a scheme of electoral arrangements for 18 wards on 1 October 1996, wrote to all Community Councils seeking their views, made copies of its proposals available for inspection at local libraries and the main Council offices for a period of 4 weeks from 3 October 1996 and published details of its draft proposals in local newspapers asking that representations be made to the Council and the Commission.

26. In preparing its proposals the Council acknowledged the desirability of keeping communities within a single electoral ward but, equally, recognised that, in practice, this was not always possible. The Council identified the western part of its area, along the line of the A701, as a corridor of common interest with closely linked communities. It also believed that there were no geographical links or historical ties with settlements to the east, such as Rosewell and Bonnyrigg. The Council had, therefore, determined that the 5 existing wards within the A701 corridor should be redrawn to create 6 new wards and, bearing in mind electoral parity across the Council area, it was clear that both Penicuik and Loanhead would require to be associated with other areas. The Council believed that it was necessary to link Bilston with Loanhead and Roslin and pointed out that, under present arrangements, the latter 2 settlements were already linked. The Council further noted that other alternatives had been examined but the outcomes created significant divergence from electoral parity.

27. In considering the Council's draft scheme of electorate we noted that the 2001 electorate forecast for Ward 11, Arniston/Cockpen, indicated an increase of 21% over the 1996 electorate. We, therefore, asked the Council to provide details of how the forecast of electorate had been calculated for the Council area and for the proposed new wards. The Council duly provided the

necessary information and we were satisfied that the forecasts of electorate at both council and ward level were acceptable.

28. As a result of the public consultation exercise 6 representations were received. The Council was invited to comment and, where appropriate, to provide revised electorate data so that the impact of making revisions to its draft proposals could be assessed. A small number of representations were made directly to the Council and we discuss these at paragraph 35 below.

29. Penicuik and District Community Council wrote to say that it believed Midlothian would be better served by 21 rather than 18 councillors and that the present proposals led to the average electorate per councillor in Midlothian being more than 10% above the Scottish average. It believed that, while achieving parity was a desirable objective, community considerations should be of equal importance. It believed that 4 Penicuik wards could be created within the current Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale parliamentary constituency and within the electoral parity guidelines. We noted the Community Council's views regarding the number of councillors appropriate for Midlothian Council area. Regarding the creation of 4 Penicuik wards within the bounds of the present parliamentary constituency, electorate data provided by the Council clearly demonstrated that, in practice and given the constraints of the primary rule concerning electoral parity, it would not be possible to create 4 wards which had easily identifiable and clearly defined boundaries and, accordingly, we could not accept the Community Council's proposal.

30. The Committee of Midlothian Liberal Democrats wrote to say that it considered that the number of councillors should be increased from 15 to 20. It also held the view that the elected councillor for a ward is an important channel of communication with Council officers, that wherever possible the catchment areas for Primary Schools and Churches should be in one ward only, and that, where there are widely scattered electorates within one ward, the transport system should provide easy access. An alternative scheme for 18 wards was submitted (although an earlier alternative suggested 19 wards). We noted that there was a significant divergence from electoral parity in a number of wards, with overall parity ranging between -20% and 17%, which we considered unacceptable. We concluded that there were no apparent advantages in the amended proposals and were unable to adopt the changes.

31. Penicuik Conservative Association wrote to object to the proposed scheme as it relates to Penicuik and Roslin and enclosed alternative proposals for 4 Penicuik wards contained within the constraints of Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale parliamentary constituency boundaries (it also considered that this area would be better administered within Scottish Borders Council area). We noted that our review of electoral arrangements could not consider any proposal for administrative boundary changes between Midlothian and Scottish Borders Council areas. In assessing the proposed ward revision, electorate data provided by the Council indicated that, in 3 of the 4 amended wards, electoral parity for the revised wards at 2001 would be -11%, -8% and -6%. Further, if the proposal was accepted, it was evident that there would be a considerable knock-on effect on other wards within the A701 corridor where parity would be exceeded by 12% and 15%. The Council also informed us that the only alternative would be to reduce the Loanhead and Roslin communities in size, with parts of their areas being merged with Rosewell and Bonnyrigg with which they have no historical ties. Because of the adverse effect on electoral

parity in both the Penicuik area and adjoining wards, we were unable to accept the proposed amendments.

32. Penicuik Liberal Democrats welcomed the increase in the number of councillors but expressed concern about the division of the Council area into wards of equal electorate rather than retaining natural communities. It was considered that Penicuik and Roslin should remain as separate entities and that there was no good reason for associating part of the village of Roslin with Penicuik. As discussed above we considered that it is not possible to create revised wards, as suggested for the Penicuik/Roslin/Bilston areas, within the statutory rules and having proper regard to electoral parity.

33. Roslin and Bilston Community Council wrote to object to the division of Roslin and proposed that Ward 5 be amended to include all of Roslin together with a small area of land south of the River Esk, and that the Bush be excluded. A supporting petition with 56 signatures was also presented. It intimated that Roslin and Bilston should be wholly contained within a single ward and that the case for retaining community ties should outweigh any requirement to achieve electoral parity. Electorate data provided by the Council indicated that the proposal to retain Roslin as a single ward would result in a significant divergence from electoral parity (22%) and, accordingly, we were unable to accept the proposed change.

34. A single representation objected to the association of Roslin Glen with Rosewell. Electorate data provided by the Council indicated that there would be no significant impact on electoral parity if Roslin Glen was associated with Ward 3. Accordingly, we agreed that the amendment was acceptable.

35. A number of representations were made to the council:

- Bonnyrigg and Lasswade Community Council considered that the scheme was well thought out and logical and had no objections to the proposed wards or their names.
- Eskbank and Newbattle Community Council wrote to say that it was disappointed that Eskbank and Newbattle had not become a single ward but recognised that this was not possible in terms of electoral parity. However, the Community Council asked that minor adjustments be made so that Newbattle Conservation Area would be wholly contained within Ward 16 (Newbattle/Pathhead). Electorate data provided by the Council indicated that very few electors would be affected and that there would be no impact on electoral parity. We, therefore, agreed to accept the proposed change.
- Gorebridge Community Council wrote to say that it rejected the proposed scheme because it would divide Gorebridge between Wards 11 and 12, and considered that there should be a single ward for Gorebridge. We noted that, at present, Gorebridge is divided between 2 wards and we were advised by the Council that it would not be possible to create a single ward which satisfied the statutory rule

regarding electoral parity. Accordingly, we agreed that it would not be possible to meet the Community Council's request.

- Mayfield/Easthouses Community Council wrote to suggest that there should be a small boundary adjustment so that Mayfield Industrial Estate would fall within Ward 18. The Community Council also suggested that Wards 17 and 18 should be renamed Lothian East and South Lothian respectively. The Council informed us that, although the Mayfield Industrial Estate was currently divided between 2 wards, the change proposed by the Community Council would be possible with minimal implications for electoral parity. Accordingly we agreed to meet the Community Council's request. The Council, however, did not intimate agreement to revise the ward names and we were, therefore, content that the names as proposed by the Council should remain.
- Newtongrange Community Council expressed its support for the Council's proposals.

Publication of Commission's Provisional Proposals

36. Public notice was given of the publication of our provisional proposals on 11 September 1997. Midlothian Council was asked to make copies of the electoral ward boundary descriptions, electoral statistics and illustrative maps available for inspection at their 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 9 October 1997.

Consideration of Representations

37. Seven letters were received:

- **Gorebridge Community Council** welcomed the proposals but considered that there was one substantial weakness; namely that the natural association of some small communities had been disregarded. For example, North Middleton, Borthwick and Newlandrigg had long been associated with Gorebridge but were now in other wards. It was also thought that other communities which had associations with Bonnyrigg had been artificially included with Arniston. Initial examination of maps etc. suggested that the perceived problem could perhaps be resolved by minor boundary changes involving only a small number of electors. We, therefore, directed our officers to determine if a suitable boundary line to accommodate the request could be identified and, thereafter, asked the Council to provide a count of the electorate at 1996 and forecast electorate at 2001 for the area in question. The information provided by the Council indicated that

accommodating the proposed change would involve a transfer of 356 and 421 electors at 1996 and 2001. This change altered electoral parity at 2001 for the wards in question from -5% and -2% to 7% and -14%. We, therefore, concluded that because of the significantly adverse effect on electoral parity the proposed change could not be included in our final recommendations.

- **Penicuik and District Community Council** recognised the desirability of maintaining a broad parity between electorates and appreciated that this is the prime consideration when fixing ward boundaries. Nevertheless, it considered that we should not overlook the statutory provision concerning local ties which would be broken in fixing a particular boundary and the provision that the strict application of the statutory rule concerning parity can be departed from in areas where there are special geographical circumstances. The Community Council contended that it was possible to create 4 wards for Penicuik which remained broadly within acceptable parity levels, that the division of Roslin was unwarranted, perverse and did not contribute to good local government, that the creation of a ward which straddles the boundary of a parliamentary constituency should not be accepted unless there is an over-riding reason for doing so and that, subject to further investigation, the creation of 2 wards including the whole of Loanhead, Bilston and the whole of Roslin might be possible within the parameters laid down and to the satisfaction of local people. The Community Council further argued that, while the $\pm 5\%$ rule is by and large a sensible one, it should not be adhered to rigidly if minor variations can create wards which are more acceptable to the local electorate and that Midlothian Council has already recommended breaching this rule.

We concluded that there are no special geographical considerations in the area which would warrant significant deviation from the application of the primary rule concerning electoral parity. We noted that it would not be possible to consider the desired changes in the Penicuik, Roslin, Loanhead and Bilston areas if the primary rule concerning electoral parity was to be appropriately recognised. Indeed electorate data available from the Council indicated that in some areas the changes proposed would lead to divergences from parity ranging between 9% and 26%. We noted also that we cannot be constrained by parliamentary constituency boundaries determined by the Boundary Commission for Scotland and, in any event, we were aware that a review of these boundaries would likely take place shortly after our review was completed. Because of the significant divergence from electoral parity in the alternative proposals submitted by the Community Council we were unable to adopt the changes proposed.

- **Roslin and Bilston Community Council** endorsed the amendments submitted by Penicuik and District Community Council and called for a public meeting to consider a logical way round the splitting of the Roslin/Bilston community into 2 separate wards. As we mention above, we concluded that the revised proposals could not be adopted because of the adverse effect on electoral parity.

- **Midlothian Liberal Democrats** wrote to express disappointment that our provisional proposals were almost the same as those submitted by Midlothian Council. They considered that the proposals were unacceptable and were approved by Midlothian Council because they are of benefit to existing elected representatives. Further, they concluded that the proposals have no regard for some easily identifiable boundaries, have broken existing local ties and create new wards which do not seem to form natural communities. An alternative scheme was submitted for our consideration and there was a request for a public enquiry. We noted the comments made by the Midlothian Liberal Democrats and draw attention to the rules which we are required to observe in considering proposals for the revision of electoral arrangements and which are set out at Appendix A to our report. We carefully considered the alternative scheme. A close examination of the revisions and electorate data provided indicated that they were seriously flawed because errors had failed to account for 2,645 electors when recalculating the consequences of the proposed changes. Further, it was clear that the revisions, outwith the immediate Penicuik area, would lead to significant and unacceptable deviations from electoral parity. Accordingly, we were unable to accept the modifications proposed. We further concluded that the appointment of an Assistant Commissioner to consider a community centred ward structure was not appropriate.
- **Penicuik Conservative Association** wrote to re-iterate its previous objections to the provisional proposals for Midlothian Council area, deprecating the emphasis on numerical parity to the detriment of community integrity and geographical logic. It noted the views of Penicuik Community Council and considered that these views should be considered. It contended that the numerical basis for the inclusion of Roslin in Ward 3 did not stand up when numbers throughout Midlothian Council wards were examined. It appealed to us to give priority to community boundaries wherever possible and stated that the opportunity should be grasped to re-unite communities such as Eskbank which were subdivided at the last electoral review. Earlier proposals were resubmitted for further consideration. Having considered at length the representations made by Penicuik Conservative Association prior to publishing our provisional proposals, we concluded that, because of the adverse impact on electoral parity, the amendments proposed remained unacceptable and that our provisional proposals offered the best option for revised electoral arrangements in the Council area.
- **Penicuik Liberal Democrats** found it inconceivable that we had totally disregarded the wishes of local communities, referred to previous representations objecting to the Council's draft proposals, and urged a reconsideration of our proposals. Having considered at length the representations made by Penicuik Liberal Democrats prior to publishing our provisional proposals we concluded that our provisional proposals offered the best option for revised electoral arrangements in the Council area.

- A single representation commented that it was felt locally that there had been insufficient consultation and that our proposals for Roslin, which had a wealth of history, would mean a loss of identity. Further, more attention should be focused on communities rather than numerical parities. It was suggested that it would be possible to create 4 wards with acceptable parity for Penicuik without the Roslin electorate. It was also mentioned that we should consider convening a local meeting in the vicinity of Penicuik and Rosin. We asked the Council to provide electorate data so that the proposed change could be assessed. We were informed by the Council that the electorate data provided in the representation was substantially underestimated and that to effect the changes would result in the electoral parity for Wards 3 and 5 being -27% and 22% respectively unless consequential changes were made to other wards across the Council area. Accordingly, because of the adverse impact on electoral parity, we could not accept the proposed amendment to our proposals.

Final Recommendation

38. Having conducted the third statutory review of electoral arrangements for Midlothian 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 18 members.

39. The designation of the electoral wards that we recommend for Midlothian 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.

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

Map	Area	Scale
1	Midlothian Council Area	1:50,000
2	Penicuik	1:10,000
3	Penicuik/Roslin/Rosewell	1:10,000
4	Loanhead/Bonnyrigg	1:10,000
5	Dalkeith/Newtongrange/Mayfield	1:10,000
6	Newtongrange/Gorebridge	1:10,000

Appendix B

Midlothian Council Area Proposed Electoral Wards

Number	Name	Electorate	
		1996 (Actual)	2001 (Estimated)
a	b	c	d
1	Penicuik South West	3,634	3,634
2	Penicuik North	3,758	3,766
3	Penicuik/Roslin	3,547	3,559
4	Penicuik South East	3,311	3,646
5	Bilston/Roslin	3,116	3,457
6	Loanhead	3,511	3,606
7	Poltonhall/Rosewell	3,371	3,582
8	Bonnyrigg North	3,533	3,636
9	Bonnyrigg South	3,730	3,730
10	Newtongrange	3,478	3,593
11	Arniston/Cockpen	3,020	3,643
12	Gorebridge South	3,113	3,388
13	Dalkeith /Newton	3,404	3,666
14	Dalkeith/Eskbank	3,319	3,470
15	Dalkeith/Woodburn	3,570	3,588
16	Newbattle/Pathhead	3,098	3,385
17	Easthouses/Mayfield North	3,274	3,521
18	Mayfield South	3,367	3,491
	Total	61,154	64,361