

## Grant A (Alistair)

---

**From:** Iain Henderson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 September 2017 13:28  
**To:** Local Govt Boundary Comm Scot  
**Cc:** Maureen Wife  
**Subject:** Boundary Review at Cardowan, Stepps

Dear Sirs,

We are writing in relation to your publication of proposals for the relocation of an area of housing at Cardowan, Stepps from Glasgow City Council to North Lanarkshire Council. Many thanks for allowing us the opportunity to comment.

We would both very much support the proposals for relocation. We have copied below our original comments and think that they are still relevant, particularly in relation to:

1. The anomalous situation of one small part of a larger cohesive community of housing being located in a different local authority area to the larger part of the community. Properties almost literally straddle the local authority boundary and we have two sets of Councils providing the same range of services with one of them requiring to take access entirely through the other's area. It is noted from North Lanarkshire Council's comments that, as electors, we are already administered for voting purposes by North Lanarkshire Council for all but UK Parliamentary Election purposes.
2. Consistency and precedent in relation to the decision in 2008 to transfer the part of the community immediately across the road from our house from Glasgow City Council to North Lanarkshire Council. While the Easterhouse Regeneration Road is mentioned in Council representations, this is something that we would have thought would have been in the thoughts of the Boundary Commission when it took its decision in 2008. The road has been in contemplation for quite some considerable time.

I note that North Lanarkshire Council have no objections to the transfer, in principle. The concern they have raised is purely in relation to the current capacity of St Joseph's and Stepps Primary Schools. They state that they are considering solutions for these schools in the context of other housing development in the area but that no budget is currently identified for works that would accommodate the pupils that this area would potentially generate.

While it is appreciated that there could be a need to identify budget to accommodate some pupils from this area at the two schools, our thoughts would be:-

1. It is anticipated by North Lanarkshire Council that 36 pupils would be generated by this area. In the context of the wider Council area, we would not have thought that this would be insurmountable for North Lanarkshire Council which is a local authority of considerable size.
2. Presumably, not all of these 36 notional pupils would be expected to attend Stepps and St Joseph's Primary Schools. We would have imagined they would of varying ages and be spread across the primary and secondary school class groups.

3. There are other North Lanarkshire primary schools within the relatively near vicinity of our community that pupils may be able to be allocated to if the two schools under pressure are genuinely unable to accept them. This would, perhaps, be preferable and more convenient than pupils traveling to the Glasgow City Council primary schools.

4. North Lanarkshire Council has not identified any capacity issues with its secondary school portfolio in relation to the proposal which is positive.

5. While we may not fully understand the local authority budget arrangements, we would have thought that North Lanarkshire Council would benefit from additional Council Tax generated by our area and also perhaps an increase in central government funding commensurate with the addition of the area. In the context of them already providing a full range of services within the immediate community and economies of scale, this may allow some budget to be allocated for specific education purposes.

In relation to Glasgow City Council's response, they have mentioned a number of developments and proposals such as the Robroyston and Millerston railway station. It is, of course, possible that we are misunderstanding what is involved in such developments but none of them seems to be in the vicinity of the land proposed for transfer which is almost entirely comprised of existing housing with a body of water to the immediate east. If anything, the part of the community to the immediate north of our house, which is already within North Lanarkshire Council, is closer to the railway line.

Many thanks once again for the opportunity to feed our comments into your considerations. If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Kind regards,

Iain and Maureen Henderson  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Iainwhenderson <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** 6 January 2016 at 14:49:35 GMT  
**To:** [colin.wilson@scottishboundaries.gov.uk](mailto:colin.wilson@scottishboundaries.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** Maureen Wife <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Boundary Review at Cardowan, Steps

Dear Mr Wilson,

I hope that you have a very good 2016 and enjoyed the festive period.

I understand that you are co-ordinating the consideration by the Boundary Commission of a potential administrative boundary review in relation to the development I live in at Cardowan, Steps.

I know a large number of my neighbours are supportive of such a review taking place and have submitted comments to you. I am equally supportive of a review taking place.

I would say, at the outset, that I am conscious that my wife and I purchased our house in the knowledge of the local authority area and I have no issue with Glasgow City Council. We

have a son in 5th year at High School who continues to attend the school where we previously lived. We have no other children that would drive any thoughts of school catchment areas. We are also settled here and have no desire to move elsewhere.

That said, and having lived in the area for some time now, I think there are some reasons why having a review would be a sensible decision.

When we bought our house, we looked at the local authority boundaries and understood that the majority of the larger development in the immediate vicinity would fall within the Glasgow City Council area. It would seem, however, that the development directly across the road from our house was previously, following a boundary review, transferred to North Lanarkshire Council. This has influenced my decision to write to you for a number of reasons.

This earlier decision for the other part of the larger development has, I would have thought, established a precedent and I can see no particular reasons that would distinguish our request from that of the remainder of the development. If anything, I would think the fact that we constitute an even smaller and more isolated proportion of the overall development would make the consideration of our position more compelling.

We are a small section of a development – just over 100 households I believe - surrounded immediately on two sides by houses within North Lanarkshire Council and on the other sides by countryside. Our Bellway Homes development is split into two different local authority areas meaning identical housing sharing communal development facilities is subject to different local authority service provision.

There is no means of accessing our part of the development other than to travel through North Lanarkshire Council. This results in services from Glasgow City Council, such as refuse collection, travelling through another local authority area to provide services to around only 100 properties. I cannot imagine that this constitutes best value for the use of ever more scarce public resources when North Lanarkshire Council are already providing the same services to a larger number of properties within the immediate vicinity.

An example of the lack of consistency of service provision is when I reported a loose manhole cover directly outside our house to Glasgow City Council. According to the boundary lines, the manhole would lie within the Glasgow City Council area. However, the response I received was that the matter was being passed by Glasgow City Council to North Lanarkshire Council who are responsible. The matter was resolved quickly but it demonstrates the lack of a coherent and streamlined provision of service due to 100 houses lying as an island surrounded by properties in another local authority area.

I fully appreciate the reasons for the current position given the original boundary line and the incremental nature of development within the area. I do, however, think that the result has become irrational and somewhat perverse. I wholeheartedly think that a review of the position is an excellent idea at this time.

Many thanks for your assistance and if you think I can assist in any way with your considerations, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Iain Henderson  


---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

\*\*\*\*\*

This email has been received from an external party and  
has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*