



[www.lgbc-ni.org.uk](http://www.lgbc-ni.org.uk)  
[info@lgbc-ni.org.uk](mailto:info@lgbc-ni.org.uk)



# Final Recommendations 2021-2022 Review

Published 31<sup>st</sup> May 2022



## Contents

<b>Chapter 1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 2. Legislative Framework.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 3. Work to Date and key milestones.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Chapter 4. Consultation on Revised Recommendations. ....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter 5. Representations relating to the revised proposals .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Chapter 6. Final Recommendations for the 11 Districts. ....</b>	<b>27</b>
6.1 Antrim and Newtownabbey District.....	27
6.2 Ards and North Down .....	28
6.3 Armagh City, Banbridge and Craigavon.....	30
6.4 Belfast .....	32
6.6 Derry City and Strabane District.....	36
6.7 Fermanagh and Omagh.....	38
6.8 Lisburn and Castlereagh.....	40
6.9 Mid and East Antrim.....	41
6.10 Mid Ulster.....	43
6.11 Newry, Mourne and Down .....	45

## Chapter 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report presents my final recommendations for the Review of Local Government Boundaries in Northern Ireland.
- 1.2 I was appointed by the Department for Communities (DfC) as Local Government Boundaries Commissioner for Northern Ireland in June 2020. My task is to review and make recommendations in respect of the number, boundaries and names of the 11 local government districts and the number, boundaries and names of the wards into which each district is divided.
- 1.3 The initial period of public consultation, on my Provisional Recommendations, ran from 27th July until 21st September 2021. Eleven public hearings were held in September and October, each chaired by an Assistant Commissioner.
- 1.4 After consideration of the written representations and the reports of the Assistant Commissioners I made some revisions to my provisional recommendations and published my Revised Recommendations Report on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2022. A further period of public consultation, on my Revised Recommendations Report, ran from 18<sup>th</sup> January 2022 to 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022.
- 1.5 I received 15 submissions in response to my revised recommendations and I comment further on those representations at chapter 5.
- 1.6 I have endeavoured to make this Review as accessible and inclusive as possible. I am presenting these recommendations in an accessible digital format that has been developed by colleagues in Ordnance Survey of Northern Ireland (OSNI). This approach is not only in response to the current public health situation, but also because I am of the view that the quality of the digital maps is far superior to a printed version and this will allow everyone to examine my proposals in detail. I am encouraged by the positive feedback that I have received about this approach in response to my previous reports.

## Chapter 2. Legislative Framework

2.1 This chapter sets out the legislative framework for my Review. The parameters of the Local Government Boundaries Review and the procedures for the Review that I must follow are set out in the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 1972.

2.2 I was appointed under Part IV of the above act, Section 50(3) of the Act provides that

*The function of a Commissioner appointed under subsection (1)(b) shall be to review, and make recommendations regarding —*

*(a) the number, boundaries and names of local government districts; and*

*(b) the number, boundaries and names of the wards into which each district is divided.*

2.3 Schedule 4 of the above act sets out the appointment process for a LGB Commissioner, as well as the procedure for my Review that I must follow and the rules that I must adhere to. Full details of this legislation can be found at [www.lgbc-ni.org.uk/links](http://www.lgbc-ni.org.uk/links).

2.4 The current names and boundaries of local government districts and wards in Northern Ireland are detailed in the Local Government (Boundaries) Order 2012. Following the 2012 Order, a number of District Councils made applications to the Department to amend the District name. These changes to the names of the districts took effect in 2016 full details of the legislation can be found at <https://www.lgbc-ni.org.uk/links>.

2.5 The current boundaries of districts and wards can be found on the MapViewer <https://apps.spatialni.gov.uk/LGBC/LGBCPublicConsultationApp/index.html>.

2.6 I have set out in detail my general approach to the Review and to the legislation in my Provisional Recommendations Report Chapter 4. <https://www.lgbc-ni.org.uk/publications/provisional-recommendations-report>.

## Chapter 3. Work to Date and key milestones

- 3.1 This chapter summarises the work done in this Review. A summary of key milestones is available at <https://www.lgbc-ni.org.uk/milestone-timeline>.
- 3.2 The data that informs the Review was provided by the Chief Electoral Officer for Northern Ireland on the Enumeration Date, the 4th January 2021.
- 3.3 I published a public notice on 3 February 2021 launching the LGBC website and announcing that the preparatory stage of my Review was complete. I invited proposals from councils, political parties, associations, organisations and individual members of the public in relation to the number, boundaries and names of the 11 districts: and the number, boundaries and names of the wards within the 11 districts.
- 3.4 In May 2021 I hosted a number of ‘Meet the Commissioner’ virtual information sessions with officers and members from the 11 councils. I used these virtual sessions to raise awareness among councils about the Review, to clarify the Review process and the timescales involved. A number of the questions raised during these sessions can be found at <https://www.lgbc-ni.org.uk/faqs>.
- 3.5 On 27 July 2021 I launched my Provisional Recommendations report for public consultation for a period of 8 weeks. I published a public notice in the local and regional press announcing the launch of the consultation and inviting responses from all interested parties. My proposals were presented in an online format with high quality digital maps for each district and ward provided by OSNI on Spatial NI. There was an online portal for responses, with more detailed responses submitted by e-mail. The consultation closed on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2021.
- 3.6 On August 1<sup>st</sup> the Department for Communities appointed five Assistant Commissioners to assist me with my Review. From 28<sup>th</sup> September until 14<sup>th</sup> October a series of Public hearings were held, one for each district. The hearings were chaired by the Assistant Commissioners and were conducted in a hybrid format that allowed socially distanced in-person participation at the venues as well as participation via an online platform. The Assistant Commissioners have since submitted their reports to me on each of the districts, taking into consideration oral and written submissions. The Reports are published on the LGBC website [Publications | Local Government Boundaries Commissioner for Northern Ireland](#). More detail on the consultation is found in Sections 4 and 5 of this report.

3.7 On 18<sup>th</sup> January 2022 I released my Revised Recommendations Report and opened a 6 week period of public consultation which ran from 18<sup>th</sup> January 2022 to 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022. I published a public notice in the local and regional press announcing the launch of the consultation and inviting responses from all interested parties. My proposals were once again presented in an online format with high quality digital maps for each district and ward provided by OSNI on Spatial NI. There was an online portal for responses, with more detailed responses submitted by e-mail. More detail on the consultation is included in chapter 4.

3.8 This report has been submitted to the Department for Communities on 31 May 2022.

## **Chapter 4. Consultation on Revised Recommendations.**

- 4.1 I published my Revised Recommendations Report for public consultation on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2022. I advertised the public consultation by publishing a public notice in the local and regional press, as well as via LGBC social media channels.
- 4.2 I announced the publication of my Revised Recommendations Report and the opening of the 6 week consultation period by sending a letter of notification to Assessors to the Commissioner including the Chief Electoral Officer, the Director of Census (in place of the Registrar General), the Commissioner of Valuation and the Chief Survey Officer. Chief Executives of the 11 Councils were notified and asked to disseminate to their members, as were those government and non-governmental bodies on the Department for Communities Section 75 Consultee lists which includes all political parties in Northern Ireland.
- 4.3 My revised recommendations were presented in an online format with high quality digital maps for each district and ward provided by OSNI on Spatial NI. There was an online portal for responses, with an e-mail address provided for the submission of more detailed responses.
- 4.4 Libraries NI assisted in the consultation process by facilitating online access to the consultation across the network of local libraries in Northern Ireland. A number of District Councils also provided online access to the consultation for their citizens in council facilities, improving access to the reports, maps and consultation for those without internet access at home. I am very grateful for Libraries NI and to the District Councils who were able to assist us in this, particularly given the challenging public health situation due to the Covid-19 pandemic over recent months.
- 4.5 The report and consultation documents were made available in alternative formats and in other languages on request. Following a request, the team provided a translation of the report and consultation questions in Irish, which was also published on the LGBC website.
- 4.6 There were a total of 15 responses to the consultation. There were 6 responses received by e-mail and 9 on the online portal.
- 4.8 I have set out my response to the specific issues raised in the consultation in Chapter 5 of this report.



## Chapter 5. Representations relating to the revised proposals

### Boundaries of Local Government Districts

#### 5.1 Boundary of Mid and East Antrim District with Causeway Coast and Glens District

5.1.1 I received a representation by email from Ian Paisley, the MP for North Antrim, relating to the boundary between Mid and East Antrim District and Causeway Coast and Glens at Moboy Road. This point was raised in the consultation following my Provisional Recommendations Report. I believe that this issue was resolved by my revised recommendations and therefore no further consideration was required.

5.1.2 The Assistant Commissioner for Causeway Coast and Glens had addressed the issue in his Report to me in November 2021 and recommended the following:

*2.8 I recommend that a small area of land within Drumcon townland, including 17A, 17B and 19 Maboy Road, identified on the map in Appendix A, is transferred from the district of Causeway Coast and Glens to the district of Mid and East Antrim.*

I then Reviewed the Assistant Commissioners recommendation and accepted it in my Revised Recommendation Report as follows:

*6.5.2 The Assistant Commissioner has recommended that a defacement of the district boundary with Mid and East Antrim at Maboy Road is corrected. I accept this recommendation; and*

*6.9.2 The Assistant Commissioner has included a recommendation that a defacement of the district boundary with Causeway Coast and Glens District at Maboy Road is corrected. I recommend this change to the district boundary as set out in the map.*

I therefore believe that the anomaly on the boundary line in this area, and which was addressed after the first consultation, is the same issue which has been raised by Mr Paisley on behalf of his constituent during the second consultation. I also believe that the proposed amendment to the boundary at this point as set out in my Revised Recommendations Report deals with the anomaly affecting this constituent's property. No further change is proposed.

#### 5.2 Boundary of Mid Ulster District with Armagh City, Banbridge and Craigavon District

5.2.1 I received 8 representations in respect of the area around the villages of Clonmore and Tamnamore on the issue of the district line between the Districts of Armagh City Banbridge and Craigavon and Mid Ulster.

5.2.2 This issue was not previously raised during the first consultation period. My Provisional Proposals for this District line and my Revised Proposals were exactly the same, but this matter has become subject to representation only at secondary consultation stage.

- 5.2.3 It is surprising that this strength of feeling has been submitted at this point given that there was no attendance at the public hearing for either of the two Districts in question. I also note that there were no representations on this issue made to me by any councillors in either District during my engagement forums with councils immediately prior to the launch of the Provisional Proposals.
- 5.2.4 It must be noted that all of the representations made on this issue are not based on any changes which have occurred in this area since this District line was proposed by the 2008/09 Review of Local Government Boundaries and subsequently created by the 2012 Order. Instead, all submissions on this issue are based on an ongoing dissatisfaction on the part of some residents in these villages in respect of the boundary line as created by the 2012 Order (which became a practical reality for residents as of the 2015 elections to the new 11 District Councils).
- 5.2.5 The representations received centred on the desire for these villages and their environs to be taken out of the Armagh City Banbridge and Craigavon District and placed within Mid Ulster District. This desire was expressed on the basis that the District line established by the 2012 Order, and which has not been changed by my proposals, cuts across established communities.
- 5.2.6 One consultee described the *“centuries long affiliation”* of the two villages of Clonmore and Tamnamore with Dungannon and the Mid Ulster area. Frustration was expressed *“because many people still look to our old Dungannon-based councillors for advice and assistance”* and that residents in that area had been *“subject to the highest rates increase in the entire country”*.
- 5.2.7 Similar views were outlined by other individuals on the CitizenSpace consultation portal. I therefore believe that there are some residents in this area with very strong views that I should review this area and make a series of changes to boundary lines which would achieve moving these villages out of Armagh City, Banbridge and Craigavon District and into the Mid Ulster District.

For example, an individual posed the question:

*“Why vote and pay rates to ABC?...No school bus even on road to ABC?”*

And another explained:

*“...inhabitants largely identify with Dungannon and what is currently the Mid Ulster council in terms of schools, leisure centre and services. In six years there has been little or no engagement from ABC council in the area and discussions should be made around our realignment once again with the now Mid Ulster council”*

A resident of Clonmore commented:

*“I don’t think we have any sense of belonging to the new council, we are seen as a remote part without any real support or services, only higher rates! Most people would see themselves as part of Mid Ulster and use services, schools there more than in ABC”*

- 5.2.8 I must give primacy to the statutory rules when delineating boundaries and those factors are focused on number balancing and geographical features such as drawing lines which can be said to create boundaries which are ‘readily identifiable’ and achieving wards with

‘substantially the same’ number of electors. In determining boundaries, I must take account of the statutory Rules and the requirement under Rule 19 to create wards with a similar number of electors can mean that, in some instances, there will be lines delineated which may not exactly correspond to historic community links due to the changes in the distribution of population over time.

- 5.2.9 The level of change to previously well understood boundaries was a well debated issue across Northern Ireland under the 2008/09 Review, which radically reshaped 26 Districts into an 11 District model. Given that the change was the most significant reform in the structure of local government in Northern Ireland since 1972, it is to be expected that some of the change will take time to embed both structurally, in terms of delivery by councils, and in the hearts and minds of residents, in terms of trust and confidence.
- 5.2.10 Many people who participated in this Review have observed that the statutory rules are overly focused on number balancing at the expense of other important factors which are social and practical in nature, such as community cohesion, community identity, local links and historical social ties. I accept that the representation in this particular area demonstrates some public dissatisfaction with the way in which the legislation requires the drawing of lines which can, at times, disrupt established community links and does not allow for prioritizing social and practical considerations over the balancing of the number of electors. The particular issue, which is the subject of these representations in this area, is a legacy from the previous Review of 2008/09 and the subsequent council mergers
- 5.2.11 However, the arguments which have been made to me in this Review are proposals in terms of potential reform to the legislation and to widen the scope of the statutory considerations for a future Local Government Boundaries Commissioner. Representations on this issue were purely based on how some residents feel about the Districts created by the 2012 Order, which in the views of the consultees did not pay adequate regard to community affiliations and identity, as well as the perceived quality of representation and the perceived performance of a council in how it meets the needs of residents. Such matters are out of scope of the legislation and I must therefore conclude that there are no relevant reasons nor any compelling evidence of change since the enactment of the boundaries under 2012 Order which would persuade me to redraw the District boundary line in this area.

### **5.3 Boundary of Belfast City with Lisburn City and Castlereagh Districts**

- 5.3.1 During the consultation I received a representation on behalf of Belfast City Council and a further separate letter of representation from the City Solicitor of Belfast City Council on this same issue.

*‘The Council would argue that any independent review into the placement of any district boundary line should be based on the Schedule 4, Part III “Rules in accordance which recommendations of a commissioner are to be made”, the first of which (Rule 14) is:*

*“Regard shall be had to the desirability of determining district and ward boundaries which are readily identifiable”.*

*The Council would reiterate the points made its submission to the Provisional Recommendations, including that those features which the Local Government*

*Boundary Commissioner correctly determined in 2008 to constitute 'readily identifiable boundaries' in respect of this area (namely the A55 Outer Ring Road and the upland topography in this area) have not changed.*

*The Council recognise that all of the extant district and ward boundaries for all 11 councils, including those in relation to Belfast, were mandated by a political process of the NI Assembly following the last review in 2008/9. The Council would argue that this fact may not exempt any of the boundaries from future review as this would negate the requirement for any future review and would render the rules set out in Schedule 4, Part III of The Local Government (Boundaries) (Northern Ireland) Order 2006 redundant.*

*The Council would therefore recommend again that the Commissioner refers to the principles upon which the 2008 Final Recommendations were made and the Schedule 4, Part III Rules including the first rule which places prominence on the desirability of determining district boundaries which are readily identifiable.*

*The reason put forth by the Council therefore appeals directly to the first rule in Schedule 4, Part III which defines the rules in accordance which a Commissioner will make recommendations, therefore ensuring that such a reason is not only valid but is a material consideration.*

*Any argument that Belfast's district boundary was "mandated by a political process" or reference to "the fact that the boundary was a decision made by the NI Assembly which is historically agreed" will equally apply to all district boundaries which are subject to the review. As such, the Council do not agree that this is a valid argument for determining that such reasons as those which directly relate to legislated Rules such as Schedule 4, Part III (14) are not compelling.*

*The Council would note that no other argument, other than previous political agreement has been presented against the suggested change to the district boundary.*

In a further letter received separately from the City Solicitor of Belfast Council, it was stated as follows:

*I am writing with respect to the Local Government Boundary Commissioner's Revised Recommendations which were published on 18 January 2022 and to seek clarification on number of points.*

*In its response to the Provisional Recommendations, the Council requested that the Local Government Boundary Commissioner revisit the findings of the 2008/09 Local Government Boundary Review including the "Final Recommendations" report and the "Report of the Assistant Commissioner Sarah Havlin on Belfast City Council district" which made clear recommendations that the Galwally area containing Forestside should reside within the Belfast district boundary.*

*The Council argued that the principles upon which the 2008/09 recommendations were made and those features which the Commissioner determined to constitute 'readily identifiable boundaries' in respect of this area (namely the A55 Outer Ring Road and the upland topography in this area) have not changed. A Belfast City Council argued at the time, the decision by the NI Assembly in 2009, to ignore the*

*Boundary Commissioners Final Recommendations report, amounted to an irrational departure from those features that have helped to shape the delimitation of the District Boundary in this part of Belfast. Indeed, when viewed on a map, it graphically stands out as an aberration in boundary demarcation.*

*In the Revised Recommendations, you recommend that the district boundary line should remain unchanged and provide the following reasons.*

*“I note the submissions on this issue and the analysis of the Assistant Commissioner. I am in agreement with the rationale of the Assistant Commissioner on the importance of the fact that the boundary line at this point was mandated by a process of the Northern Ireland Assembly following the last Review in 2008/09. It is true to say that the boundary line at this areas does not correspond to the recommendations made by my predecessor in the 2008/09 Review, however, it is the line which was passed into law after consideration and amendment by legislature during the passage of the 2012 Act”.*

*The Council note that it is a fact that “all” of the extant district and ward boundaries for each of the 11 councils, including those in relation to Belfast, were mandated by a political process of the NI Assembly following the last review in 2009 and duly passed into law after consideration and amendment as a result of this statutory process. The fact that all of the existing boundaries were passed into law following the last review may not exempt any of the district or ward boundaries from subsequent consideration or amendment. Indeed, a reliance on such an argument would seem to negate the requirement for any future boundary review and would render the rules set out in Schedule 4, Part III of The Local Government (Boundaries)(Northern Ireland) Order 2006 redundant.*

*The Council would therefore seek assurance that any decision with respect to the Belfast boundary in 2022 will be based not upon the outcome of the 2008/09 review, but upon the application and consideration of the principles contained in Schedule 4, Part III which defines the rules in accordance which a Commissioner will make recommendations.*

*The Council would also seek clarification on the following paragraph from the revised recommendations.*

*“My approach in this Review is one of minimum intervention where possible. In the absence of a compelling reason, I am not persuaded to interfere with existing District boundary lines. I agree with the Assistant Commissioner that the submission make by Belfast City Council (BCC) does not constitute a compelling reason to interfere with the District boundary between the District of Belfast City and the District of Lisburn and Castlereagh”.*

*I am unable to find any reference in the legislation or guidance to a requirement or preference for applying a principle of “minimum intervention where possible” with respect to the local government boundary review. In Chapter 6 of the Provisional Recommendations (Methodology), it is indicated that “the required balance of*

*electoral numbers per ward within a District as required by Rule 19 might be achieved by a series of internal movements of electors with little or no intervention to the external district boundaries". However, it is also recognised that in some cases district boundary lines may need to be changed in response to features on the ground as per Rule 14. It is clear in this instance that the proper application of Schedule 4, Part III in relation to Rule 14 and "readily identifiable boundaries" would recommend a district boundary line which is consistent with the topography on the ground such as the A55 Outer Ring Road and that any such change would not impact on the requirements of Rule 19 and the balance of electoral numbers per ward. I would therefore appreciate if you could explain your rationale for taking a "minimum intervention" approach in relation to the Belfast District Boundary.*

*It is my view that the Council has indeed presented a "compelling reason" to amend the district boundary line. The Council has appealed directly to the first rule in Schedule 4, Part III, Rule 14 which places prominence on the "desirability of determining district boundaries which are readily identifiable".*

*The same argument for changing the district boundary, following application of the same principles, was provided by both yourself in your role as Assistant Commissioner with responsibility for Belfast district in 2008 and the Boundary Commissioner (Dick Mackenzie) in his Final Recommendations report. It is therefore irrational, when applying the same legislative guidelines and principles to the current review, to view Belfast City Council's submission containing an identical argument as "not constituting a compelling reason" to move the district boundary line.*

*To ignore such an argument, based squarely on principles identified in the Schedule 4, Part III rules, may represent an unlawful fettering of discretion, particularly in the absence of any valid reason, other than a preference not to interfere with the existing lines.*

*The Council also note the following paragraphs from the Report of the Assistant Commissioner for the Lisburn and Castlereagh district who indicated that her "comments in relation to this submission are limited to its potential impact on Lisburn and Castlereagh, as I have not considered the Commissioner's recommendations for the Belfast City area".*

*"It is my view that the overriding consideration in relation to deliberation of this issue must be that this particular boundary was agreed by the NI Assembly, and was a robustly debated political decision. To open up a further debate on this part of the boundary would 'unpick' this decision, unravelling the decisions made on the number, size and boundaries of councils further to the Review of Local Government, with the possible consequence of destabilizing local government for quite some time".*

*The above paragraph is incorrect in that any change to the district boundary could not unravel any decision on the "number" of councils which will remain at 11 councils. Also, the fact that an amendment to any district or ward boundary may impact the "size and boundaries" of such districts or wards is part and parcel of the*

*review (and all previous and subsequent LG boundary reviews) and should not be considered as a reason not to consider such boundary changes. I also do not agree that the Assistant Commissioner should be including for consideration a subjective view on the implications of any boundary line amendments. To postulate that a change to any boundary may have the “possible consequence of destabilizing local government for quite some time” would appear to me to be outside of the scope of the Commission and may represent an unlawful fettering of discretion on behalf of the Assistant Commissioner.*

*I would finally like to point out that the letter from Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council to you dated 4 October 2021, mischaracterises Belfast’s position as being one which “appears to merely address a rates intake argument – a position that is incongruous with the purpose of the review as well as the settled legal position of the NI Assembly in respect of Local Government Boundaries and subsequent rates settlement”. You will note from all of our correspondence that Belfast City Council has not put forward any position which attempts to address a rates intake argument. Belfast City Council has presented a recommendation based on the principle of readily identifiable boundaries. However, I do agree that such matters as those listed in the letter from Lisburn and Castlereagh, including rates intake and social and economic demographics, should remain outside the scope of the Review and consideration should be restricted to reviewing the boundaries based on the application of the principles listed in Schedule 4, Part III of The Local Government (Boundaries) (Northern Ireland) Order 2006.*

- 5.3.2 I wish to be clear about all the factors that have been assessed in this process which I will set out below. Of most importance, I wish to be clear that I have given primary regard to the statutory rules in the delineation of all boundary lines for wards and districts which are proposed under this Review. Any reference to this District line having been mandated by the Northern Ireland Assembly following the last Local Government Boundaries Review is by way of illustrating that the existing line, which was not the line proposed by my predecessor, is the line that ultimately was defined by law and which therefore is the clear and certain line which people have come to understand.
- 5.3.3 The rules primarily require me to draw boundaries which can be reasonably described as **readily identifiable** and which **create wards which are substantially the same in number of electors**. In doing so I am required to have regard to the factors in paragraph 17: the **size, population and physical diversity of the district** and the desirability that there should be a **proper representation of the rural and urban electorate within the district**. Furthermore, I am bound by the rules to create a certain number of wards in each District with the discretion to vary that number, if desired, by not more and not less than 5 wards. In Belfast that number is 60 and is 40 in all other Districts. This summarises the statutory framework which has underpinned all of my delineations and assessments in this process.
- 5.3.4 My approach to this task was explained in detail in the ‘Approach’ section of my previous two reports and explains my rationale and my interpretation of certain phrases in the Rules in detail. For example, I explained a number of matters including how I defined a boundary which is ‘*readily identifiable*’ and my approach to measuring what might reasonably be described as being ‘*substantially the same*’.

- 5.3.5 I also explained that I had begun the exercise of mapping the Districts with the preference, but not the intention, of avoiding intervention with District lines where it was possible in order to avoid disruption to people (see paragraphs 6.4 and 6.5 of my Revised Recommendations Report). I certainly did not set out with this as a goal of the process but it was my view that the public had only come to understand the 11 Districts and their boundaries since 2015, following the Review of Public Administration (RPA) which underpinned the 2008/09 Review, and which brought about the most radical restructure of the map of local government in Northern Ireland since 1972.
- 5.3.6 Whilst the Review in 2008/09 made the recommendations for the boundary lines of the 11 new Districts, due to political disagreement, those lines did not become law until 2012. It was not until the next local government elections and the formal merger of councils in 2015, that the new Districts were in fact implemented and became a reality for the public to see and understand in real terms. In the eyes of citizens, this seismic change only took effect in 2015 and in many areas the Districts are still only becoming established, both in the hearts and minds of people and in the new ways of working for councils.
- 5.3.7 I began my Review in 2020 which was only 5 years after this change had taken effect in real terms. My preference towards minimum intervention in terms of achieving minimum disruption to people insofar as possible is not a statutory consideration which was driving my drawing of boundaries under this Review, nor have I erected such a consideration into any equivalence to the statutory rules. This preference was merely formed as a working principle to consider and it was based on my own observations and the feedback I received from residents and political representatives all over Northern Ireland since my appointment to this role during stakeholder engagement forums
- 5.3.8 I therefore began my first assessments when designing a possible map as a first draft for consultation with the view that a map which presented as little disruption as possible was preferable. However, it is of course always acknowledged that change is unavoidable under the statutory requirement to achieve wards which contain substantially the same number of electors. Such change is driven by the movement of people and population changes over time, hence the legislative requirement to periodically review the map of electors and ensure that such changes are reflected in the distribution across local government wards.
- 5.3.9 My principle of minimum disruption is shown as not being inflexible because where it is required I have intervened in reviewing a District line. An example of this, is the issue of defacement. This reason for redrawing a District line can be seen in the Districts of Mid and East Antrim and Causeway Coast and Glens.
- 5.3.10 I also concluded that a model with 60 Belfast wards is achievable in terms of number balancing within the District of Belfast only using movement of electors between Belfast wards which have become overpopulated (i.e well over the average ward size) into other Belfast wards which have become underpopulated (i.e well under the average ward size). However, it is acknowledged that an alternative model could be considered which could move streets of electors out of the Belfast wards bordering other Districts, thereby moving population from wards within Belfast over into wards within its neighbouring Districts which have much lower populations, such as Ards and North Down or Lisburn and Castlereagh etc. Such an approach would require the redrawing of a District boundary line and potential disruption to residents, whereas the internal recalibration of Belfast electors across internal Belfast wards is less disruptive. On balance, I preferred the approach in which residents

remained in their existing council area and this was again a decision based on my working principle of minimum disruption where possible.

- 5.3.11 On the specific issue of the delineation of the Belfast/Lisburn District boundary line at Galwally/Forestsides, both Belfast City Council and Lisburn and Castlereagh Council responded to my Provisional map at first consultation stage with strong and opposing views about any change to the District line at the Galwally area. This is not the first time that this matter has been a source of contention. In the 2008/09 Review, this precise part of the District boundary line was a source of much debate and legal submissions at the public hearings. At that time, I was the Assistant Local Government Boundaries Commissioner for Northern Ireland and I was assigned to the District of the City of Belfast. I am therefore very familiar with the historic contention about this boundary.
- 5.3.12 At the time of the last Review, two potential boundary lines were put forward and robustly argued by each of the councils. The boundary line preferred by Belfast City Council was the line which brought the area of Galwally/Forestsides into the new proposed District of Belfast City and another line, which brought the area of Galwally/Forestsides into the new proposed District of Lisburn and Castlereagh, was argued by representatives for Lisburn council. Both lines were recognised by me at that time as being readily identifiable boundaries, and my judgment at that time was that I preferred the line advocated by Belfast City Council. My assessment was accepted by the Local Government Boundaries Commissioner at that time, Richard Mackenzie CB. Mr Mackenzie endorsed my view and his Final Report recommended the line which encircled Galwally/Forestsides into the proposed District of Belfast City.
- 5.3.13 Under the legislation, the sponsoring Department of the Local Government Boundaries Commissioner, may put forward the Final Recommendations of the Commissioner to the Northern Ireland Assembly **with or without modification**. The discretion to modify the Belfast/Lisburn Castlereagh line from the line proposed by Mr Mackenzie was exercised by the sponsoring Department at that time, the Department of the Environment. The modification was made at the precise point of the District boundary line which is subject to the present submission by Belfast City Council. The modification resulted in the area of Galwally/Forestsides moving into the District of Lisburn and Castlereagh instead of into Belfast as recommended by the Commissioner using an alternative boundary line.
- 5.3.14 The rationale of the Department for this modification was given in its Statement of Reasons for Modifications of the Local Government Boundaries Commissioner as part of the Draft Local Government Boundaries (Northern Ireland) Order 2012. At paragraph 3 of its statement of reasons The Department of Environment stated:

***Galwally***

*The District Boundary recommended by the Commissioner would result in the civic and administrative headquarter offices of Castlereagh Borough Council being in the new Belfast District. To ensure continuity of service provision it is vital that the headquarter offices are retained in the new Lisburn and Castlereagh District. Relocation of the services from these offices would be costly. Castlereagh Borough Council has already invested significant funds in building the Galwally premises. To force relocation at further cost to ratepayers is not justifiable. In addition it makes economic and logistical sense to retain these offices as an administrative centre for the eastern part of the new District.*

- 5.3.15 The reasons given by the Department of the Environment for the modification of the line at this point are out with the permissible statutory considerations of the Local Government Boundaries Commissioner, but such reasons are within the power of the Department itself and to present to the Northern Ireland Assembly. Subsequently, the Draft Order with this modification was democratically endorsed by the Northern Ireland Assembly. It should be noted that I can give no regard to these reasons for drawing the line under such criteria and it has had no influence on my own judgement in this Review. I am setting out this information in this report for contextual reference only.
- 5.3.16 What has shaped my view on this line is the fact that the line as it stands was the line passed into law by the 2012 Order and it is the clear and certain line which is now known and which would seem to have been largely accepted and absorbed by the public in both Belfast and Lisburn/Castlereagh council areas since 2015. By way of illustration, I have received no representations from any individuals or businesses in this area expressing any concern about the District boundary line nor is there any evidence of topographical change since the last Review at this point of the boundary line. Notwithstanding this fact, should there be a compelling reason pursuant to the statutory rules which would cause me to review this District line, either at this point of the line or indeed any part of it, I would be fully prepared to do so. In my view, there is no compelling reason for me to do so.
- 5.3.17 The only argument advanced by Belfast City Council is based on historic arguments about the perceived comparative quality of the boundary line as modified following the last review, and a continuing desire to redraw the line in the way that was originally advocated by Belfast City Council at the 2008/09 review. The basis of the argument is that out of the two possible lines which could be drawn, the one advocated by Belfast City Council was and still is more logical and by comparison it is the most readily identifiable boundary in this particular space.
- 5.3.18 My view is that there is no requirement under the legislation to create a hierarchy of what is judged to be a boundary that is '*readily identifiable*' or to select a line based on its perceived superior quality to another line. Each of the geographical features I have set out for use in the delineation of boundary lines in my 'Approach' section have not been listed in order of preference or priority. So, for example I see no requirement for a road to be viewed as being superior to a river nor am I required to favour a street over a laneway. In other words I am not required to choose a boundary which is *most* identifiable but to propose boundaries which are readily identifiable. The legislation requires me to draw ward boundary lines that are readily identifiable having regard to the factors in paragraph 17, the overall objective of creating a certain number of wards in each District and ensuring that wards in each district contain a number of electors which can reasonably be described as being substantially the same.
- 5.3.19 During my assessment of the two potential lines put forward in this Review, one being the existing line and the alternative line as presently (and previously) advocated by Belfast City Council, I remain of the same view as I had set out in my report to Mr Mackenzie in 2008/09, in that both lines are readily identifiable and both are based on geographic features that are readily identifiable boundaries.
- 5.3.20 In terms of which line I prefer in this present Review, my conclusion is based on two factors. The first is that there was extremely limited support during the consultation for a review of the line in this area either as advocated by Belfast City Council or at all. The second is the

fact that the line, as it currently stands, is the clear and certain line as passed into law by the 2012 Order and which, given the lack of representation on this issue during this Review, seems to have been accepted as the boundary by most people living and working in the area. I believe this gives the existing district boundary line strength and credibility. Moreover, as outlined by Belfast City Council, there has been little or no topographic change in this area since the last Review.

- 5.3.21 My working principle of minimum intervention has helped inform my judgment on this issue, but I would wish to be clear that had there been any significant change of population in this area or new housing developments on the boundary line or indeed any other change to the size, shape population or physical diversity of the area, then I would not hesitate to review the line in accordance with my statutory remit. Based on present evidence and information, I see no reason to change the line in this area as it currently stands.

#### **5.4 Boundary of the Newry, Mourne and Down District**

- 5.4.1 I received 1 representation on the District Boundary with Ards and North Down District. An individual made the following representation:

*I do not detect any great desire for change in the internal ward boundaries for Newry Mourne and Down. However, there is an obvious groundswell of opinion in the east Down area that it is inappropriately linked with Newry in a local government district which stretches from Saintfield to Cullaville, beyond Crossmaglen on the border with County Monaghan. There is no hope of creating commonality of interest in an area which is so geographically and socially incoherent. This incoherence is so marked that it suggests some unacknowledged factor was at play when the Newry Mourne and Down District Council area was created. The Downpatrick, Rowallane, and Slieve Croob electoral areas, and Newcastle with the northern part of the Mournes electoral area, were formerly part of the Down District Council area centred on the former county town of Downpatrick. This reflected the social, economic, educational, historical and transport realities of the various communities which have little or no day-to-day relationship with Newry. This reality is also recognised in health provision, with Downpatrick and its hinterland being in the South-Eastern Health and Social Care Board area, while Newry is within the remit of the Southern Board. Some change is bound to be necessary over time. But while there are obvious challenges in ensuring fairness in electoral representation, I suggest that clear social factors are as important as electoral head-counting in achieving the kind of cohesion required for successful local government. In that regard it is suggested that much happier and more effective local government would be achieved by linking together the east Down electoral areas of Downpatrick, Rowallane, Slieve Croob, and the Newcastle side of the Mournes with the Comber, Newtownards and Ards Peninsula wards of the present North Down and Ards Council. This would create an East Down Council area which is historically and socially coherent and where a community of interest could be fostered around Strangford Lough. This could never happen in the present Newry Mourne and Down Council area. This proposal would require adjustments of Council boundaries in adjoining areas but this could be done without*

*violating their natural catchment areas and communities in the way which now afflicts Newry Mourne and Down.*

- 5.4.2 This representation suggests the way in which legislation and policy could be shaped in order to allow me to consider and perhaps even prioritise social cohesion and other social and practical matters which relate directly to the efficacy of the provision of local government services. These are arguments for the potential reform of the legislation so that links between local communities, cohesion and historic patterns of social activity across regions are given equal weight to the statutory considerations when delineating Districts, but they are out of scope of the legislation as it presently stands
- 5.4.3 I have given primacy to the statutory rules when delineating boundaries and the factors within the rules are focused on number balancing and geographical features, such as drawing boundary lines which can be said to be 'readily identifiable' and achieving wards with 'substantially the same' number of electors. I can also consider matters of 'size, population and physical diversity' of a district. In determining ward boundaries, I have taken account of all of the statutory Rules. However, the requirement under Rule 19 to create wards which contain substantially the same number of electors means that, in some instances, there will be lines drawn which may not exactly correspond to historic community links due to changes in the distribution of population over time.
- 5.4.4 It is my assessment that this submission is out of scope in terms of my statutory remit. The consultee bases his argument on the following grounds:
- '... while there are obvious challenges in ensuring fairness in electoral representation I suggest that clear social factors are as important as electoral head-counting in achieving the kind of cohesion required for successful local government.'*
- 5.4.5 Social factors and the way that services are delivered cannot be given priority over the statutory rules on creating readily identifiable boundaries and creating wards with substantially the same number of electors. Therefore, I am not persuaded to accommodate any of these proposed changes.

### **Numbers and boundaries of wards**

#### **5.5 Newry, Mourne and Down District**

- 5.5.1 I received 1 representation in this District on ward boundaries. A councillor made a representation as follows:

*I have previously raised my concerns regarding the retention of the area of Killowen, Rostrevor within the Lisnacree Ward of the Mournes DEA. Killowen & Rostrevor form Kilbroney parish and as such it is regarded as an integral part of Rostrevor, and the wider Crotlieve DEA, where the residents of Killowen shop, socialise, attend church & go to school. It's people regard me as their local councillor based on the amount of requests for help that I receive from the area, they are both physically and psychologically detached from the Mournes DEA and have zero affiliation with local councillors who are based up to 20 miles away from where they live. The residents of Killowen who engage me on these matters are outraged at what has become in*

*effect their disenfranchisement from the electoral process and their ability to vote for people who genuinely have their best interests at heart. I implore your office to once again give this matter the due consideration that it deserves and should my pleas continue to fall on deaf ears, I would be grateful if you would provide a detailed rationale as to why your office believes the best interests of the residents of Killowen are served by elected members who are based miles away.*

5.5.2 I am unable to accept this representation as it is framed around the issue of District Electoral Areas (DEA's). The issue of DEA's is out of scope of this Review. The Review of District Electoral Areas is a separate statutory process which immediately follows the enactment of any legislation passed which amends existing local government boundaries. The Review of DEA's is **not** done in tandem with this Review and the modelling of DEA's cannot be a consideration in this Review.

5.5.3 To be clear, once any change is enacted to the Local Government Boundaries by legislation, the legislative requirement to review the DEA's in all 11 Districts will be triggered. DEA's are the vehicle used to group wards together, usually in number of 5-7 wards, for the purpose of holding local government elections. DEA's are used by councils in terms of planning and strategy for the different DEAs within the District, as the wards are grouped into different DEAs based on matters such as proximity, shared features or commonality of interests.

5.5.4 In the event that my Final Recommendations are passed into law, an immediate Review of District Electoral Areas will be launched. More information can be obtained from Elections Policy Branch of the Northern Ireland Office and details of this will be published on my website at the conclusion of my Review. Any Review of District Electoral Areas will give all stakeholders and citizens a comprehensive opportunity to participate and make representations for remodelling of DEA's under the terms of the legislation for that Review.

## **5.6 Belfast district**

5.6.1 I received a representation on behalf of the Social Democratic and Labour Party in South Belfast. The representation outlines '*grave concerns that the plans to decimate a number of the wards in South Belfast will have a detrimental impact on their residents and the city more generally*'

5.6.2 I would wish to be clear that my proposed number of wards allocated to Belfast is 60 and this is the same as the suggested number of wards in the governing legislation. I have not decided to increase the number of wards pursuant to my discretion to do so up to a limit of 65, but neither have I decided to decrease the number of Belfast wards pursuant to my discretion to do so to a lower limit of 55.

5.6.3 Another concern is outlined in relation to electoral turnout in South Belfast which is not a permissible consideration under this process.

5.6.4 A further concern is that the proposed recalibration of wards in South Belfast impacts diverse communities *'primarily on the southern parts of Stranmillis and Windsor wards so therefore lops off entire neighbourhoods of a similar cohesive nature rather than being done in a way which is equitable across the wards, and will effectively create a shells of wards with isolated and unconnected neighbourhoods, skewing the wards away from the current age, race, religious, economic and social diversity that they currently enjoy. Indeed, the extant wards in the northern portion of South Belfast form the most diverse area on the island of Ireland – this is at risk under these plans.'*

5.6.5 The characteristics of electors is not a permissible consideration. My legislative remit requires an exercise of number balancing which at times causes upheaval and change to what people have become used to. This is, at times, an unavoidable consequence of a boundary review.

5.6.6 A further concern is that:

*too much of the southern end of the Windsor and Stranmillis wards are being transferred to Malone – while we accept that some move across may be required and support this, the wholesale lifting of entire sections of this part of the community across will be too detrimental to the fabric of this one area – to cleave the patch between Hillside Drive and Deramore Park South, and the area around the Marlborough Park South, Central and North, focuses too much change on one specific area of Stranmillis and Windsor, and will result in a seismic impact on the demographic nature of these wards, not to mention on the residents of these areas themselves. For example, the Holylands area which has no link with the Stranmillis community geographically or in terms of character, is being brought within the Stranmillis ward to reduce the number of electors within the current Central ward, while parts of Stranmillis itself are being taken out of the ward altogether, unnecessarily splitting natural communities. Likewise, parts of Blackstaff are being moved into Windsor, only for communities at the southern end of Windsor to be cut off from neighbouring streets and moved into Malone. We don't believe that due consideration has been given to the impact of this in either the provisional recommendations or the revised recommendations, so would be very grateful if the Commissioner would consider a much-reduced transfer between Stranmillis and Windsor to Malone e.g. leave the stretch from Hillside Drive and Deramore Park South within Stranmillis, or leave Marlborough Park South, Central and North within Windsor, to reduce the upheaval in this part of South Belfast. We appreciate the mathematical impact of this, but strongly believe that it is important to keep similar communities intact.*

5.6.7 I note that the representation acknowledges that the mathematical impact of these changes would be problematic. I cannot give priority to community links and cohesion over the statutory requirement to create wards which contain substantially the same number of electors and so I cannot recommend any change to the proposals on this basis.

5.6.8 A further concern was stated as:

*We also have remaining concerns that in any extant, proposed or further revised configurations, the population density in South Belfast means that there are not enough wards to adequately serve the community compared with other parts of the*

*city. We welcome the Assistant Commissioner's agreement with our proposal on this in terms of his suggestions for the creation of a new 'University' ward to ease the pressure on those wards in that part of the city, and would ask the Commissioner to reconsider this proposal. We note that she comments in her provisional recommendations that although she "did not choose a model of more than 60 wards for my Provisional Recommendations, I would not rule out using my discretion to increase or to decrease the number of wards as a method of configuring boundaries within a District and this submission provides a welcome opportunity to further test the issue in the context of this district," so would ask her use exercise this discretion in this instance.*

5.6.9 I would reiterate the evidence provided to me on population and migration statistics and projections about Belfast from the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency as set out at 6.4.9 – 6.4.12 of my Revised Recommendation's Report. I cannot see any evidential basis based on population statistics for Belfast City which would persuade me that the creation of new wards in the south of the city can be justified

5.6.10 Another concern was stated as:

*We would also raise the point that there is likely to be population growth in the communities around Queen's University, given efforts to address ongoing issues and rebuild communities in the Holylands and wider university area, as well as plans for large student accommodation – we don't believe this has been factored into considerations.*

5.6.11 Again, I would reiterate the evidence provided to me on population and migration statistics and projections about Belfast from the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency as set out at 6.4.9 – 6.4.12 of my Revised Recommendation's Report. I cannot see any evidential basis based on population statistics for Belfast City which would persuade me that the creation of new wards in the area of South Belfast can be justified

## **5.7 Names of districts and wards**

5.7.1 I received a comprehensive submission from Foras na Gaeilge expressing disagreement with my conclusions about the use of Irish language as a general policy across the map in terms of the place naming of Districts and of wards. My conclusion was based on two key points;

5.7.2 Firstly that my remit for the naming of Districts and Wards, in my view, is linked to my primary role and function as intended by the legislation, which is that of carrying out spatial delineation of administrative boundaries based primarily on regulating electoral parity and on mapping according to geographic and spatial considerations. I reaffirm my view that my remit for naming Districts and wards is directly connected to that primary function and is not separate, self-contained or to be seen through any other lens than that of creating administrative wards and districts and naming the units thereby created by way of description that is based on local reference points.

5.7.3 Secondly, the issue of using the Irish language in public administration as a general principle is a matter of policy and not of law. I reaffirm my position as set out in my Revised Proposals Report that, in law, English is the general language of public administration in Northern Ireland although very recent developments may change this position. I accept that my

position on this is rejected by Foras na Gaeilge, but I remain unpersuaded by their arguments to change my conclusions on this.

- 5.7.4 It is my assessment that I can only operate under existing applicable law and my stated approach to my governing legislation in terms of the issue of the naming of Districts and Wards (an approach which I have clearly set out in my previous reports). It is my assessment that I have neither the necessary remit nor the full information to set out a full map of Northern Ireland with proposals for 462 wards names and 11 District names in the Irish language which can be said to be accurate and fully and fairly tested. Based on the evidence, including that from the Place Names Project (which is incomplete at present), I cannot confidently conclude that any option of such a final and complete model exists. Such a model may well be something that can be further researched and achieved under a comprehensive language framework and strategy with advice and guidance of a specialist Commissioner for Languages, for example that which is proposed in the *New Decade New Approach* (NDNA). As I have previously stated in my Revised Recommendations Report, at the time of writing this report, the commitments to developing the NDNA framework and appointing Commissioners for minority languages have not yet been fully enacted.
- 5.7.5 Furthermore, aside from the matter of ward names (which can only be named under this type of process) I would re-iterate the freedoms which exist for any individual council that may choose to legally change its current District name. This can be achieved by use of democratic means pursuant to Section 51 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 1972. This enables any council to adapt its District name which includes the option of using another language, should that be the will of any individual council.
- 5.7.6 All of that said, I have made it clear in my Revised Recommendations Report that I do accept that I have the authority under my own legislative remit to listen to and consider views on a case by case basis as to the appropriate naming of individual wards and districts. This can include the desire for a ward to be named according to the traditions of the community living within it, which may include names in a minority language as a local reference point. Indeed, it is true to say that local geographical features after which wards are named often bear Irish language names.
- 5.7.7 In Chapter 5 of my Revised Recommendations Report, I set out how I make the distinction between the wider submission on the use of the Irish language across the whole map, which is a request to develop a policy approach on the use and official recognition of a language, and those submissions which are more local and nuanced in terms of how local people in specific areas refer to the name for their locality which, in some cases, may be linked to the use of a language and strong cultural heritage of a particular local area.
- 5.7.8 I have set out in my Revised Recommendations Report that I see merit in the recommendations of the Assistant Commissioner for the District of Belfast City to potentially rename 7 stipulated wards in the Irish language and I have sought further views on what the Irish language names should be.
- 5.7.9 I am very grateful for the response from Foras na Gaeilge on this issue. They state that they *'understand and welcome the reasoning presented in the Belfast area report of evidence of particular level of use of the Irish language in the seven particular local wards referenced'*. They submit that the original name in Irish of *Turf Lodge* is *Lóiste na Móna*. In relation to Cliftonville, they submit that *'...it is more complex. Cliftonville Road in Dublin has been*

*translated by Dublin Council as "Bóthar Cliathmhuine" which provides an option but the name could be checked with QUB Placenames NI.* They concur that the other five names set out in my Revised Recommendations Report are correct.

Foras na Gaeilge also emphasise that *'the same reasoning for bilingual naming of the seven wards in Belfast also exists in many other places within the jurisdiction of other Councils where the use of the Irish language has reached such a level of prevalence'*.

They go on to say that *'The Assistant Commissioner reports cite at least four other Council areas where a bilingual approach for the naming of specific local wards or districts was advocated for. We would urge consideration of other proposals for renaming in the context of information previously provided.'*

- 5.7.10 I am not satisfied that a sufficient level of evidence exists in any other District for specific local ward naming in any other language based on the present evidence and the submissions received. At the moment, I can see no basis upon which to recommend any other specific place names other than those identified for certain specific wards in the District of Belfast City.
- 5.7.11 Based on the evidence available at the moment, I am not satisfied that there is an agreed name in the Irish language which I could confidently propose for the ward of Cliftonville and therefore I make no proposals for change.
- 5.7.12 In respect of the other 6 wards of the 7 identified in the Revised Recommendations Report I recommend that the wards be named as follows:

Turf Lodge – Turf Lodge/Lóiste na Móna

Ballymurphy – Ballymurphy/Baile Uí Mhurchú;

Beechmount – Beechmount/Ard na bhFeá;

New Lodge – New Lodge/An Lóiste Úr;

Shaw's Road – Shaw's Road/Bóthar Seoighe;

Twinbrook – Twinbrook/Cill Uiaghe.

## Chapter 6. Final Recommendations for the 11 Districts.

### 6.1 Antrim and Newtownabbey District

6.1.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Antrim and Newtownabbey](#)

**Table 1. Antrim and Newtownabbey**

<b>Number of wards – 40</b>	<b>Total electorate – 100909</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Abbey	2433
Aldergrove	2731
Antrim Centre	2726
Ballyclare East	2774
Ballyclare West	2771
Ballyduff	2331
Ballyhenry	2541
Ballynure	2620
Ballyrobert	2732
Burnthill	2393
Carnmoney	2338
Carnmoney Hill	2364
Clady	2728
Collinbridge	2320
Cranfield	2319
Crumlin	2632
Doagh	2510
Fairview	2356

Fountain Hill	2307
Glebe	2367
Glengormley	2483
Greystone	2433
Hightown	2670
Jordanstown	2543
Mallusk	2733
Monkstown	2487
Mossley	2505
O'Neill	2285
Parkgate	2464
Randalstown	2531
Rathcoole	2290
Rostulla	2700
Shilvodan	2710
Springfarm	2771
Steeple	2748
Stiles	2355
Templepatrick	2582
Toome	2698
Valley	2280
Whitehouse	2348

## 6.2 Ards and North Down

6.2.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Ards and North Down](#)

**Table 2. Ards and North Down**

<b>Number of wards – 40</b>	<b>Total electorate - 118539</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Ballycrochan	2887
Ballygowan	3228
Ballygrainey	3251
Ballyholme	2975
Ballymagee	2861
Ballywalter	3258
Bloomfield	3197
Broadway	3081
Bryansburn	3012
Carrowdore	3060
Castle	2835
Clandeboye	2750
Comber North	2790
Comber South	2856
Comber West	2828
Conway Square	2940
Cronstown	3083
Cultra	3141
Donaghadee	2955
Glen	3212
Gregstown	2826
Groomsport	2883
Harbour	2898
Helen's Bay	3023
Hollywood	3220
Kilcooley	2870

Killinchy	2812
Kircubbin	2849
Loughries	3141
Loughview	3106
Movilla	2698
Portaferry	2866
Portavogie	2707
Rathgael	2727
Rathmore	2924
Scrabo	3208
Silverbirch	2892
Silverstream	2681
Warren	3172
West Winds	2836

### 6.3 Armagh City, Banbridge and Craigavon.

6.3.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Armagh City, Banbridge and Craigavon](#)

**Table 3. Armagh City, Craigavon and Banbridge**

<b>Number of wards - 41</b>	<b>Total electorate 149505</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed electorate</b>
Aghagallon	3698
Ballybay	3776
Banbridge East	3533
Banbridge North	3331
Banbridge South	3511

Banbridge West	3785
Blackwatertown	3950
Bleary	3521
Brownlow	3902
Cathedral	3364
Corcrain	3485
Craigavon Centre	3743
Demesne	3749
Derrytrasna	3606
Donaghcloney	3382
Dromore	3394
Gilford	3339
Gransha	3469
Hamiltonsbawn	3620
Keady	3697
Kernan	3975
Killycomain	3917
Knocknashane	3296
Lough Road	3802
Loughbrickland	3616
Loughgall	3928
Magheralin	3672
Mahon	3532
Markethill	3849
Mourneview	3706
Navan	3749
Parklake	3719
Quilly	3292
Rathfriland	3447
Richhill	3588

Seagahan	3951
Shankill	3836
Tandragee	3640
The Birches	3718
The Mall	3573
Waringstown	3844

## 6.4 Belfast

6.4.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for the boundaries in this district remain unchanged however there has been some changes to the names of wards. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Belfast](#)

**Table 4. Belfast**

<b>Number of wards – 60</b>	<b>Total electorate - 230236</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Andersonstown	3713
Ardoyne	4018
Ballygomartin	4129
Ballymacarrett	3819
Ballymurphy/Baile Uí Mhurchú	3599
Ballysillan	3651
Beechmount/Ard na bhFeá	3604
Beersbridge	3611
Bellevue	3672
Belmont	3608
Belvoir	3681

Blackstaff	4209
Bloomfield	3618
Cavehill	3513
Central	4214
Chichester Park	3860
Cliftonville	3896
Clonard	3828
Collin Glen	4089
Connswater	3975
Cregagh	3490
Duncairn	4088
Dunmurry	3878
Falls	3457
Falls Park	3707
Finaghy	4217
Forth River	3479
Fortwilliam	3876
Garnerville	3553
Gilnahirk	3740
Hillfoot	3630
Innisfayle	3932
Knock	3649
Ladybrook	3927
Lagmore	3986
Legoniel	3772
Malone	4202
Merok	3513
Musgrave	4219
New Lodge/An Lóiste Úr	3460
Orangefield	3713

Ormeau	4200
Poleglass	4131
Ravenhill	3485
Rosetta	3854
Sandown	3794
Shandon	4000
Shankill	4086
Shaw's Road/Bóthar Seoighe	3984
Stewartstown	3644
Stormont	3791
Stranmillis	4184
Sydenham	3732
Turf Lodge/Lóiste na Móna	3521
Twinbrook/Cill Uiaghe	4198
Upper Malone	4218
Water Works	3954
Windsor	4178
Woodstock	3793
Woodvale	3694

## 6.5 Causeway Coast and Glens

6.5.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Causeway Coast and Glens](#)

### Table 5. Causeway Coast and Glens

<b>Number of wards – 40</b>	<b>Total Electorate count - 99539</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Aghadowey	2565
Altahullion	2333
Atlantic	2613
Ballycastle	2386
Ballykelly	2572
Ballymoney East	2306
Ballymoney North	2341
Ballymoney South	2318
Castlerock	2671
Churchland	2643
Clogh Mills	2646
Coolessan	2256
Dervock	2480
Drumsumn	2265
Dundooan	2489
Dungiven	2511
Dunloy	2574
Feeny	2438
Garvagh	2362
Giant's Causeway	2435
Greysteel	2654
Greystone	2349
Hopefield	2593
Kilrea	2661
Kinbane	2710
Loughguile and Stranocum	2624
Lurigethan	2258

Macosquin	2675
Magilligan	2252
Mountsandel	2611
Portrush and Dunluce	2265
Portstewart	2302
Quarry	2590
Rasharkin	2704
Roeside	2260
Route	2398
Torr Head and Rathlin	2532
University	2456
Waterside	2731
Windy Hall	2710

## 6.6 Derry City and Strabane District

6.6.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Derry City and Strabane](#)

**Table 6. Derry City and Strabane District**

<b>Number of wards – 40</b>	<b>Total Electorate - 109899</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Artigarvan	2653
Ballycolman	2636
Ballymagroarty	2820
Brandywell	2573
Carn Hill	2996

Castleberg	2536
Caw	2959
City Walls	2457
Claudy	2605
Clondermot	2877
Creggan	2820
Creggan South	2843
Culmore	2790
Drumahoe	2972
Dunnamanagh	2585
Ebrington	2746
Eglinton	2868
Enagh	2930
Finn	2654
Foyle Springs	2624
Galliagh	2891
Glenderg	2479
Glenelly Valley	2532
Kilfennan	3036
Lisnagelvin	2496
Madam's Bank	2923
New Buildings	2825
Newtownstewart	2643
Northland	2985
Park	2574
Shantallow	2980
Shantallow East	3021
Sheriff's Mountain	2591
Sion Mills	2749
Skeoge	2843

Slievekirk	2612
Springtown	2534
Strabane North	2767
Strabane West	2546
Victoria	2928

## 6.7 Fermanagh and Omagh

6.7.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Fermanagh and Omagh](#)

**Table 7. Fermanagh and Omagh**

<b>Number of wards – 40</b>	<b>Total Electorate - 84713</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Ballinamallard	2316
Belcoo and Garrison	2121
Belleek and Boa	2237
Beragh	2109
Boho, Cleenish and Letterbreen	2312
Brookeborough	1985
Camowen	2186
Castlecoole	2284
Coolnagard	2072
Dergmoney	2123
Derrygonnelly	2072
Derrylin	1988
Donagh	2000

Dromore	1986
Drumnakilly	2161
Drumquin	2149
Ederney and Kesh	2223
Erne	2122
Fairy Water	2209
Fintona	1923
Florence Court and Kinawley	2243
Gortin	2257
Gortrush	2217
Irvinestown	2199
Killiclogher	2124
Lisbellaw	2232
Lisnarrick	2320
Lisnaskea	2042
Maguiresbridge	2007
Newtownbutler	1977
Newtownsaville	2070
Owenkillew	2086
Portora	2255
Rosslea	1988
Rossorry	2011
Sixmilecross	2033
Strule	2003
Tempo	2142
Termon	1960
Trillick	1969

## 6.8 Lisburn and Castlereagh

6.8.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Lisburn and Castlereagh](#)

**Table 8. Lisburn and Castlereagh**

<b>Number of wards – 40</b>	<b>Total electorate – 104519</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Ballinderry	2862
Ballyhanwood	2351
Ballymacash	2797
Ballymacbrennan	2370
Ballymacoss	2907
Beechill	2513
Blaris	2467
Cairnshill	2687
Carrowreagh	2788
Carryduff East	2642
Carryduff West	2484
Derryaghy	2868
Dromara	2468
Drumbo	2377
Dundonald	2393
Enler	2742
Galwally	2437
Glenavy	2743
Graham's Bridge	2842

Harmony Hill	2449
Hilden	2469
Hillhall	2766
Hillsborough	2664
Knockbracken	2455
Knockmore	2937
Lagan	2538
Lagan Valley	2353
Lambeg	2536
Lisnagarvey	2793
Maghaberry	2833
Magheralave	2693
Maze	2352
Moira	2716
Moneyreagh	2394
Newtownbreda	2354
Old Warren	2781
Ravernet	2396
Stonyford	2814
Wallace Park	2847
White Mountain	2641

## 6.9 Mid and East Antrim

6.9.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Mid and East Antrim](#)

### Table 9. Mid and East Antrim

<b>Number of wards – 40</b>	<b>Total Electorate - 99429</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Academy	2241
Ahoghill	2316
Ardeevin	2311
Ballee and Harryville	2295
Ballycarry and Glynn	2733
Ballykeel	2354
Boneybefore	2479
Braidwater	2245
Broughshane	2546
Burleigh Hill	2713
Cairncastle	2674
Carnlough and Glenarm	2346
Castle	2656
Castle Demesne	2260
Craigyhill	2730
Cullybackey	2261
Curran and Inver	2477
Fair Green	2311
Galgorm	2425
Gardenmore	2458
Glenravel	2535
Glenwhirry	2611
Gortalee	2536
Grange	2699
Greenisland	2557
Islandmagee	2367
Kells	2484

Kilroot	2712
Kilwaughter	2732
Kirkinriola	2359
Love Lane	2421
Maine	2518
Park	2243
Portglenone	2324
Slemish	2421
Sunnylands	2686
The Maidens	2473
Victoria	2691
Whitehead South	2530
Woodburn	2699

## 6.10 Mid Ulster

6.10.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Mid Ulster](#)

**Table 10. Mid Ulster**

<b>Number of wards – 40</b>	<b>Total Electorate - 101427</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Ardboe	2690
Augher and Clogher	2474
Aughnacloy	2501
Ballygawley	2613
Ballymaguigan	2781
Ballysaggart	2639

Bellaghy	2714
Caledon	2686
Castlecaulfield	2567
Castledawson	2611
Coagh	2386
Coalisland North	2667
Coalisland South	2755
Cookstown East	2326
Cookstown South	2330
Cookstown West	2515
Coolshinny	2728
Donaghmore	2547
Draperstown	2290
Fivemiletown	2294
Glebe	2609
Killyman	2608
Killymeal	2668
Lissan	2518
Loughry	2276
Lower Glenshane	2363
Maghera	2370
Moy	2472
Moygashel	2552
Mullaghmore	2763
Oaklands	2384
Pomeroy	2464
Stewartstown	2309
Swatragh	2495
Tamlaght O'Crilly	2611
The Loup	2757

Tobermore	2424
Town Parks East	2493
Valley	2542
Washing Bay	2635

## 6.11 Newry, Mourne and Down

6.11.1 Following the consultation exercise on my Revised Recommendations Report the proposals for this district remain unchanged. The map for this district can be viewed here: [Newry, Mourne and Down](#)

**Table 11. Newry Mourne and Down**

<b>Number of wards – 41</b>	<b>Total Electorate - 127075</b>
<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Proposed Electorate</b>
Abbey	3277
Annalong	3111
Ballybot	3349
Ballydugan	2807
Ballynahinch	3054
Ballyward	3255
Bessbrook	3390
Binnian	3031
Burren	3127
Camlough	2894
Castlewellan	2964
Cathedral	2817
Crossgar and Killyleagh	3084
Crossmaglen	2952

Damolly	3371
Derryboy	3014
Derryleckagh	3086
Donard	2860
Drumalane	3355
Drumaness	2968
Dundrum	3117
Fathom	3288
Forkhill	3059
Hilltown	3398
Kilkeel	2848
Kilmore	2921
Knocknashinna	3003
Lecale	2953
Lisnacree	3068
Mayobridge	3414
Mullaghbane	3151
Murlough	3239
Newtownhamilton	2944
Quoile	2937
Rostrevor	3312
Saintfield	3008
St Patrick's	3398
Strangford	2974
Tollymore	3148
Warrenpoint	3237
Whitecross	2892