



THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
TASMANIA

Comment on public suggestion number 2

Alex Jago

2 pages

Tasmanian Federal Redistribution, 2016

Comments on Suggestions

Dear Committee members,

My comments on suggestions are below.

Best Regards,
Alex Jago
5th December 2016

Specific Comments

Submissions, 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 & 18 all relate exclusively to the naming of that Division currently known as 'Denison'. My position is that it should instead be named 'Inglis Clark'. In particular, Andrew Wilkie MP, the Member for Denison, supports the renaming. A stronger endorsement could not be had. I note the various suggestions that any rename only take effect when the boundaries of the Division are modified substantially. I now support that compromise.

Submission 2 proposes that Tasmania only deserves four Divisions on a population basis. This is true. However, as per the Constitution, Tasmania along with every other original State, gets a minimum of five Divisions. Anyone bothered by this should try to amend the Constitution. Good luck.

Submission 3, Jeff Waddell's, is as always, comprehensive. Along with almost everybody, he's proposed giving Latrobe LGA back to Braddon. He's done what I dared not and swapped West Tamar into Bass for Scottsdale-Bridport and everything northeast. I guess we'll soon find out who objects to that. I'm not convinced that splitting Hobart and Glenorchy LGAs is the correct course of action, but given his interpretation of 3(b)(iii) it's the only choice.

Submission 4 is my own. Nothing major ventured. I'll soon find out if anything truly objectionable is in it.

Submission 6, Martin Gordon's, provides a similar proposal to S3, but gives the Meander Valley to Lyons rather than the North-East. This keeps Lyons a bit more compact He's worked to keep whole LGAs in one Division, an admirable goal. I wonder whether these splits of Greater Hobart and Greater Launceston are really the best possible — but of course the existing boundaries aren't necessarily any better!

Submission 10, Darren McSweeney's, also proposes major changes in Bass, swapping West Tamar LGA for the North-East. Latrobe LGA goes to Braddon, of course. In the southeast, he's done as I have and united Brighton LGA in Lyons. Quite straightforward.

Submission 13, from West Tamar LGA, requests that West Tamar LGA become part of Bass. If the Commission substantially adopts either S3, S6, S10, S14, S21A or S21B, West Tamar will get their wish.

Submission 14, Mark Mulcair's, is very similar to S6 in the north, giving Latrobe LGA to Braddon and swapping West Tamar for Meander Valley. In the south, he unites Brighton LGA in Lyons.

Submission 15, from Latrobe LGA, requests to become part of Braddon (again). Seems likely!

Submission 16, James Walker's, looks to be identical to my own. Great minds think alike? Regarding *mapping software*, I have one word for Alderman Walker, and that word is QGIS.

Submission 17, the Greens', proposes Latrobe in Braddon and no changes in Bass. They suggest that on demographic and community-of-interest grounds, the part of Franklin that compensates Lyons should be Richmond rather than Old Beach (Brighton). As Franklin's population would still be a little high, they also propose to put Sandfly in Denison. A not unreasonable proposal.

Submission 19, Labor's, proposes Latrobe and a part of Kentish in Braddon, with a view to eventually including all of Kentish. They half-recommend that Bass' boundaries move south a little to incorporate a little more of Greater Launceston, in particular its airport. In the south, they recommend uniting Brighton LGA in Lyons, and for the Denison-Franklin boundary to move south a little at Kingston Beach. I agree with the former and I look forward to other's comments on the latter. They also support renaming Denison to 'Inglis Clark'.

Submission 20, the Liberals', proposes that Kentish LGA in its entirety goes to Braddon, rather than Latrobe. No change to Bass. In the south, Richmond goes to Lyons from Franklin, which makes plenty of sense on community-of-interest grounds, There also a minor boundary adjustment at Sandfly, to follow the Huon Highway; this creates a strong southern boundary.

Submission 21, Ken Hart's, contains *two* proposals; both are substantially different from any other. He also uses polling-booth numbers rather than Statistical Areas, which seems to have had a rather crucial impact.

21A's main objective appears to be reducing the area of Lyons. Rather than move the Latrobe LGA, (which apparently on polling-booth numbers would put Braddon over) Mr Hart proposes shifting population into Braddon in the *south*: Ouse, Bothwell, Glenora, Westerway. He claims that this area is accessible from Braddon. Presumably he refers to a link via the Lyell Hwy. However, given the last redistribution gave the West Coast to Braddon much because it *wasn't* very accessible from the rest of Lyons. Mr Hart proposes to extend Bass in the east (Scamander) and west (Wesley Vale), compensating Lyons with a bit more of the Launceston suburbs. In the south, Lyons gains more population from Franklin, including the eastern Clarence LGA and the entire South Arm peninsula. Franklin and Denison swap Kingston for Glenorchy. Frankly, I find this to be a bizarre proposal and I can only hope it makes more sense to Tasmanians than it does to me.

21B takes things further and in doing so becomes much more coherent. Mr Hart expands Bass even further west into the Latrobe (!) and return gives the North-East to Lyons. He retains the Braddon expansion in the southwest of Lyons. In the south, he expands Denison southwards to cover the Huon and Kingborough LGAs, while Franklin retains Clarence and gains Glenorchy. This makes much more sense, and I advise Mr Hart to examine Submission 3, which apart from Braddon is fairly similar.

Overall Comments

Regarding Braddon, almost everybody agrees that Latrobe LGA should be united in Braddon. Some argue that Kentish LGA should go to Braddon. Both are fairly sensible. If population growth permits, I think it would make sense for Latrobe to go to Braddon now and Kentish to join in next time around.

Regarding Bass: it is clearly possible to swap West Tamar LGA for Meander Valley or the North-East. I don't believe that a good boundary in the south of Launceston is achievable given quota requirements.

Regarding Lyons: there's never going to be a focal centre for this Division. The best we can do is to draw boundaries such that the Division is well connected and contains a coherent community of interest.

Regarding Franklin and Denison: I don't believe there's necessarily a good solution here. It comes down to a value judgement as to whether inner Hobart or Franklin should be split.