



Objection 92

Jeff Waddell

17 pages

Comments on the

Victorian Redistribution

Committee's proposal

April 2018

Author: Jeff Waddell

Address: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Disclaimer: Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the data provided in this submission, there may be unintended instances of calculation or raw data errors. As the author, I make no attempt to intentionally mislead the reader, nor for the reader to draw incorrect conclusions should any error of calculation be found in this submission. I have performed all calculations in good faith, assuming my work to be 100% correct.

Introduction

To the Augmented Electoral Commission for Victoria and the National Redistribution Manager

As the author of one of the original 67 submissions provided at the outset of this process, I appreciate the opportunity to provide some analysis and comment on both the proposed boundary changes and the report of the Redistribution Committee for Victoria.

Whilst this stage of the process is generally about lodging objections to proposed boundaries; it is my intention – as I did at this stage of the 2016 Northern Territory Redistribution – to also register my support to those parts of the proposal that I think are worthy of being retained for the final report that were either a part of my original submission or my comment on submissions.

SA1 Data published on AEC website (Excel)

This is a matter I have raised at previous redistributions, and is perhaps one that the National Redistribution Manager could take up with the ABS:

Like most Commonwealth Redistributions for other States; LGA boundaries form a significant portion of CED boundaries, yet the SA1 & SA2 Excel documents published on the AEC website still do not show (or even break down) SA1's that are split across multiple LGA's.

Somewhere in excess of 120 2011 SA1's traversed LGA boundaries in Victoria. These SA1's need to be broken down by both Division and LGA at all stages of the Redistribution process. This would allow those of us who take the time and effort to produce comprehensive submissions to further improve the accuracy of our proposals.

The handling of split SA1's

The 'vic-spatial' data published in Excel has a numerical suffix added where an SA1 has been divided between Divisions. As we all know, there are smaller units of measurements than SA1's – Mesh Blocks – and I would ask the augmented Electoral Commission to consider whether breaking split SA1's down by Mesh Blocks may be a better way of handling split SA1's. This would mean the only modification to the ABS numbering system would then need to occur where a Mesh Block is split between Divisions.

Comment on the Report of the Redistribution Committee for Victoria

Elector Movements

It is a relief to see that almost 1 in 5 Victorians will be voting in a different electoral Division at the next Federal Election compared to 2016.

Too often in the past, Redistribution Committees from various States have been obsessed with keeping elector movement between existing and proposed Divisions to a minimum. There is no legislative requirement for any such approach to be taken and it's refreshing to see such a relatively high number of electors moving between Divisions at this Redistribution.

To me, this indicates that new electoral boundaries have been constituted to better comply with paragraph 66(3)(b) of the Electoral Act - specifically paragraph 66(3)(b)(v) - which instructs that existing boundaries are of a lesser consideration than the requirements in paragraphs 66(3)(b)(i), 66(3)(b)(ii) & 66(3)(b)(iv).

Divisional name changes and the new Division of Fraser

Between pages 30 and 39 of the Redistribution Committee's report, it goes to great lengths to detail the logic behind the creation of the new Division of Fraser as well as the renaming of 4 other Divisions.

The renaming of Corangamite to Cox; Melbourne Ports to Macnamara; McMillan to Monash and Murray to Nicholls are all well detailed and show that the person(s) after which the Division is now renamed; had – for the greater part – some form of association to the Division.

- Cox – Swimming and Lifesaving – Surf Coast & Bellarine Peninsula-based Division.
- Macnamara – medical science – inner metropolitan Division
- Monash – Military Service, Engineering, State Electricity Commission Chair – Gippsland-based Division
- Nicholls – Aboriginal rights and welfare – Division incorporating place where both persons passed.

However, the same consideration has not been afforded former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser for the Division named in his honour.

As noted in my original submission, Malcolm Fraser was a pastoralist from the rural community of Nareen in the Western District of Victoria – from an *economic, social and regional communities of interest* and from an *area and physical features* perspective; Wannon is everything the proposed Division of Fraser is not.

Perhaps if the allocation of the new Divisional name been performed in conjunction with the renaming of 4 Divisions, we may have had a slightly different scenario.

Whilst I accept that any change is unlikely now, **I propose swapping the Divisional names of Monash and Fraser** as the simplest and most logical solution to providing all 5 new Divisional names an appropriate location within the State of Victoria

The Divisional name of Fraser would then represent the farming communities of the Bass Coast, Baw Baw and Cardinia Shires; whereas Monash would represent the western suburbs as he was born in West Melbourne.

Principles

The Redistribution Committee appears to have adopted the principle of proposing that electoral boundaries align with locality boundaries if they cannot align with LGA boundaries in non-metropolitan Divisions.

Having not read the ACT or SA proposals at the time of writing this document, I sincerely hope this principle is adopted for all future Redistributions for all States and Territories.

It is a principle I fully support, and I heartily commend the Redistribution Committee for applying it to this Redistribution. Hopefully this principle is here to stay for all future Commonwealth Redistributions.

Approach

Again, the report on proposed Divisions (pages 43 – 77) is detailed in Divisional Alphabetical Order rather than the order in which the Redistribution Committee would have assessed the Divisions.

I add my voice to those who have noted this approach in other recent Redistributions and encourage Redistribution Committees for future redistributions to return to the old process of detailing each Division as assessed.

Boundary changes in line with my original submission

I applaud the Redistribution Committee for adopting many suggestions contained in my original submission. Some of the suggestions were also supported by other submissions independently. In particular, I acknowledge the following:

- Uniting the Bellarine Peninsula in a single Division (Cox) using Coppards Rd as the basis for the Divisional boundary between Corio and Cox.
- Removing the balance of Golden Plains Shire from Ballarat
- Removing Central Goldfields Shire from Wannon
- Uniting Loddon Shire in Mallee
- Abolishing the Divisional Name of Murray and part of the logic behind that decision
- Uniting all of Banyule LGA in Jagajaga
- Making Scullin a wholly Whittlesea LGA Division
- Uniting Craigieburn in Calwell
- New Division of Fraser (my Monash) comprises electors from Brimbank and Maribyrnong LGA's
- Removing Moonee Valley LGA from Melbourne
- Uniting Bass Coast Shire in Monash (McMillan)
- Transferring Pakenham from Monash (McMillan) to La Trobe
- Limiting La Trobe to be a Division based on the Cardinia and Casey LGA's
- The re-orientation of both Bruce and Chisholm from north-south to east-west
- The eastward expansion of Bruce into Casey LGA.

Objections to proposed boundaries

I want to preface this objection by stating that overall, I applaud the Redistribution Committee's proposal. Even though there were a few suggestions in my proposal that did not get adopted, I recognise that the logic applied by the Redistribution Committee for taking their approach.

The submission by City of Maroondah Council to have as many of their constituents as possible contained within a single Division, would have been the catalyst for Menzies crossing the Yarra which blew away any chance of my proposed McEwen being adopted. Therefore, my biggest disappointment is that the proposed Division of McEwen still contains both urban and rural electors.

Specific objection and alternative proposal

Whilst much has been said in the media of the Redistribution Committee's proposed Division of Dunkley, I support the transfer of Carrum Downs, Sandhurst and Skye into Dunkley – especially as they are relatively disconnected from the balance of the Division of Isaacs.

However, I believe there is a problem with the Redistribution Committee's proposed Division of Flinders.

Whilst acknowledging that 4 suggestions recommended confining Flinders to just electors from within the Mornington Peninsula LGA; these suggestions – and therefore the Redistribution Committee's proposal – have neglected to consider, and therefore split, another community of interest.

Perhaps the Redistribution Committee missed my analysis on page 66 of my original submission where I wrote; *"I found its [Flinders] boundaries with Dunkley, Holt and La Trobe to be strong and any boundary changes with these Divisions was only likely to fragment communities of interest, not improve them."* This is exactly what has been proposed by the Redistribution Committee. However, some of this fragmentation can be reversed.

The Mornington Peninsula contains 2 distinct communities – the more densely populated western side based around Port Phillip Bay and the less densely populated east side based around Western Port. The Western Port community does not end at the Mornington Peninsula – Casey LGA boundary. And I would ask the Redistribution Committee to also consider the community of interest currently contained within the State Electoral District of Hastings (link below)

<https://www.vec.vic.gov.au/images/maps/Hastings%20District%20MapHR.pdf>

Not only from an *economic, social and regional* communities of interest, but also from an *area and physical features* perspective; the communities of Tooradin, Blind Bight, Cannons Creek, Warneet and Pearcedale have a closer connection with Somerville, Tyabb, Hastings and Crib Point than they do with the more urbanised and higher population density suburbs of Cranbourne, its geographic derivatives North, East and West; Narre Warren South and Hampton Park.

Therefore, I humbly request that the augmented Electoral Commission consider reversing some of the changes applied to Flinders and return all of the Pearcedale – Tooradin and all of the Cranbourne South SA2's to Flinders; including Cranbourne South SA1 # 130310 (which is currently in the Division of La Trobe and proposed to transfer to Holt). These reversals leave Flinders over quota and Holt under quota.

To resolve these resulting discrepancies, a series of changes are proposed for Bruce, Dunkley, Flinders, Holt, Hotham, Isaacs and La Trobe which – I believe – improves the communities of interest of all 7 Divisions beyond the improvements already proposed by the Redistribution Committee.

Flinders

As noted above, Flinders regains the SA2's of Cranbourne South and Pearcedale – Tooradin from the proposed Holt. Flinders should also gain the locality of Langwarrin South from Dunkley. It can then transfer back to Dunkley, all of the Mornington SA2 except for the SE corner bound by Dunns Rd to the west and Mornington - Tyabb Rd to the north.

Numerical constraints prevent the entire Mornington SA2 being returned to Dunkley. The augmented Electoral Commission should also note that my proposed reversal involves splitting 2 x SA1's; therefore, the real number of electors returned to Dunkley may vary slightly from the estimates below – but not enough to put either Division outside either current or projected enrolment tolerances.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed Flinders		107,220	109,828
From Proposed Dunkley	Langwarrin SA1's 137426 & 137427 - Locality of Langwarrin South	927	960
From Proposed Holt	Cranbourne South SA2 - all	6,449	6,848
From Proposed Holt	Pearcedale - Tooradin SA2 - all	5,671	5,865
To Proposed Dunkley	Mornington SA2 - part. Exc E of Dunns Rd & S of Mornington-Tyabb Rd	-14,197	-14,526
New Total		106,070	108,975
Variation		-0.83%	-1.27%
To Flinders	Total transfers in	13,047	13,673
From Flinders	Total transfers out	-14,197	-14,526

Flinders' new boundary now runs from where the Mornington – Mount Martha locality boundary meets Port Phillip Bay; ESE along the locality boundary and continuing ESE along Bentons Rd; NNE along Dunns Rd; ESE along Mornington – Tyabb Rd; NNE along the Moorooduc Hwy; east along Sages Rd and continuing east along Baxter – Tooradin Rd; NNE onto Peninsula Link; east along Robinsons Rd; north along Dandenong – Hastings Rd; NE along Cranbourne – Frankston Rd; ESE along Ballarto Rd (and following a line in continuation through Cranbourne's Royal Botanic Gardens); NNE onto Clyde – Five Ways Rd; ESE along Pattersons Rd; SE along Pound Rd and aligning with the Casey – Cardinia LGA boundary all the way into Western Port.

Holt

Holt now needs to extend further north to recover electors lost in its south. I propose Holt use the Princes Highway and Monash Freeway as its northern boundary in line with my original submission.

Holt's new northern boundary continues further north along the Dandenong – Hastings Rd (a.k.a. South Gippsland Freeway) to the Princes Highway, then turns in a generally ESE direction along the Princes Highway until it crosses the M1. Then turning SE along the M1 and finally south along Clyde Rd before uniting with the Redistribution Committee's proposed boundary just north of the Clyde Rd – Glasscocks Rd – Grices Rd intersection.

These changes strengthen Holt's community of interests in that it is now a wholly high-density urban Division and its connection with the Western Port coastal areas removed.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed Holt		100,170	109,847
From Proposed Bruce	Hallam SA2 - part - S of Princes Hwy	1,736	1,782
From Proposed Bruce	Narre Warren SA2 - part - S of Princes Hwy	1,051	1,086
From Proposed La Trobe	Berwick - South SA2 - part - W of Clyde Rd	5,147	5,366
From Proposed La Trobe	Narre Warren SA2 - part - S of Princes Hwy	4,693	4,909
From Proposed La Trobe	Narre Warren South SA2 - balance	0	0
To Proposed Flinders	Cranbourne South SA2 - all	-6,449	-6,848
To Proposed Flinders	Pearcedale - Tooradin SA2 - all	-5,671	-5,865
New Total		100,677	110,277
Variation		-5.87%	-0.09%
To Holt	Total transfers in	12,627	13,143
From Holt	Total transfers out	-12,120	-12,713

La Trobe

Having to supplement Holt's shortfall, La Trobe needs to gain electors from elsewhere. I propose that La Trobe's western boundary, north of the Princes Highway, move from Narre Warren North Road to Hallam North Road. La Trobe therefore gains all electors in the bloc bound by Narre Warren North Rd to the east; Narre Warren North's northern locality boundary to the north (aligning in part with the Casey – Yarra Ranges and Casey – Knox LGA boundary); Hallam North Rd and Belgrave – Hallam Rd to the west; the Princes Highway and Princes Freeway to the south. This is in line with my original submission.

In addition, I also propose that La Trobe return to the former Division of McMillan (proposed Monash) the localities of Maryknoll, Tynong North and all localities further east in the Bunyip - Garfield SA2 and that the current La Trobe – McMillan Divisional boundary through the Emerald – Cockatoo SA1 # 128901 is reinstated.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed La Trobe		102,129	109,705
From Proposed Bruce	Hallam SA2 - part - E of Belgrave - Hallam Rd and N of Princes Hwy	2,219	2,263
From Proposed Bruce	Narre Warren North SA2 - part - All exc. part SA1 129911 - W of Belgrave - Hallam Rd	2,804	2,954
From Proposed Bruce	Narre Warren SA2 - part - N of Princes Hwy and W of Narre Warren North Rd	7,789	7,924
To Proposed Holt	Berwick - South SA2 - part - W of Clyde Rd	-5,147	-5,366
To Proposed Holt	Narre Warren SA2 - part - S of Princes Hwy	-4,693	-4,909
To Proposed Holt	Narre Warren South SA2 - balance	0	0
To Proposed Monash	Bunyip - Garfield SA2 - part - localities of Maryknoll, Tynong North and all localities further east	-1,186	-1,214
To Proposed Monash	Emerald - Cockatoo SA1 128901 - part - existing La Trobe - McMillan CED boundary	-16	-14
New Total		103,899	111,343
Variation		-2.86%	0.88%
To La Trobe	Total transfers in	12,812	13,141
From La Trobe	Total transfers out	-11,042	-11,503

Hallam North Rd is a more logical Divisional boundary for La Trobe than Narre Warren North Rd. As can be seen when viewing the urbanisation either side of Hallam North Rd; there is high density urbanisation to the west (Endeavour Hills) which sits well in the Division of Bruce; whereas the properties to the east of Hallam North Rd (Narre Warren North) are significantly larger in size denoting a separate *economic community of interest*. These larger properties mirror those of other localities further east like Harkaway and Beaconsfield Upper which are fully contained within the Division of La Trobe.

These changes reinforce the description of La Trobe in paragraph 353, P 65 of the Redistribution Committee's report: *The proposed Division of La Trobe will be based on the northern areas of Cardinia Shire Council and north-eastern areas of Casey City Council.*

Bruce

The contraction westwards of Bruce in its SE allows it to re-acquire some of its existing electors in the Springvale area and also to align its western boundary with the Greater Dandenong LGA boundary. In addition, I propose that Bruce's southern boundary changes from Cheltenham Rd and Kirkham Rd to the Dandenong Bypass. This allows for the residential communities to both the north and south of Kirkham Rd, Dandenong to be in the same Division (Bruce), given that the residential communities south of Kirkham Rd are isolated from other electors in the Redistribution Committee's proposed Division of Isaacs.

From the intersection of Springvale, Lower Dandenong and Cheltenham Roads; Bruce's CED boundary follows the Greater Dandenong LGA boundary in a clockwise direction until it aligns with Police Rd; continuing in a generally easterly direction along Police Rd and the Police Rd reserve until it becomes the Casey – Knox LGA boundary. Leaving the Casey – Knox LGA boundary to turn west along the Lysterfield South – Narre Warren North locality boundary, then generally south on the Hallam North and Belgrave – Hallam Roads; west along the Princes Highway; SE along the South Gippsland Highway; west along the Dandenong Bypass until it crosses over Cheltenham Rd and finally west on Cheltenham Rd to Springvale Rd.

These changes also remove Bruce's awkward back-street boundary with Hotham through Springvale.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed Bruce		108,421	110,513
From Proposed Hotham	Springvale SA2 - balance	9,105	9,548
From Proposed Isaacs	Dandenong SA2 - part - N of Dandenong Bypass	1,144	1,179
From Proposed Isaacs	Keysborough SA2 - part - N of Dandenong Bypass	2,157	2,183
From Proposed Isaacs	Springvale South SA2 - balance	2,694	2,759
To Proposed Holt	Hallam SA2 - part - S of Princes Hwy	-1,736	-1,782
To Proposed Holt	Narre Warren SA2 - part - S of Princes Hwy	-1,051	-1,086
To Proposed La Trobe	Hallam SA2 - part - E of Belgrave - Hallam Rd and N of Princes Hwy	-2,219	-2,263
To Proposed La Trobe	Narre Warren North SA2 - part - All exc. part SA1 129911 - W of Belgrave - Hallam Rd	-2,804	-2,954
To Proposed La Trobe	Narre Warren SA2 - part - N of Princes Hwy and W of Narre Warren North Rd	-7,789	-7,924
New Total		107,922	110,173
Variation		0.90%	-0.18%
To Bruce	Total transfers in	15,100	15,669
From Bruce	Total transfers out	-15,599	-16,009

Hotham

Having lost its Greater Dandenong territory and electors to Bruce; Hotham must acquire electors from Isaacs. The solution I propose is to transfer the Moorabbin – Heatherton SA2 in its entirety from Isaacs to Hotham. In addition, I propose to use Tootal Rd to complete Hotham’s new southern boundary.

From the intersection of South and Tucker Roads; Hotham’s new boundary now runs west along South Rd; SE along the Bayside – Kingston LGA boundary; east along Wickham and Keys Roads; south along Warrigal Rd; generally south-east aligning with the Moorabbin – Cheltenham locality boundary; continuing east along Centre Dandenong Rd then NE along Tootal Rd to the Kingston – Greater Dandenong LGA boundary.

As noted above, these changes also remove Hotham’s awkward back-street boundary with Bruce through Springvale.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed Hotham		107,960	110,473
From Proposed Isaacs	Dingley Village SA1 # 131309	45	44
From Proposed Isaacs	Moorabbin - Heatherton SA2 - all	5,822	6,053
To Proposed Bruce	Springvale SA2 - balance	-9,105	-9,548
New Total		104,722	107,022
Variation		-2.09%	-3.04%
To Hotham	Total transfers in	5,867	6,097
From Hotham	Total transfers out	-9,105	-9,548

Isaacs

Having to supplement enrolment numbers to both Bruce and Hotham in its north; Isaacs must gain electors in its south from Dunkley.

Rather than reverse the Carrum Downs – Sandhurst – Skye transfer I propose an alternative that better meets *communities of interest* and *area and physical features* of Isaacs.

Given that Isaacs already incorporates the bayside communities of Kingston Council it would not be out of character to transfer Seaford and the commercial part of Carrum Downs (west of Frankston – Dandenong Road) from Dunkley to Isaacs.

This would change the Isaacs – Dunkley boundary to run from the intersection of Frankston – Dandenong and Thompsons Roads; SW along Frankston – Dandenong Rd to Skye Rd, then westwards following the Seaford – Frankston locality boundary into Port Phillip Bay.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed Isaacs		105,707	109,463
From Proposed Dunkley	Carrum Downs SA2 - part - W of Frankston - Dandenong Rd	763	790
From Proposed Dunkley	Seaford (Vic.) SA2 - all	12,190	12,312
To Proposed Bruce	Dandenong SA2 - part - N of Dandenong Bypass	-1,144	-1,179
To Proposed Bruce	Keysborough SA2 - part - N of Dandenong Bypass	-2,157	-2,183
To Proposed Bruce	Springvale South SA2 - balance	-2,694	-2,759
To Proposed Hotham	Dingley Village SA1 # 131309	-45	-44
To Proposed Hotham	Moorabbin - Heatherton SA2 - all	-5,822	-6,053
New Total		106,798	110,347
Variation		-0.15%	-0.02%
To Isaacs	Total transfers in	12,953	13,102
From Isaacs	Total transfers out	-11,862	-12,218

Dunkley

As has been detailed under Flinders and Isaacs above; Dunkley regains most of Mornington apart from a small portion of Mornington's SE; transfers Langwarrin South to Flinders; all of Seaford and the part of Carrum Downs west of the Frankston – Dandenong Rd to Isaacs.

It's also worth noting that from a State Electoral District perspective; both Mornington and Mount Eliza have been in the State Electoral District for many years.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed Dunkley		108,476	110,545
From Proposed Flinders	Mornington SA2 - part. Exc E of Dunns Rd & S of Mornington-Tyabb Rd	14,197	14,526
To Proposed Flinders	Langwarrin SA1's 137426 & 137427 - Locality of Langwarrin South	-927	-960
To Proposed Isaacs	Carrum Downs SA2 - part - W of Frankston - Dandenong Rd	-763	-790
To Proposed Isaacs	Seaford (Vic.) SA2 - all	-12,190	-12,312
New Total		108,793	111,009
Variation		1.72%	0.58%
To Dunkley	Total transfers in	14,197	14,526
From Dunkley	Total transfers out	-13,880	-14,062

As noted above, these changes further strengthen the *economic, social and regional communities of interest; the means of communication and travel and the area and physical features*, to a level beyond that of the Divisions proposed by the Redistribution Committee. And though I haven't crunched the numbers, I believe they may also slightly reduce the overall number of electors transferred between Divisions from that proposed by the Redistribution Committee.

As someone whose home electorate is directly affected by these changes and as someone who has spent many years working within and travelling through all of the Divisions identified above I ask the augmented Electoral Commission to please give this alternative proposal its utmost consideration.

On the other 31 Divisions – with some minor alterations proposed

Aston

The version of Aston proposed by the Redistribution Committee closely matches my “Aston Plan A” which I eventually discarded. Given the requirement to have as much of Maroondah LGA as possible in a single Division (Deakin), the version of Aston proposed by the Redistribution Committee is the perfect solution and should be left exactly as proposed.

Ballarat

The version of Ballarat proposed by the Redistribution Committee matches mine and other submissions in that it contains the LGA’s of Ballarat, Hepburn and Moorabool in their entirety and only electors from those 3 LGA’s. Another Division that should be left exactly as proposed.

Batman

Ultimately a beneficiary of having McEwen not contract further north; the Redistribution Committee’s proposed Batman has a cleaner and simpler boundary than the current version. It will be interesting to see how many objections are lodged relating to this Division retaining the name Batman.

Bendigo

This was a Division where my suggestion didn’t get up, but the downstream impact on Murray (now Nicholls) in some ways justified the Redistribution Committee’s minimal changes from the existing Divisional boundaries.

Calwell

I had hoped that the less developed localities within Hume LGA like Bulla, Wildwood, Clarkefield, Yuroke, Mickleham and Kalkallo would have been left in McEwen rather than transferred to Calwell. Though I concede that aesthetically, the version of Calwell proposed by the Redistribution Committee appears more cohesive than my original suggestion.

Casey

Not dissimilar to Aston; my “Casey Plan A” was to transfer that part of the Yarra Ranges LGA currently in La Trobe to Casey. The Redistribution Committee has followed that path in addition to adding the Knox LGA component of Upper Ferntree Gully to Casey. Given the requirements that needed to be met for Deakin this version of Casey is one that should be left as proposed.

Chisholm

A big thank-you to the Redistribution Committee re-orienting both Chisholm and Bruce from north-south to east-west running Divisions.

I still believe that the Monash Freeway & Wellington Rd would form a better southern boundary for Chisholm than Waverley Rd, but that would involve Higgins expanding east rather than south-east.

Corio

I recognise the Redistribution Committee's proposal is very similar to what I proposed for Corio's new southern boundary with Cox. It's nice to see a proposal get up when yours is the only submission that proposes that specific new boundary. Please don't change it!

Cox (ex-Corangamite)

I was a bit surprised that the Redistribution Committee's proposal for this Division split both the Colac Otway and Golden Plains LGA's between Cox and Wannon. Though I haven't crunched the numbers, I wonder if it would be worth the augmented Electoral Commission modelling placing all of Golden Plains Shire in Wannon and all of Colac Otway Shire in Cox.

Deakin

Hats off to the Redistribution Committee for being able to place as much of the Maroondah LGA into this Division as they did.

Fraser

The version of Fraser proposed by the Redistribution Committee shares a significant part of the boundary with the Division of Monash proposed in my original submission. Apart from renaming the Redistribution Committee's proposed Fraser to Monash as I reiterated on Page 3 of this document, this is yet another Division whose boundaries should not be altered from those proposed by the Redistribution Committee.

Gellibrand

In line with many proposals, the Redistribution Committee has seen fit to unite the Hobsons Bay LGA in Gellibrand. I do, however, propose a slight change to the proposed Gellibrand – Lalor CED boundary. I propose that the new boundary continues in a generally northerly along Forsyth Rd, then turn east along Sayers Rd transferring Truganina SA1 # 136608 from Lalor to Gellibrand.

This SA1 contains 1,281 current and 1,429 projected electors.

This transfer also aligns the Gellibrand CED boundary with the Williams Landing locality boundary placing all of the locality of Williams Landing in Gellibrand.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed Gellibrand		106,184	111,084
From Proposed Lalor	Truganina SA1 # 136608 - Balance of locality of Williams Landing	1,281	1,429
New Total		107,465	112,513
Variation		0.48%	1.94%
To Gellibrand	Total transfers in	1,281	1,429
From Gellibrand	Total transfers out	0	0

Gippsland

The number of suggestions to transfer Yallourn North from McMillan to Gippsland made this almost a fait accompli which the Redistribution Committee has thankfully proposed. Apart from some possible minor boundary alignments south of the La Trobe River (which can wait for the next Redistribution) this is yet another Division which the augmented Electoral Commission should leave as proposed.

Goldstein

The only Division with no changes to its land-based boundary in this Redistribution, I still believe there is merit for making this a Division more focussed on bayside localities but this can be left for a future Redistribution.

As the old saying goes; "If it ain't broke; don't fix it". This appears to have been the approach taken by the Redistribution Committee for this Division and I believe it should not be amended by the augmented Electoral Commission.

Gorton

I was surprised to see Gorton push east and acquire the Hume LGA component of Diggers Rest but given the Redistribution Committee's approach to aligning CED boundaries with locality boundaries this time around it is a welcome surprise. Some of the other changes made to Gorton mirror my proposal including the adoption of both Main Road West and Station Road as part of the new Gorton CED boundary.

Higgins

The unification of the suburbs of Hughesdale and Murrumbeena in Higgins has probably set the limit as to how far Higgins can expand to its SE in its current configuration. That said, the Redistribution Committee's proposed boundary for Higgins is a solid and logical progression from the current version and should not be further altered.

Indi

The Redistribution Committee is to be commended for transferring the part of Moira Shire out of Indi and uniting it in their proposed Division of Nicholls. And whilst the expansion into Strathbogie Shire leaves some room for further expansion should future Redistributions require this, it may ultimately need to venture back into Moira Shire if current trends continue or possibly consider crossing the Great Dividing Range into current Casey territory.

Jagajaga

As noted above and also as proposed by other submissions; the Banyule LGA is now united in Jagajaga which is a logical progression. Though an argument could be mounted that localities like Diamond Creek and Wattle Glen have little in common with the older suburbs of Ivanhoe and Heidelberg.

Kooyong

The Redistribution Committee's proposed Kooyong differs only slightly from my proposal as it also unites the locality of Surrey Hills in Kooyong. The new boundary proposed by the Redistribution Committee is a strong one and should be left unchanged by the augmented Electoral Commission.

Lalor

As noted under Gellibrand; I propose that Truganina SA1 # 136608 transfer from Lalor to Gellibrand uniting all of Williams Landing in Gellibrand.

I read with amusement the first half of paragraph 358 of the Redistribution Committee's report where it stated; *"The Redistribution Committee noted that no suggestions, or comments on suggestions, proposed alteration to the current western boundary of Little River."*

I am sure that the Redistribution Committee is fully aware that the Wyndham – Greater Geelong LGA boundary has been one that is "traditionally" not crossed at either State or Commonwealth level.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed Lalor		101,452	109,084
To Proposed Gellibrand	Truganina SA1 # 136608 - Balance of locality of Williams Landing	-1,281	-1,429
New Total		100,171	107,655
Variation		-6.34%	-2.46%
To Lalor	Total transfers in	0	0
From Lalor	Total transfers out	-1,281	-1,429

Macnamara (ex-Melbourne Ports)

Even though this Division had to gain electors at this Redistribution; if plans for the massive urban development at Fishermans Bend progress, this Division should be shrinking in area at future Redistributions. The augmented Electoral Commission should also leave this Division exactly as proposed.

Mallee

The transfer and unification of Loddon Shire in Mallee was almost a no-brainer given Mallee had to gain a significant number of electors. And whilst the Redistribution Committee's report touts the unification of Loddon Shire in Mallee, it then splits both Northern Grampians and Pyrenees Shires between Mallee and Wannon to complete the new proposed Division. One step forwards; two steps back.

Maribyrnong

The version of Maribyrnong proposed by the Redistribution Committee contains a series of solid and continuous boundary components which mark a significant improvement in boundary selection by this Redistribution Committee compared to previous Redistributions for other States.

The transfer of the Flemington Racecourse SA2 from Melbourne to Maribyrnong, sets a precedent that will only be expanded on in future Redistributions; assuming the population of the City of Melbourne LGA continues to grow at a rate greater than the rest of the State.

McEwen

I have already expressed my disappointment that the Redistribution Committee could not remove all of Wollert, Mernda and Doreen (Whittlesea LGA component) from McEwen and return McEwen to being a wholly rural electorate. I will elaborate more on this under my assessment of Menzies.

Melbourne

The removal of all of Moonee Valley LGA north of Racecourse Rd was no surprise. Some interesting boundary “manipulation” with Wills and Batman has been performed to ensure the balance of the boundaries of both Divisions were strong elsewhere. And credit where credit is due to the Redistribution Committee here. It’s these minor adjustments here and there that provides for strong Divisional boundaries for **all** Divisions.

For the larger States, it’s these “one percenters” that those of us who do this in an honorary capacity just don’t have the time to consider in our 4-week submission window.

As I noted under my assessment of Maribyrnong; the breaching of the City of Melbourne LGA boundary in the NW with the transfer of the Flemington Racecourse SA2 to Maribyrnong; sets a precedent for future Redistributions should the Division of Melbourne continue along its trend of growing at a greater rate than the State average.

Menzies

Menzies crossing the Yarra into Nillumbik LGA to acquire its numbers was one I didn’t see coming, though after reading the submission from Maroondah Council I should have known it was going to be in the mix. Especially as the precedent had already been set at the previous Victorian State Re-Division where the SED of Warrandyte crossed the Yarra River to incorporate the locality of North Warrandyte.

I can’t help but wonder if I should have taken my own advice from page 18 of my original submission where I wrote (in relation to the crossing of the Yarra River); *If this boundary is to be crossed, then the most logical place to do this is across the Lower Yarra, downstream of the Eastern Freeway.*

A possible alternative would have been Menzies moving south, not north, along another boundary that is rarely crossed at either State or Commonwealth level – Koonung Creek – taking possibly Balwyn North and Box Hill North SA2’s from Kooyong and Chisholm; Richmond SA2 would then move from Melbourne to Kooyong; most of Alphington, Fairfield and Northcote transfer to Melbourne; Bundoora – North, Bundoora – West & Thomastown SA2’s transfer from Scullin to Batman; Scullin takes balance of Epping and South Morang SA2’s from McEwen and McEwen gains Nillumbik LGA that went to Menzies.

Next time!

Monash (ex-McMillan)

As noted on page 7 of this document, there is no need for La Trobe to extend further east than the locality of Nar Nar Goon North. The communities of Tynong North, Garfield North, Tonimbuk and Bunyip North have closer *economic, social and regional communities of interest* with the localities of Tynong, Garfield and Bunyip than they do to Pakenham.

Therefore, the Divisional boundary between La Trobe and Monash north of the Princes Highway should run as follows: In a generally northerly direction, following the western locality boundaries of Tynong North, Maryknoll and Tynong North again until such time as the Tynong North locality boundary crosses Gembrook – Tonimbuk Rd, then briefly west on Gembrook – Tonimbuk Rd to Triangle Rd where it meets the existing La Trobe – McMillan CED boundary and continues to follow that boundary in a generally northerly direction to the Cardinia – Yarra Ranges LGA boundary.

As mentioned on page 3 of this document, the only other change I would make would be to rename Monash to Fraser in exchange with the Redistribution Committee’s proposed Fraser.

Division	Component	Proposed	Projected
Proposed Monash		106,180	108,828
From Proposed La Trobe	Bunyip - Garfield SA2 - part - localities of Maryknoll, Tynong North and all localities further east	1,186	1,214
From Proposed La Trobe	Emerald - Cockatoo SA1 128901 - part - existing La Trobe - McMillan CED boundary	16	14
New Total		107,382	110,056
Variation		0.40%	-0.29%
To Monash	Total transfers in	1,202	1,228
From Monash	Total transfers out	0	0

Nicholls (ex-Murray)

The Redistribution Committee is to be congratulated for ensuring all of the Campaspe, Greater Shepparton and Moira LGA's are wholly united within this Division. And whilst Moira Shire has been united in Nicholls; Strathbogie Shire is now divided between the 2 and Mitchell Shire now split between 3 Divisions instead of 2.

With Indi, Mallee and Nicholls all having to gain electors at this Redistribution, and enrolment trends showing no signs of changing in the short to medium term; it may become a question of **when** the number of Divisions bordering NSW along the Murray River needs to decline from 3 to 2.

Scullin

Another of my suggestions that got up! The changes to the eastern side of Scullin – removing its presence in the Nillumbik Shire and becoming a wholly City of Whittlesea Division – as suggested by a number of submissions is a logical and positive step.

As noted earlier in this document, I regret that Scullin didn't venture even further north to take the balance of Wollert, Mernda and Doreen from McEwen. Though some movements in this area will undoubtedly be required if Victoria gets to the point of gaining a 39th Division.

Wannon

Given the existing Wannon's Divisional boundary aligns with either State, ocean or LGA boundaries; it was always going to be difficult to deliver a repeat performance this time around – especially with Wannon needing to gain a significant number of electors. I'll have more to say on the number of rural LGA's divided between Divisions as proposed by the Redistribution Committee in my closing comments

Wills

How can you argue against a proposed Division that has 1 watercourse boundary running its entire eastern boundary and the same in its west; an LGA boundary across its north and almost the same in its south and manages to fall within electoral tolerances?

As good as it gets! Please don't change it.

The Redistribution Committee's report on this Division states that it contains part of the City of Yarra LGA. However, I can find no point either on the maps or in the SA1 data where Wills crosses into the City of Yarra.

Closing Comments

If the measure of the success or otherwise of a Redistribution is a net reduction in the number of LGA's that are divided between Divisions – especially in rural and regional areas - then this proposal from the Redistribution Committee would be an unmitigated failure!

The unification of the Bass Coast, Loddon and Moira councils into single Divisions are more than offset by the dividing of the previously united Baw Baw, Colac Otway, Northern Grampians, Pyrenees & Strathbogie Shires.

Yet despite an increase in the number of divided LGA's in rural and regional Victoria, the boundaries proposed by the Redistribution Committee are overall a significant improvement on the 2010 boundaries.

The Redistribution Committee is to be congratulated for taking on board and applying to its draft boundaries; so many of the suggestions that were made at the public submission phase of this process.

Another change worthy of note is the strengthening of other CED boundaries by adopting a single continuous boundary type for as long as possible. These changes not only simplify boundaries but also reduce the likelihood of any potential confusion for electors located near Divisional boundaries.

Apart from some relatively minor reversals and additional alterations as identified above, I believe this is the best proposal by a Redistribution Committee for any State Redistribution that I have read in my 5 years of contributing to the Redistribution process at both Commonwealth and State/Territory levels.

If the augmented Electoral Commission can apply my reversals and alterations in full to the Redistribution Committee's proposal, this would be the 'icing on the cake'.

I look forward to reading the other objections and hope that others propose some of the reversals that I have addressed above.

I will then submit my final observations at the Comments on Objections phase.

+++ End of Document +++