



# Comment on objections 49

Australian Labor Party (Victorian Branch)

10 pages

A nighttime cityscape featuring illuminated skyscrapers and a bridge over a body of water. A large, thick red diagonal line cuts across the image from the top left towards the bottom right. The text is positioned on the white background to the left of this line.

# **Victorian Labor's**

Comments  
on objections.

Victorian  
**Labor**

## **AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY – VICTORIAN BRANCH’S COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS MADE TO THE REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE’S PROPOSALS**

### **Overview**

The common theme of most objections, including our own, is a focus on either existing boundaries (eg Macnamara/Higgins) or else traditional arrangements (eg whether Menzies should move south or east). Each local government area, town, suburb and locality has a connection with adjoining places. In determining electoral arrangements, subject to the mandatory numerical requirements of the Electoral Act, the decisions of the Augmented Commission should focus on which connections are stronger than other possible arrangements. Those considerations are at the core of the community of interests criteria within the Electoral Act.

Existing boundaries are subordinate to the community of interest criteria within the Act. All these criteria are subject to meeting the Electoral Act’s mandatory numerical requirements. So, an existing boundaries argument has to also pass muster with these other criteria. We also acknowledge that, from time to time, boundaries are determined which produce the fairest outcome in meeting community of interest criteria for a group of surrounding Divisions. In other words, no electoral Division is an island. Sometimes, Commissioners produce boundary arrangements which are the best for a regional area, in the context of the numbers. That means every redistribution, new numerical requirements mean a new juggling act in complying with the criteria, of which existing boundaries is but one.

However, if an electoral boundary has been in place for decades prudence should demand very careful consideration be given for justifying upsetting those arrangements.

For convenience, the ALP’s comments on objections begin with southern Melbourne Divisions as follows:

#### **1. La Trobe/Holt/Bruce : Objections made by the Liberal Party and Charles Richardson**

The ALP’s objection to the draft proposals raised concerns regarding the inclusion of three growth areas in La Trobe (as Clyde moved into La Trobe from Holt) and the consequential changes which split the Berwick Township into two. We stated that these issues required further consideration and resolution.

Other objectors raised similar concerns, including the Liberal Party, Charles Richardson, Colin McLaren and Dr Mark Mulcair, and put forward various proposals to address these problems.

**The ALP acknowledges that the proposals put forward by the Liberal Party and Charles Richardson best address the concerns identified by many objectors.** The growth area of Clyde should remain in Holt – this reduces the number of growth area suburbs in La Trobe, makes a more logical community of interest while reducing change for electors, and the township or Berwick (east of Harkaway Road should remain in La Trobe).

**We propose therefore that the Commission adopt the Liberal Party's objection with just one very minor refinement to make a more logical boundary and retain the small semi-rural township of Harkaway in La Trobe.**

- The Bruce / La Trobe boundary that runs up Clyde Road should continue up Lyall Road and Harkaway Road, leaving the old township and established area of Berwick united in La Trobe.
- Harkaway is a small semi-rural community of about 600 voters that fits much better with La Trobe than Bruce as it relates strongly to the Berwick township and Beaconsfield and it should be retained in La Trobe.

These adjustments reduce change for electors and meet the mathematical requirements of the Act for La Trobe.

With regard to our proposal to run the boundary up Harkaway Road, this is the neatest option. It would mean that a very small *non-residential* part of Harkaway would slip into Bruce but as it is a park no electors would be affected. Alternatively the actual locality boundary for Harkaway could be adopted as the boundary though this would be a slightly strange shape. Either of these approaches make a far more logical northern boundary between La Trobe and Bruce.

**Bruce then needs to gain electors from Holt. The ALP agrees with the Liberal Party's objection that this is best and most simply done in Hampton Park**

The Liberal Party's suggestion is a sensible way to do so, save for a minor adjustment which is necessary to meet the mathematical requirements of the Act. The northern boundary for Holt in this area could run along both Fordholm Road and River Gum Reserve which matches the Liberal Party's objection as closely as is possible. The Commission may of course elect to tweak the boundary in this area to align with SA1s or provide a slightly neater shape, for example along Cairns Road to the south.

Below, we summarise the changes we suggest that would allow the Richardson/Liberal Party objections to be adopted, whilst, at the same time also allowing the earlier ALP objections to also be adopted. We also note that Dr Richardson has also proposed that the small part of Berwick, proposed by the Redistribution Committee to be transferred from Latrobe to Holt, instead be sent to Bruce. That was also proposed in our original objection.

### **ALP Compromise to the Liberal Party and Charles Richardson Objections**

**(Transfers part of SA2 Berwick North north of High Street as proposed by both objections; restores the suburbs of Clyde and Tooradin back to Holt and also transfers from Holt to Bruce that part of the suburb of Hampton Park north of both Fordholm Road and River Gum Reserve)**

**DIVISION**

**15/7/20**

**26/1/25**

**LA TROBE (Commissioners Proposal) 98 272(-9.9) 120 106(2.6)**

Less part SA2 Cranbourne South (That part proposed to be transferred from Holt)

**To Holt -1 991 -3 140**

Less part SA2 Pearcedale-Tooradin (That part proposed to be transferred from Holt)

**To Holt -1 129 -1 231**

Plus part SA2 Berwick North (North of Princess Highway and east of Lyall Road to Harkaway Road and all east of that Road. As per Liberal Party Objection)

SA1's 2129315; 22-23; 32-37; 46; 50

Part SA1 2129314 (est 65/70) part SA1 2129318 (est 214/220)

**Ex Bruce +3 572 +3 913**

Plus part SA2 Narre Warren North (Entire suburb of Harkaway)

SA1's 2129901; 12

**Ex Bruce +602 +620**

**TOTALS 99 326(-8.9) 120 268(2.7)**

**HOLT (per ALP Objections) 102 446(-6.0) 121 000(3.3)**

Less part SA2 Hampton Park-Lynbrook. (That part of the suburb of Hampton Park north of Fordholm Road and north of River Gum Reserve)

SA1's 2130506; 9-12; 16-20; 33-35; 42; 46; 48.

**To Bruce -4 229 -4 374**

Plus part SA2 Cranbourne South (That part proposed to be transferred from Holt)

**Ex La Trobe +1 991 +3 140**

Plus part SA2 Pearcedale-Tooradin (That part proposed to be transferred from Holt)

**Ex La Trobe +1 129 +1 231**

**TOTALS 101 337(-7.0) 120 997(3.3)**

**BRUCE (per both ALP Objections) 110 569(1.4) 113 987(-2.7)**

Less part SA2 Berwick North (North of Princess Highway and east of Lyall Road to Harkaway Road and all east of that Road. As per Liberal Party Objection)

SA1's 2129315; 22-23; 32-37; 46; 50

Part SA1 2129314 (est 65/70) part SA1 2129318 (est 214/220)

<b>To La Trobe</b>	<b>-3 572</b>	<b>-3 913</b>
Less part SA2 Narre Warren North (Entire suburb of Harkaway) SA1's 2129901; 12		
<b>To La Trobe</b>	<b>-602</b>	<b>-620</b>
Plus part SA2 Hampton Park-Lynbrook. (That part of the suburb of Hampton Park north of Fordholm Road and north of River Gum Reserve) SA1's 2130506; 9-12; 16-20; 33-35; 42; 46; 48.		
<b>Ex Holt</b>	<b>+4 229</b>	<b>+4 374</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>110 624(1.5)</b>	<b>113 828(-2.8)</b>

## **2. Bruce / Hotham interface at Mulgrave / Noble Park North**

The Redistribution Committee's draft proposals for Bruce and Hotham were broadly accepted by the ALP, however we raised concerns regarding the confusing proposal for Bruce to cross Police Road (a municipal boundary) and strangely include a small portion of Mulgrave and the City of Monash in Bruce which is currently in Hotham.

Dr Mark Mulcair (Objection 37) also noted "*the intrusion of Bruce into part of Monash Council*" while making different and far more complicated suggestions as to how to address this.

**Having considered all of the objections lodged, the ALP maintains that the minor adjustment proposed in our objection best addresses the issue; i.e. simply retaining the entire Noble Park North locality in Bruce and keeping Police Road as the northern boundary of Bruce, therefore leaving Mulgrave in Hotham.**

This reduces unnecessary change for electors, better reflects the community of interest, and avoids illogically and unnecessarily splitting suburbs, localities and municipalities across Divisions.

## **3. Macnamara/Higgins: Objections raised by several community organisations and others**

The ALP objection concerning these seats was very detailed. The several objections made to the proposed boundaries of these Divisions have highlighted the strong connection between the communities in Caulfield and St Kilda.

Since the significant 1990 redistribution, which, among other things, abolished the Division of Henty, thereby triggering a major realignment of electoral boundaries in southern Melbourne, Caulfield has been in Melbourne Ports/Macnamara. In 2010, due to

enrolment growth, Caulfield South and other suburbs with a strong Jewish presence were transferred to Goldstein.

Apart from the 2010 change and the unnecessary transfer of the suburb of Windsor at the last redistribution, Macnamara's (previously Melbourne Ports) boundaries have been unchanged since 1990.

This is surely an instance of a decades long electoral arrangement. Melbourne's Jewish community is concentrated in Goldstein and Macnamara. The objectors to the proposed new boundaries are as baffled by the justification made by the Redistribution Committee as we are.

#### **4. Menzies/Deakin: Charles Richardson's objection**

Several objections, such as that of Dr Mulcair propose an alternative arrangement to the Committee's proposals for Deakin and Menzies which would have the effect of replacing Whitehorse Road with Canterbury Road as the southern boundary of Menzies.

However these objections, whilst producing a more significant southern road boundary, do not adequately consider how significant is the existing southern boundary of Menzies, which is replicated across three levels of government.

The objection made by Dr Richardson does stress the importance of the southern boundary. He points out that with the loss of the Nillumbik area from Menzies:

*"there are realistically only two options: to the south-east, from the City of Maroondah, or to the south, from the City of Whitehorse.<sup>7</sup> The Committee has chosen the second of those; I believe that with the benefit of further consideration, the Commission should reverse that decision.*

*Each option has its advantages. That chosen by the Committee fits the whole City of Maroondah within a single division (Deakin), which is a real gain. But the price paid for it, in my view, is too high. The existing Menzies/Chisholm boundary along Mullum Mullum Creek (which mostly coincides with the Eastern Freeway) is a strong boundary of very long standing: breaching it requires a strong justification. The northern boundary of the Shire of Maroondah has no such weight of precedent behind it; it is a good boundary, but it has been crossed at the last three redistributions.*

*More seriously, the Committee's approach results in a boundary running along Whitehorse Road the whole way between Elgar Road and Heatherdale Road. This is a singularly poor boundary: it splits business and commercial districts in Box Hill (see figure 3), Nunawading and Mitcham, where in each case a number of important facilities would be separated from the greater part of their respective suburbs (examples include Box Hill TAFE, the Whitehorse civic centre and Mitcham's largest supermarket). Worst off would be Blackburn, which would be split three ways, with the Chisholm/Deakin boundary down*



*Blackburn Road: its hotel and primary school would be in Menzies, its post office in Deakin and its railway station and supermarket in Chisholm”.*

Can we request the members of the Augmented Commission, prior to making their final determination, to visit the Eastern Freeway at the point they wish to transfer electors south of the existing boundary of Menzies.

As pointed out by Dr Richardson, moving electors from Maroondah Council to Menzies has occurred repeatedly over the years and is far less intrusive than transferring electors from Whitehorse Council.

Sure, there are north-south road connections but the stronger connections south of the Freeway are east-west.

## 5. Chisholm/Deakin Objections

The ALP has no issue with that part of the Liberal Party objection which seeks to consolidate the suburb of Burwood East within Chisholm, via a transfer of electors from Deakin.

Such a movement of electors would be complementary to the ALP objection which seeks to place, via a transfer from Chisholm, the entire suburb of Surrey Hills within Kooyong.

However, we strongly oppose the Liberal Party proposal to transfer a triangle of electors from Chisholm to Hotham. The Redistribution Committee’s proposed southern boundary for Chisholm runs along Dandenong Road and then Wellington Road. That’s very clear and understandable. There are no good reasons to justify complicating the boundary.

## Addendum

### **Overall effects of ALP Objections and part adoption of Liberal Party Objection for La Trobe involving the Divisions of Bruce; Hotham; Holt; Isaacs and La Trobe**

<b>Division</b>	<b>Restored To existing Division</b>	<b>15/7/20</b>	<b>26/1/25</b>
<b>Hotham</b>	Part SA2 Mulgrave restored from Bruce	<b>3 290</b>	<b>3 337</b>
<b>Bruce</b>	Part SA2 Noble Park North restored from Chisholm	<b>1 708</b>	<b>1 713</b>
<b>Isaacs</b>	Part SA2 Dandenong restored from Bruce	<b>4 042</b>	<b>4 235</b>
<b>Holt</b>	Part SA2 Lynbrook-Lyndhurst restored from Isaacs (Lyndhurst)	<b>4 229</b>	<b>4 686</b>
	Part SA2 Cranbourne South restored from La Trobe (Clyde)	<b>1 991</b>	<b>3 190</b>



	Part SA2 Pearcedale-Tooradin (Tooradin)	<b>1 129</b>	<b>1 231</b>
<b>La Trobe</b>	Part SA2 Berwick North restored from Bruce	<b>3 572</b>	<b>3 913</b>
	Part SA2 Narre Warren North (Harkaway)	<b>602</b>	<b>620</b>
<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>20 563</b>	<b>22 925</b>
<b>Division</b>	<b>Removed to another Division</b>	<b>15/7/20</b>	<b>26/1/25</b>
<b>Holt</b>	Part SA2 Hampton Park-Lynbrook moved to Bruce		
		<b>4 229</b>	<b>4 374</b>
<b>NET Effect of Changes</b>		<b>16 334</b>	<b>18 551#</b>

**# After all changes made from the Redistribution Committee's proposals.**

## **6. Tucker/Corangamite**

Several objections, including that of the Liberal Party have requested that the Augmented Commission retain the Federation and indigenous name of Corangamite. These also accord with the ALP objection.

However, it would be very disappointing should Tucker be discarded as an electoral name. We also note that some of the objectors to the loss of the electoral name of Corangamite have also proposed that Gellibrand or Hotham be considered for renaming to Tucker.

The ALP also disagrees with the objection made by Golden Plains Shire which has proposed that Inverleigh, Lethbridge and Teesdale be retained in Tucker, instead of being transferred to Ballarat.

Given that Tucker can't take too many more electors without breaching quota, it's reasonable to consider which is best? Transfer the suburb of Anglesea from Wannon, (with associated transfer to Wannon of several more rural localities near Winchelsea), or make the Inverleigh transfer. The numerical requirements mean you can't do both.

Anglesea is much more closely aligned in community interest with the proposed Tucker than Inverleigh, Lethbridge and Teesdale, this takes the form of:

- a. Closely linked economic interests, with especially similar economic production and output to the Bellarine Peninsula. This is reflected across the community from commonality of industry, particularly focussed on tourism, to labour force participation rates.
- b. Geography, Anglesea is located near to the coast like the rest of the proposed electorate of Tucker – Inverleigh, Lethbridge and Teesdale are significantly more inland.

Moreover, under the Committee's proposal, two thirds of Golden Plains Shire is in Ballarat, with Bannockburn, closest to Geelong, retained in Tucker. Whereas we would prefer a local government area with the population of Golden Plains to be entirely in a particular Division, if it can't be done, you have to draw the line somewhere. The Committee has struck the right balance.

We were also surprised that some objectors, including Charles Richardson have proposed to divide the Bellarine Peninsula again between the Divisions of Corio and Tucker/Corangamite. The uniting of the Bellarine area within a single Division was a notable outcome of the last redistribution. Let's keep it that way.

## **7. Wannon/Mallee**

The ALP supports the Redistribution Committee's proposal for Wannon/Mallee. In rural areas, it's always a good thing if an entire local government area can be united in a single Division. With the proposed transfer of Stawell to Mallee, all of Northern Grampians Shire would be united in Mallee. You are right and your critics are wrong.

## **8. Wills/Melbourne**

We disagree with those objections proposing that the part of Brunswick East proposed to be transferred from Wills to Melbourne be instead retained in Wills.

It's usually a good thing, if possible, to unite a suburb in the same seat. But this is a case where there are compelling arguments against, due to the differences between the north and south of the suburb of Brunswick East.

### **3.1 Parks and recreation**

Residents of Brunswick East south of Glenlyon Rd and east of Lygon St particularly frequent Fitzroy North, Princes Hill and Carlton North for services given the close proximity to these suburbs. Princes Park, Edinburgh Gardens, Yarra Bend Park in Clifton Hill in addition to the surrounding cycling and running tracks are most frequented for these residents for recreational purposes and all located within the electorate of Melbourne.

### **3.2 Employment and Education**

Most residents of Brunswick East south of Glenlyon Rd and east of Lygon St are workers and students who live in these areas because of their proximity to the CBD, Parkville, Carlton North, Carlton, Fitzroy North and Fitzroy. The universities and other CBD businesses employ a significant number of Brunswick residents who regularly commute into the seat of Melbourne.

Many students from the University of Melbourne, RMIT and other university CBD campuses either live in Brunswick East from the commencement of their study or at least after a short initial period (1-2 years) in Melbourne given its proximity. Offering these residents consistency in their electoral enrolment should be prioritized, particularly given they are

likely to continue utilizing the same services and amenities in Melbourne throughout their study.

This proposal also makes sense for residents of the Division of Melbourne because of the close connection of this area of Brunswick East with the northern most part of Fitzroy North that was re-distributed from Wills to Melbourne in 2019. In addition, residents of Princes Hill, Fitzroy North, Parkville and Carlton North frequent Brunswick East for essential shopping and basic amenities given their proximity.

Residents who live south Glenlyon Rd and east of Lygon Street rarely venture north of this area. Their professional, cultural and social lives are lived in this area and then south, in the inner-city suburbs of Carlton North, Fitzroy North, Princess Hill, Parkville, Carlton and Fitzroy which are all located in the division of Melbourne.

### **3.3 Culture, entertainment and shopping and dining**

Most people in the south of Glenlyon Rd and east of Lygon Street walk, cycle or catch public transport for cultural activities, entertainment, shopping and dining in the Division of Melbourne. The major dining, entertainment and shopping precincts frequented by these residents are all located in the Division of Melbourne. These precincts include Nicholson St in Carlton North, Rathdowne St Village in Carlton North, Lygon St in Carlton and St Georges Road in North Fitzroy.

Whilst some of these roads extend into the Division of Wills, most of this activity is concentrated in the Division of Melbourne as the northern section becomes more residential and acts as an arterial road that connects residents to the city.

### **3.4 Schools zones**

The eastern section of Parkville, all of Princes Hill and most of Carlton North are within the same secondary school zone as most of this section of Brunswick. The only public secondary school in this zone is Princes Hill Secondary College, located in the Division of Melbourne.

This South-Eastern Area is split between two zones, with one joining Princes Hill, part of Brunswick on the western side of Sydney Rd and the eastern section of Parkville. This zone is serviced by Princes Hill Primary School located in the Division of Melbourne and Brunswick South Primary School, located on the border of the Division of Melbourne and the Division of Wills.