



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
NEW SOUTH WALES**

Comment on Objections 154

Dr. Graeme C Woodrow, FTSE

2 pages

[REDACTED]
Bilgola Plateau
NSW 2107

24 July, 2024

Redistribution Committee for New South Wales
Australian Electoral Commission
Locked Bag 4007
Canberra ACT 2601

**Re: Comments on Objections to the Proposed Redistribution of the Division
 of Mackellar**

As an elector in the Division of Mackellar, I am writing to support the proposal made by the Committee with respect to the changes made to the electorate's southern boundary with the Division of Warringah and to express concern at various objections made by others in adjoining electorates to this sensible proposal. For the ease of discussion, the focus of my remarks is directed towards those in **Objection 671**, since this is written by the local member and echoed by many others.

In short, Objection 671 suggests keeping the areas of Dee Why, North Curl Curl, French's Forest, Killarney Heights and Forestville in Warringah, and instead, having Mackellar acquire constituents from the locality of St Ives in the Division of Bradfield. This suggestion can be shown to be quite deficient in satisfying the criteria of the *Electoral Act* using the very same arguments that Objection 671 uses in prosecuting its own case for changes to Warringah's western boundary.

1. The main argument in Objection 671 is that the above-named areas are "*inextricably linked to the southern end of the peninsula through transportation, business, services and education.*" (p. 2). Yet, how can uniting the currently split suburbs of Dee Why, Forestville and Frenchs Forest be considered anything but a good idea in satisfying the requirements of the *Electoral Act*? Indeed, this satisfies the argument made in the Objection that a key criterion is "*keeping communities of interest together.*" (p.3)

Likewise, incorporating North Curl Curl and Killarney Heights into Mackellar unites them with their highly culturally and socially related neighbours. All the criteria which the author of Objection 671 suggests makes these areas "inextricably linked" to the southern end of the peninsula, viz. *transportation, business, services and education*, in fact, also apply to the northern part of the peninsula, i.e. to Mackellar.

2. In arguing against the Committee's sensible decision to keep Mackellar's boundaries coincident with the boundaries of the LGA and within certain natural features, Objection 671 makes the spurious case that such criteria are not usually applied to metropolitan Divisions. The *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* makes no such distinction between metropolitan and regional areas and the Committee is quite right in applying these criteria in deciding not to include St Ives in the Division of Mackellar. Indeed, for the committee not to do so would put it in jeopardy of not satisfying the requirements of the *Electoral Act*.

3. Objection 671 suggests that the area of St Ives has a cultural fit with the Northern Beaches that is greater than the fit of Dee Why, North Curl Curl, French's Forest, Killarney Heights and Forestville. I spent decades living on the North Shore, raised my children there and had family living in St Ives from its early days in the 1960s. I loved those years but after now living on the Northern Beaches for 15 years, I can confirm that the connection (culturally, socially, administratively and geographically) between St Ives and the Northern Beaches is far less than for Dee Why, North Curl Curl, French's Forest, Killarney Heights and Forestville.

Summary

The proposal by the Redistribution Committee to expand the Division of Mackellar by incorporating Killarney Heights and North Curl Curl as well as the split areas of Dee Why, Forestville and French's Forest is sound. Objections that suggest that St Ives would be a good fit in Mackellar in preference to these areas are unsustainable on any of the criteria that the *Electoral Act* requires be applied.

Dr. Graeme C Woodrow, FTSE
Elector in Mackellar