



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL
TERRITORY**

Submission CS2

Liberal Party of Australia ACT Division

Comments on Suggestions from the Liberal Party of Australia ACT Division to the Federal Redistribution Committee for the Australian Capital Territory

1. The Liberal Party of Australia ACT Division (“Liberal Party”) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Suggestions received by the Redistribution Committee for the Australian Capital Territory (“Committee”).
2. The Liberal Party has approached its consideration of the boundaries in the ACT with a view to ensuring that the relevant criteria in s66 of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act (1918)* (“Act”) are adhered to, particularly ensuring that the various Divisions are strongly linked on community of interest grounds and take into consideration the means of communication and physical features to ensure logical and representative electorates. The Liberal Party, while recognising that maintaining existing boundaries is a subordinate criterium, believes there is significant benefit in minimising the impact to electors by avoiding unnecessary changes to boundaries between electoral events, in the context of the current boundaries in the ACT not having any significant issues requiring rectification relating to communities of interest, means of communication and physical features.

Summary of Suggestions

3. The Suggestions received by the Committee primarily focussed on balancing electors between the Divisions of Canberra and Bean, due to both Divisions not meeting the required projected enrolment on current boundaries.
4. Some Suggestions also advocated for a more extensive redistribution moving electors from the Divisions of Canberra to Fenner and moving electors in both directions between the Divisions of Canberra and Bean.
5. There was a clear consensus view that the suburb of Phillip should be transferred to the Division of Canberra from the Division of Bean, even though

most Suggestions only sought to transfer the electors north of Hindmarsh Drive.

6. There were a number of Suggestions that also considered transferring electors in the Molonglo Valley to the Division of Canberra from the Division of Bean.
7. Some Suggestions also suggested transferring electors from the Division of Canberra to the Division of Fenner either from Hawker and Weetangera or from Giralang, Lawson, and Kaleen.
8. There were also some Suggestions relating to Jervis Bay Territory and Norfolk Island.
9. The Liberal Party's Comment on Suggestions will deal with each of these matters separately below.

Molonglo Valley

10. There were six Suggestions that proposed the transfer of electors from the Molonglo Valley to the Division of Canberra from the Division of Bean.¹ While the Liberal Party considered this transfer, it was suggested that it was not an optimal way to transfer electors from the Division of Bean to the Division of Canberra.² Some of these Suggestions considered only transferring electors from Whitlam,³ while others consider more wide-ranging transfers that also included electors in Denman Prospect, Molonglo, Coombs, and Wright being transferred to the Division of Canberra.⁴
11. The Liberal Party maintains its original Suggestion to the Committee that the entirety of the Molonglo Valley remains in the Division of Bean. William Hovel Drive is a significant socio-geographic boundary in Canberra with minimal connection north-south across it.
12. Wherever possible, Redistribution Committees across Australia attempt to keep Local Government Areas intact. While the ACT does not have LGAs in the traditional sense, the local equivalent in the ACT is the various districts, while not integrated on a governmental level, they are more integrated as community organisational blocks within Canberra. Therefore, the Committee

¹ Submission S1: Anonymous 1; Submission S4: Ben Last; Submission S5: Roger Nye; Submission S7: Dr Mark Mulcair; Submission S9: Darren McSweeney; Submission S15: Anonymous 2

² Submission S13: Liberal Party of Australia ACT Division

³ Submission S1: Anonymous 1; Submission S4: Ben Last; Submission S7: Dr Mark Mulcair

⁴ Submission S5: Roger Nye; Submission S9: Darren McSweeney; Submission S15: Anonymous 2

should consider these districts as the primary building blocks of Divisions in the ACT, with SA2/suburbs being the secondary building blocks.

13. Unlike the eastern parts of Belconnen and the northern parts of Woden that interface with the Canberra Central district, the Molonglo Valley does not interface with Belconnen or Canberra, but rather is integrated with services, amenities, organisations, and communities in Weston Creek.

Means of Communication/Transport Links

14. The road network in the Molonglo Valley is an extension of Weston Creek's arterial roads: Cotter Road and Tuggeranong Parkway through to Parkes Way. These roads link the Molonglo Valley District with Weston Creek, Woden, and Tuggeranong that form the majority of the Division of Bean.
15. The R7 and R10 buses link the Molonglo Valley and Weston Creek to the City along the Cotter Road/Adelaide Avenue corridor, while bus route 66 links Denman Prospect with the Cooleman Court Shopping Centre and the Woden Town Centre. This shows that the Molonglo Valley orients towards the City and elsewhere in Canberra through Weston Creek as a gateway.
16. There are no rapid services linking Denman Prospect (or Weston Creek) to Belconnen. While bus route 47 does link Denman Village and Whitlam with the Belconnen Town Centre, this is a north-south shuttle service that links Denman Prospect with Whitlam, while connecting to Belconnen Town Centre (which is actually in the Division of Fenner) as a major Canberra transport hub, while skipping over the suburbs of Hawker, Weetangera, Macquarie, Cook and Aranda, demonstrating there is no demand to travel from Denman Prospect and Whitlam to these southern suburbs of Belconnen.

Community Services

17. Residents in Molonglo Valley rely on services in Weston Creek, with health and education catchment zones incorporating both areas. While Denman Village Shops is the major shopping centre in the Molonglo Valley, many residents frequent the larger Cooleman Court Shopping Centre in Weston as it has more variety, facilities, and community services co-located in one cluster.
18. Sporting clubs serving families in Molonglo Valley and Weston Creek, including Weston Creek Molonglo Cricket Club and Weston Creek Molonglo Football Club. These clubs operate from facilities in Weston Creek, with families from across Molonglo Valley and Weston Creek enrolling children in competitions with these clubs.

19. Denman Prospect, Wright, Coombs, and Whitlam are all in the same Priority Enrolment Area as Weston Creek for Canberra College. Primary Schools and High Schools enrolment areas are clustered within the Molonglo Valley district at the Evelyn Scott School, further reinforcing the Molonglo Valley as a unitary district.
20. If the Committee was to consider transferring electors from the Molonglo Valley into the Division of Canberra, it would have transfer them as a whole, not just singular suburbs/SA2s, as this would break communities of interest and not reflect the deep ties between the various suburbs within the district. Therefore, creating an orphan of Whitlam in the Division of Canberra would not meet the requirements of s66(3)(b) of the Act, while moving the balance of the Molonglo Valley (Denman Prospect, Wright, and Coombs) would also not serve the s66(3)(b) criteria as these areas are integrated with Weston Creek and not the southern suburbs of Belconnen.
21. The current alignment of Molonglo Valley in the Division of Bean, with the Belconnen suburbs being balanced between the Divisions of Canberra and Fenner is the more optimal alignment, especially where other options exist to transfer electors between the Divisions of Bean and Canberra.

Hawker and Weetangera / Giralang, Lawson, and Kaleen

22. While recognising that in an ideal world the entirety of the Belconnen District would be contained in a single Division, the requirements of s66 of the Act and geographical constraints elsewhere mean that it is inevitable that some districts will need to be split.
23. In the ACT, the previous Redistribution correctly recognised this fact due to the inability to construct electoral divisions just of whole districts. In considering this, the previous Redistribution Committee determined that it would be sensible to centre the three electoral divisions on Gungahlin (north), Tuggeranong (south), and Canberra (centre) and find the most appropriate interface suburbs in between the different electoral divisions.
24. The previous Redistribution Committee made the correct determination that this should occur east-west in Belconnen between the Divisions of Fenner and Canberra, and north-south in Woden between the Divisions of Bean and Canberra.

25. Eight Suggestions have proposed that there are changes to the boundary between the Divisions of Fenner and Canberra in Belconnen.⁵ Primarily these considered moving Hawker and Weetangera,⁶ or Giralang, Lawson, and Kaleen to the Division of Fenner from the Division of Canberra.⁷

26. In reviewing the required two numerical ranges for electoral divisions provided by the Committee, it is clear that the Division of Fenner does not require any change as it meets the enrolment required.⁸

Electorate	Enrolment as at 12 August 2025		Projected enrolment at 8 April 2030		Is the numerical requirement met?
	Enrolment	Percentage variation from the redistribution quota	Projected enrolment	Percentage variation from the projected enrolment quota	
Bean	114,006	6.26%	123,608	7.63%	No
Canberra	102,602	-4.37%	109,175	-4.93%	No
Fenner	105,271	-1.88%	111,742	-2.70%	Yes

27. Therefore, unless there is a requirement to change these boundaries to ensure the other two divisions meet the required enrolment, the Committee should consider retaining the existing boundaries. This has occurred in past redistributions elsewhere in Australia, for example the Division of Goldstein was left unchanged over successive redistributions in Victoria because it met the requirements and surrounding divisions were able to meet their respective requirements without affecting the Division of Goldstein.

28. While the Liberal Party does not object to the transfer of these suggested areas to the Division of Fenner on the criteria of community of interest, means of communication and travel, or geography, we submit that changes to the Division of Fenner are unnecessary. The Division already meets the required enrolment under s66(3)(a) of the Act, which is the overriding consideration of the Committee.

29. Furthermore, given that SA2s in the ACT correlate to suburbs, and that suburbs in the ACT are usually relatively self-sufficient, separate communities in of themselves, the Liberal Party strongly opposes any boundary dividing

⁵ Submission S1: Anonymous 1; Submission S4: Ben Last; Submission S5: Roger Nye; Submission S7: Dr Mark Mulcair; Submission S8: Malcolm Bourke; Submission S10: Ethan Raats; Submission S11: Luke Dixon; Submission S15: Anonymous 2

⁶ Submission S3: PJ; Submission S5: Roger Nye; Submission S8: Malcolm Bourke; Submission S10: Ethan Raats; Submission S11: Luke Dixon

⁷ Submission S1: Anonymous 1; Submission S4: Ben Last; Submission S7: Dr Mark Mulcair; Submission S10: Ethan Raats; Submission S15: Anonymous 2

⁸ <https://www.aec.gov.au/redistributions/2025/act/essential.html>

SA2s or suburbs between different Divisions as it is completely unnecessary to meet the required enrolment in the three divisions.⁹

30. We also submit that transferring electors from the Division of Canberra to the Division of Fenner will involve further unnecessary changes elsewhere to the boundaries between the Divisions of Canberra and Bean, potentially leading to sub-optimal alignment of boundaries on s66(3)(b) criteria.

Norfolk Island and Jervis Bay Territory

31. There were four Suggestions that considered the placement of Norfolk Island and Jervis Bay Territory in electoral Divisions in the ACT.¹⁰
32. s56AA of the Act requires Norfolk Island and Jervis Bay Territory to be included in separate electoral Divisions in the ACT, since Norfolk Island is not entitled to representation in its own right and there is more than one electoral Division in the ACT.
33. With this legislative requirement in mind, the Committee must put both Norfolk Island and Jervis Bay Territory in two different electoral Divisions in the ACT. There are no significant arguments per s66(3)(b) of the Act given that there are no communities of interest, means of communication and travel, and physical features, that directly link any part of the ACT with Norfolk Island and Jervis Bay Territory.
34. Therefore, if the Committee is considering the s66(3)(b) criteria, sub-sections (i), (ii), and (iv) do not apply to the Committee's consideration as they are overridden by s56AA, and the only s66(3)(b) criteria the Committee can consider is s66(3)(b)(v), namely the existing boundaries. This is consistent with consideration of previous Redistribution Committees that have included Jervis Bay Territory in the ACT's northern electoral Division and Norfolk Island in the ACT's southern electoral Division.
35. For that reason, no change should be made to the inclusion of Jervis Bay Territory in the Division of Fenner and Norfolk Island in the Division of Bean, where it is possible to make other transfers of electors that better align to the requirements of s66(3)(b).

⁹ As has been suggested to split the suburb/SA2 of Bruce between the Divisions of Fenner and Canberra in *Submission S7: Dr Mark Mulcair* and *Submission 15: Anonymous 2*

¹⁰ Submission S1: Anonymous 1; Submission S2: Howard Carman; Submission S14: James Dixon; Submission S15: Anonymous 2

Phillip

36. Seven Suggestions proposed to transfer Phillip from the Division of Bean to the Division of Canberra. The Liberal Party's Suggestion proposed to transfer the whole suburb/SA2,¹¹ while others suggested to transfer only the part of Phillip north of Hindmarsh Drive.¹²

37. Unfortunately, in our Suggestion, the figures in the tables for both Divisions of Bean and Canberra showed incorrect total enrolments for the proposed divisions. However, the Suggestion was otherwise compliant with the enrolment requirements of s66(2) of the Act. These are the corrected tables.

Table 1: Liberal Party proposed transfer of electors from the Division of Bean

	Current Enrolment	Variance from Quota ±10%	Projected Enrolment	Variance from Quota ±3.5%
Division of Bean	114,006	+6.26%	123,608	7.63%
LESS Phillip SA2 (801091109)	-3,883		-6,079	
Proposed Division of Bean	110,123	+2.64%	117,529	+2.34%

Table 2: Liberal Party proposed transfer of electors to the Division of Canberra

	Current Enrolment	Variance from Quota ±10%	Projected Enrolment	Variance from Quota ±3.5%
Division of Canberra	102,602	-4.37%	109,175	-4.93%
ADD Phillip SA2 (801091109)	+3,883		+6,079	
Proposed Division of Canberra	106,485	-0.75%	115,254	+0.36%

38. While the Liberal Party maintains that is better to keep all of the Phillip suburb/SA2 in the Division of Canberra, if the Committee were sympathetic to splitting the suburb across Hindmarsh Drive, the proposed boundary would also meet the required enrolment under s66(2) of the Act without requiring any further transfers of electors.

¹¹ Submission S3: PJ; Submission S10: Ethan Raats; Submission S11: Luke Dixon; Submission S13: Liberal Party of Australia ACT Division

¹² Submission S1: Anonymous 1; Submission S4: Ben Last; Submission S7: Dr Mark Mulcair

Table 3: Proposed transfer of electors from the Division of Bean in the Northern Part of the Phillip SA2

	Current Enrolment	Variance from Quota ±10%	Projected Enrolment	Variance from Quota ±3.5%
Division of Bean	114,006	+6.26%	123,608	7.63%
LESS Phillip SA2 (part, north)	-3,253		-5,179	
Proposed Division of Bean	110,753	+3.22%	118,429	+3.12%

Table 4: Proposed transfer of electors to the Division of Canberra in the Northern Part of the Phillip SA2

	Current Enrolment	Variance from Quota ±10%	Projected Enrolment	Variance from Quota ±3.5%
Division of Canberra	102,602	-4.37%	109,175	-4.93%
ADD Phillip SA2 (part, north)	+3,253		+5,179	
Proposed Division of Canberra	105,855	-1.34%	114,354	-0.42%

39. Regardless, the Liberal Party reiterates its arguments at paragraph 29 above relating to maintain entire suburbs/SA2s together. Given suburbs/SA2s in the ACT are unique in nature and structure, unlike suburbs in other major cities across Australia, it is necessary to not split them across Divisions in the ACT as they do not interface the same way as they would in Sydney or Melbourne.

40. In relation to other suggestions where electors in Mawson, Chifley, and O'Malley were transferred from the Division of Bean to the Division of Canberra,¹³ these transfers of electors are only required due to the Suggestions making unnecessary changes elsewhere between the boundaries between the Divisions of Fenner and Canberra. These suburbs/SA2s are part of the southern part of Woden, and closely with Farrer, Pearce and Torrens, and Isaacs respectively. By separating them from their neighbouring suburbs, communities are split, geography is not respected, and means of communication and travel are not taken into consideration. In the Woden district there is a clear north/south divide around Hindmarsh Drive – which is split into three distinct sections along Athllon Drive and Yamba Drive. These are north-south oriented communities, not east-west orient communities as the Suggestions would indicate.

41. Other Suggestions have also proposed to move Curtin, Hughes, Lyons, and Garran to the Division of Bean from the Division of Canberra.¹⁴ Similar to

¹³ See Submission S10: Ethan Raats and Submission S11: Luke Dixon

¹⁴ See Submission S5: Roger Nye and Submission S15: Anonymous 2

other transfers of electors between along this axis, these changes are only necessary because of other unnecessary changes between the Divisions of Canberra and Fenner, and similarly by making sub-optimal transfer of electors in the Molonglo Valley from the Division of Bean to the Division of Canberra.

42. There is a clear divide in the Woden Valley district with distinct northern and southern parts that make this a better interface district between the Divisions of Canberra and Bean. This is especially so when compared to the Molonglo Valley district, for the reasons outlined above in the “Molonglo Valley” section.

Conclusion

43. The Liberal Party maintains its position from its original Suggestion¹⁵ in transferring the electors in the Phillip SA2 (80109109) from the Division of Bean to the Division of Canberra, while leaving the Division of Fenner unchanged, as being the most appropriate way for the Committee to ensure clear and fair electoral boundaries in the ACT, in line with the requirements of the Act.

44. It is worth noting that this would mean only 1.21% of electors in the ACT would be transferred between Divisions, minimising disruption to electoral rolls and ensuring the greatest number of voters possible remains within their current Division.

21 November 2025

Appendix 1: List of Submissions considered in this Comments on Suggestions

Submission S1: Anonymous 1
Submission S2: Howard Carman
Submission S3: PJ
Submission S4: Ben Last
Submission S5: Roger Nye
Submission S7: Dr Mark Mulcair
Submission S8: Malcolm Bourke
Submission S9: Darren McSweeney
Submission S10: Ethan Raats
Submission S11: Luke Dixon
Submission S13: Liberal Party of Australia ACT Division
Submission S14: James Dixon
Submission S15: Anonymous 2

¹⁵ Submission S3: Liberal Party of Australia ACT Division