



Objection 118

Dr Mark Mulcair

13 pages

**OBJECTIONS TO
2017-18
VICTORIAN
REDISTRIBUTION**

(DR MARK MULCAIR)

GENERAL COMMENTS

I am very pleased with the Committee's proposal. While some of the changes were a little unexpected, I am very supportive of most of them, and I completely support the general pattern of Divisions that the Committee has drawn.

In particular, I am very supportive of the decisions to:

- Create a new Division in the western suburbs.
- Draw McEwen as a predominantly rural/semi-rural seat, with Craigieburn united in Calwell and Epping/South Morang united in Scullin.
- Return the Diamond Creek/Plenty area to Jagajaga.
- Draw Maribyrnong as a seat mostly east of the river.
- Re-arrange the seats of Chisholm, Bruce, Isaacs, Hotham and Dunkley in the south-eastern suburbs.

On the last point, it makes enormous sense to centre Bruce on the Dandenong area, uniting almost all of the 'Greater Dandenong' area in a single Division. It also is very logical to draw Isaacs as a purely coastal Division, linking the communities along the Frankston rail line.

The proposals for the Divisions of Corio and Cox, and in the outer eastern suburbs (Menzies, Casey, Latrobe, McMillan/Monash, and Flinders) were quite different from my own proposals, but most of these changes are sensible and logical.

Most of my 'Objections' are more like suggestions; they are all fairly minor in nature, and simply involve tidying up a boundary here and there to improve community of interest. Having made some extensive changes that are overwhelmingly positive, I would not support any major rethinking at this stage of the process.

Division listings

I would recommend that the Committee return to the previous methodology of describing their redistributions "In the order which Divisions generally relate to each other", i.e. commencing at the edges of the state and working inwards systematically.

Having the redistribution laid out alphabetically can make it difficult to follow the Committee's logic, since the description jumps around from one part of the state to the other.

OBJECTION 1: WANNON/ “COX”

The extensive redrawing of Corio and Corangamite is a surprise, but the boundaries are reasonably strong and clear. It makes sense to unite the Bellarine Peninsula in a single seat, and while Leopold is increasingly a suburban part of Geelong, its status as ‘Gateway to the Peninsula’ makes it a reasonable fit in Corangamite/Cox.

(Longer-term, I am not sure that the Committee’s boundary for Corio and Cox will be sustainable. It seems inevitable that Cox will be drawn into the southern suburbs of Geelong over time, and that most of the territory it lost to Corio will have to be regained in the future).

The only Objection I have is to the boundary between Wannon and Cox, in the Colac area. It is not clear why a small amount of ‘Colac Region’ (Birregurra and surrounds) is proposed to remain in Cox. I understand the logic of leaving the coastal parts of Colac-Otway Shire (the ‘Otway’ SA2) in Cox, but Birregurra is a hinterland community, and would seem to be a much better fit with the remaining Colac hinterland area in Wannon. Placing Birregurra in Wannon would also allow greater use of the municipal boundary, which is much clearer than the fairly arbitrary boundary proposed by the Committee.

Similarly, I think that it is better to return the balance of ‘Golden Plains South’ (Cressy and the areas immediately north) to Cox. Again, this would allow for the greater use of the municipal boundary in the area, and provide a neater split of Golden Plains Shire.

The above exchange results in a net transfer of ~400 electors from Cox to Wannon, which both Divisions can easily accommodate.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| WANNON | | | |
| EXISTING | | 112,296 | 112,757 |
| - Golden Plains South (balance) | To Cox | 751 | 754 |
| + Colac Region (balance) | From Cox | 1164 | 1176 |
| PROPOSED | | 112,709 | 113,179 |
| | | | |
| CORANGAMITE / ‘COX’ | | 103566 | 109205 |
| EXISTING | | | |
| + Golden Plains South (balance) | From Wannon | 751 | 754 |
| - Colac Region (balance) | To Wannon | 1164 | 1176 |
| PROPOSED | | 103,153 | 108,783 |

OBJECTION 2: MARIBYRNONG/CALWELL

I support the boundaries for these two Divisions, with the exception of the suburb of Gowanbrae.

Gowanbrae is an isolated area, and its only outlet is into the suburb of Airport West, most of which is currently within Maribyrnong. In contrast, Gowanbrae is almost entirely cut off from Calwell (and Wills) by freeways, parklands, and Moonee Ponds Creek.

I suggest adopting the Ring Road as the boundary in this area, transferring Gowanbrae to Maribyrnong. This would involve just over 2000 electors, leaving both Divisions within tolerance.

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| CALWELL | | | |
| EXISTING | | 103,751 | 110,464 |
| - Gowanbrae | To Maribyrnong | 2116 | 2159 |
| PROPOSED | | 101,635 | 108,305 |
| | | | |
| MARIBYRNONG | | | |
| EXISTING | | 108,119 | 111,765 |
| + Gowanbrae | From Calwell | 2116 | 2159 |
| PROPOSED | | 110,235 | 113,924 |

OBJECTION 3: FRASER/GORTON

The proposed boundary between these two Divisions is mostly clear, except in the Kings Park area where it follows the LGA boundary. This is not a clear boundary on the ground, as it follows minor streets and property boundaries.

I suggest instead that the boundary run along Kings Road, Taylors Road, and Calder Park Drive. This improves the boundary by straightening it and running it along more significant roads. All of Kings Park is returned to Gorton, while a part of Taylors Hill is now placed in Fraser.

A net ~1000 electors is transferred from Fraser to Gorton.

| | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| FRASER | | | |
| EXISTING | | 109,137 | 111,482 |
| - Kings Park (all) | To Gorton | 5552 | 5609 |
| + Taylors Hill (east of Calder Pk Drive) | From Gorton | 4362 | 4643 |
| PROPOSED | | 107,947 | 110,516 |
| GORTON | | | |
| EXISTING | | 104,042 | 111,012 |
| + Kings Park (all) | From Fraser | 5552 | 5609 |
| - Taylors Hill (east of Calder Pk Drive) | To Fraser | 4362 | 4643 |
| PROPOSED | | 105,232 | 111,978 |

OBJECTION 4: SCULLIN/McEWEN/NICHOLLS/INDI

I support the general thrust of the Committee's proposals; in particular, the decision to remove almost all of McEwen's urban territory. However, I have two specific issues with the proposed boundaries:

1) The irregular boundary through Mernda:

Quota does not seem to permit uniting Mernda in Scullin (or McEwen) without major changes elsewhere, so I accept that some split of Mernda is necessary. However, I don't agree with using Cravens Road as a boundary; this is a fairly minor local street that would be a poor boundary on the ground.

2) The splitting of Strathbogie Shire between Nicholls and Indi

I understand the logic of this decision, and I agree that there are some good links between Euroa and other towns within Indi. However, I still think it makes more sense to leave Strathbogie Shire united in Nicholls, since Indi does not require any change to meet quota.

I propose the following:

1) Straighten the Scullin/McEwen boundary along Bridge Inn Road.

This is a significant road that would be a much clearer boundary through Mernda, and would simply run in a straight line instead of making 'dog legs'.

It is not possible to get an accurate measure of the electors transferred, since the SA1 is very large. However, Scullin is at the low end of tolerance, so can easily accommodate however many electors are in this area. (My estimate is just short of 2000).

2) Return Broadford to McEwen.

This compensates McEwen for the losses to Scullin. While Broadford has good links with Seymour, it also fits well with Kilmore and surrounding areas that are proposed to remain in McEwen

3) Return to the existing Murray/Indi boundary.

If Broadford remains in McEwen, then Nicholls can re-gain the balance of Strathbogie Shire. While there are good links with Indi, there are equally good connections to areas already within Nicholls, such as Murchison and Shepparton.

A return to the existing boundary would leave Moira Shire split. However, at least this split is already there, and has been for many years, instead of creating a new split elsewhere.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| SCULLIN | | | |
| EXISTING | | 103,164 | 108,238 |
| + Mernda (south of Bride Inn Road) | From McEwen | 1400 | 1800 |
| PROPOSED | | 104,724 | 110,240 |
| | | | |
| McEWEN | | | |
| EXISTING | | 100358 | 107238 |
| - Mernda (south of Bride Inn Road) | To Scullin | 1400 | 1800 |
| + Broadford (all) | From Nicholls | 3712 | 3834 |
| PROPOSED | | 102,510 | 109,070 |
| | | | |
| NICHOLLS | | | |
| EXISTING | | | |
| - Broadford (all) | To McEwen | 3712 | 3834 |
| - Moira (part within existing Indi) | To Indi | 879 | 872 |
| + Strathbogie (balance) | From Indi | 4425 | 4465 |
| PROPOSED | | 108,442 | 109,493 |
| | | | |
| INDI | | | |
| EXISTING | | 109,395 | 111,130 |
| - Strathbogie (balance) | To Indi | 4425 | 4465 |
| + Moira (part within existing Indi) | From Indi | 879 | 872 |
| PROPOSED | | 105,849 | 107,537 |

OBJECTION 5: BRUCE/HOTHAM/ISAACS

I am recommending a very slight rotation of all three Divisions, to straighten a few boundaries and improve community of interest.

I suggest:

a) Isaacs shed Springvale South to Hotham

The proposed boundary leaves Springvale South somewhat isolated from the remainder of Isaacs by the Dingley Bypass and open space. The bypass, which also serves as the LGA boundary in the area, is a significant road that serves as a clear divide between Springvale South and Dingley, and it seems more sensible to me to unite Springvale South with those parts of Springvale already in Hotham.

b) The Isaacs/Bruce boundary move from Kirkham Road to Dandenong Creek

Kirkham Road is not a significant road in the area, being a cul-de-sac in multiple locations, with no direct connections between either side of Eastlink or Dandenong Creek. In addition, using Kirkham Road as a boundary would split a fairly self-contained residential area in Dandenong South.

Ideally, I would place Dandenong South in Bruce, as it makes sense to unite as much of 'Dandenong' as possible in one seat. However, it also fits fairly well with those parts of Keysborough that are remaining in Isaacs. Therefore, I suggest the boundary be adjusted to follow Eastlink and Dandenong Creek to the railway line. The creek is a clear boundary in the area, and would unite this suburban area in a single seat.

c) The Bruce/Hotham boundary be straightened along Springvale Road and Police Road

It is not clear why the boundary makes a deviation along minor side streets through Springvale; presumably, it was simply to balance numbers in Bruce. However, with the losses to Isaacs, there is plenty of room for Bruce to accept these extra electors. I suggest moving back to simply follow Springvale Road as far as Police Road, then continue straight down Police Road to the existing proposed boundary.

| | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| ISAACS | | | |
| EXISTING | | 105,707 | 109,463 |
| - Springvale South | To Hotham | 2694 | 2759 |
| + Dandenong South | From Bruce | 1521 | 1579 |
| PROPOSED | | 104,534 | 108,283 |
| | | | |
| BRUCE | | | |
| EXISTING | | 108,421 | 110,513 |
| ‘+ Springvale (east of Springvale Road) | From Hotham | 3179 | 3306 |
| ‘- Dandenong South | To Isaacs | 1521 | 1579 |
| PROPOSED | | 110,079 | 112,240 |

** I am proposing that Hotham and Bruce undergo further changes, discussed below*

OBJECTION 6: MACNAMARA/HIGGINS/HOTHAM

I still think it makes sense to exchange Caulfield for the South Yarra/Prahran area, if at all possible. I outlined in detail my reasons for this in my original Suggestions; the higher-density commercial/entertainment precinct along Chapel Street fits better with the more ‘Inner City’ Division of Macnamara, while Caulfield has more in common with the established affluent suburban areas that make up most of Higgins.

The Committee has made a partial change, placing the Windsor area into Macnamara, while still leaving most of South Yarra and Prahran in Higgins. I think if the Committee is prepared to go this far, they might as well go the whole way and make the complete exchange. I suggest adopting Williams Road and Hotham Street as a straight and clear boundary between the two Divisions.

This exchange transfers a net ~3000 electors from Macnamara to Higgins, which pushes Higgins over quota. I suggest a simple deletion to Hotham, by simply returning Hotham’s share of Hughesdale. This brings the boundary back to Poath Road, which is also the municipal boundary in this area.

| | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| MACNAMARA | | | |
| EXISTING | | 110,119 | 113,562 |
| + South Yarra and Prahran SA2s | From Higgins | 18,231 | 19,709 |
| - Caulfield, Elsternwick, Glenhuntly, St Kilda East (east of Hotham Street) | To Higgins | 21,961 | 22,372 |
| PROPOSED | | 106,389 | 110,899 |
| | | | |
| HIGGINS | | | |
| EXISTING | | 108,550 | 111,855 |
| - South Yarra and Prahran SA2s | To Macnamara | 18,231 | 19,709 |
| + Caulfield, Elsternwick, Glenhuntly, St Kilda East (east of Hotham Street) | From Macnamara | 21,961 | 22,372 |
| - Hughesdale (part currently in Hotham) | To Hotham | 3125 | 3183 |
| PROPOSED | | 109,155 | 111,335 |

OBJECTION 7: DEAKIN/MENZIES

The proposed boundary still isolates the small part of Donvale that lies south of Eastlink and Hillcrest Reserve. While this is part of Manningham LGA, it is largely cut off from the rest of Donvale by the freeway, and the municipal boundary appears to follow an arbitrary line through property boundaries.

My original Suggestions proposed using Eastlink and Mullum Mullum Creek, between Mitcham Road and the Ringwood Bypass, and I recommend this change to the Committee. This would transfer ~1000 electors from Menzies to Deakin, which leaves Deakin at the very top of tolerance. If the Committee felt this was a problem, then Deakin could easily return part of the Croydon or Ringwood North area to Menzies.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| DEAKIN | | | |
| EXISTING | | 110,694 | 113,159 |
| + Donvale south of freeway | From Menzies | 1,020 | 1,048 |
| PROPOSED | | 111,714 | 114,207 |
| | | | |
| MENZIES | | | |
| EXISTING | | 107,503 | 109,176 |
| - Donvale south of freeway | To Deakin | 1,020 | 1,048 |
| PROPOSED | | 106,483 | 108,128 |

OBJECTION 8: BRUCE/LATROBE

I still think that Narre Warren North is a better fit in Latrobe than in another Division. Although it has seen some residential development, Narre Warren North still retains a more semi-rural feel than Narre Warren or Endeavour Hills, and probably fits better with the rural northern part of Latrobe than with the fully suburban Bruce. Part of Narre Warren North is already in Latrobe, so it makes sense to unite this area in a single Division if at all possible.

(Ideally, Lysterfield South would probably fit better in Latrobe as well, but this would result in a very convoluted boundary)

Moving Narre Warren North would transfer around 3000 electors from Bruce to Latrobe, which both Divisions can easily accommodate.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| BRUCE | | | |
| EXISTING* | | 110,079 | 112,240 |
| - Narre Warren North (balance) | To Latrobe | 2,873 | 3,026 |
| PROPOSED | | 107,206 | 109,214 |
| | | | |
| LATROBE | | | |
| EXISTING | | 102,129 | 109,705 |
| + Narre Warren North (balance) | From Bruce | 2,873 | 3,026 |
| PROPOSED | | 105,002 | 112,731 |

* *After changes with Isaacs and Hotham*

OBJECTIONS FOR WHICH I HAVE NO SOLUTION

There are a number of issues that I would have liked to address, but I personally can't find a way to make the numbers work. If another Objection was able to find a logical way to deal with these, I would probably support it.

Point Cook

The split of Point Cook is unfortunate, as it is a fairly self-contained area with a clear community of interest. I was unable to find a way to keep Point Cook together in my original suggestions, because there is no obvious alternative transfer. Retaining Laverton and Truganina in Lalor is the obvious solution from a community of interest point-of-view, but the numbers don't work.

Wheelers Hill

Ideally, Wheelers Hill would fit better with Glen Waverley in the redrawn Chisholm, rather than with Hotham. The Monash Freeway is a clearer divide in this area than Waverley Road, but this change would transfer way too many electors into Chisholm. Any compensating transfer from Chisholm to Hotham in the Ashwood/Chadstone area would give both Divisions awkward shapes.

Pearcedale and Western Port area

The rural southern parts of Casey Council are probably a better fit in Flinders or Monash (or even Latrobe) than with the heavily suburban Holt.

Possibly, the Committee could consider an anti-clockwise rotation of Flinders, Holt, Bruce, Isaacs and Dunkley, to partially undo the proposed changes. However, I think this would result in Mornington being split, and a messier boundary between Dunkley and Isaacs. I haven't been able to find a way to make this work well.