



Comment on objections 46

Darren McSweeney

17 pages

Comment on Objections Redistribution of Commonwealth Electoral Divisions

Darren McSweeney



Victoria 2023

Queenscliff High Light (Black Lighthouse), Nhulunbuy

Photo by [Rexness](#) on [Flickr](#)

This Public Comment on Objections was lodged 10 July 2024 by
Darren McSweeney
an Australian Citizen, resident of Victoria, and member of the Australian Public Service.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
<http://mcsw.ee>

I acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which I live and write, the Bunurong people of the Kulin nation. I pay my respects to their Elders, past and present.

Cover photograph for illustration may have been colour adjusted, cropped or resized from the original image and is used under [Creative Commons 2.0 Generic](#) licence.

Political disclaimer

The views, opinions, arguments and recommendations presented in this Comment on Objections to the redistribution of electoral divisions of Victoria are the author's own and in no way reflect the views of Services Australia, the Australian Public Service or Australian Government.

My right to hold and express views as an Australian Citizen is [protected under Australian law](#).

Exercising this right to participate in public and political debate by lodging this public submission in no way affects my capacity to fulfill my duties in a professional, impartial, and apolitical manner.

This submission complies with conditions of employment in the Australian Public Service (APS) in accordance with the *Public Service Act 1999*, the [APS Values, Code of Conduct and Employment Principles](#), and [Social media: Guidance for Australian Public Service Employees and Agencies](#)

I hold no interest in, and do not stand to receive any benefit or advantage resulting from the outcome of this redistribution. I have written this submission as a private citizen taking a personal interest in psephology and the electoral redistribution process. I am not now, nor at any time in the past been a member of any political party or similar associated organisation.

This submission is lodged claiming political neutrality. No political bias or partiality is implied within this submission and none should be inferred. This submission is lodged in accordance with [guidelines for making public submissions to a redistribution](#). The political implications – if any – of the recommendations have not formed part of the recommendation and should not be inferred.

Division names – including any suggested new names– comply with [guidelines for naming federal electoral divisions](#). Suggested names are based on the individual's merit and contribution to Australian society, and do not imply any political bias towards the eponymous persons. Proposals to abolish or rename a division – if any – do not reflect the performance or character of the current member of Parliament representing that division or the eponymous person, unless specified.

Criticism of submissions or decisions taken as part of this redistribution is based solely on the merit of the arguments and recommendations presented therein and serves solely to improve electoral representation for the people of Victoria. It is not in any way a reflection upon the character or abilities of any individual, government or community group or organisation participating in this process, nor any member of a Redistribution Committee, augmented Electoral Commission, any other member of the APS, the Australian Electoral Commission, any other Australian Government entity, agency, department or any current or past member of Parliament.

Contents

Introduction.....	2
General themes presented in suggestions	2
Abolition of Higgins.....	2
Heathmont.....	3
Manningham LGA and surrounding areas	4
South Yarra and Southbank	4
Division of Wills	4
Bruce and the south east.....	5
Objections dealing with multiple divisions.....	5
Miscellaneous.....	8
Higgins or Hotham?	9
Conclusion	10
Appendices	11
Appendix A: Objections about the abolition of Higgins	11
Appendix B: Objections about the proposed boundary in Heathmont.....	14
Appendix C: Objections about Manningham LGA.....	14
Appendix D: Objections about the proposed Division of Wills	15

Introduction

I am providing comment on most of the objections submitted for the redistribution of Victorian electoral divisions. My comments will refer to objections made in relation to the proposed redistribution by the Committee.

Given the sheer number of objections, I cannot read all of them with regard to providing a full commentary on each objection. I will provide direct comments to the objections with a statewide, or multiple division focus.

I am pretty sure that I can safely assume a lot of the single-issue objections contain roughly the same themes, if not the exact same details and same copy. To this regard, I will examine a number of objections as a sample and provide commentary on the general themes. This means it is possible that I will not read an objection somewhere that provide some actual tangible solutions or key points that are not covered elsewhere.

General themes presented in suggestions

Several themes were present in the objections, not surprisingly the abolition of Higgins and what to do with the electors the top of the list. Other areas that seem to be contentious are the makeup of Wills, Deakin and Menzies (some of these flow on effects from Higgins), how Melbourne should cross the Yarra River, and the general south-east but a focus toward the makeup of Bruce.

Abolition of Higgins

A total of 333 objections¹ speak only to the abolition of Higgins, or the distribution of the electors of Higgins with neighbouring divisions. This is, by far and away, the largest single issue in this round of objections. However, the reasons given are almost entirely superficial. Many of the objections presented are the same, template copies, and present exactly the same arguments.

The objections focus on the fact that Higgins is being abolished, with some seeming to believe that they will no longer have any representation in a division. Some objections seem to believe that their social and community links will be disrupted, as if belonging to a new electoral division affects which services they can access. Others mention the united community, incorrectly emphasising the division is analogous to Stonnington LGA. They speak as if this division is somewhat special or peculiar in this regard. They conveniently neglect to mention that, even within the Stonnington LGA, there are disparate and separate communities. That's not to mention the communities within Higgins that are not within Stonnington. This division of Higgins is no more united or coherent than other similar inner-city divisions.

One of the more common reasons given is the political history of former members of the division. The fact that prime ministers or treasurers were elected to the division of Higgins is used as an argument against the abolition of the division. While this may be a romantic notion,

¹ Refer to Appendix A: Objections about the abolition of Higgins

and the history of the division can be important from a political perspective, it is not really relevant in terms of current community of interests grounds.

Still others object based on the past, current or potential future members or candidates. Some indicate that the abolition of this division is a conspiracy, either politically or socially motivated. These arguments obviously hold no substance and should be dismissed.

The one, and only, argument that holds value is that the name Higgins was based on a member of the Constitutional Conventions. Generally, I would prefer to retain divisions named for those who are considered the founding fathers of modern Australia and would agree that it is unfortunate to eliminate a division named for Henry Higgins. It would have been preferable to retain the name Higgins over say, Kooyong or Hotham. However, this being the only real argument does not diminish the fact the neighbouring divisions can easily accommodate the electors from Higgins in a relatively straightforward manner.

The fact is that one division must be abolished in Victoria to meet the entitlement determination. I cannot see any of these objections that sufficiently argues for the retention of Higgins over other divisions. None of the reasons given are compelling enough in themselves to warrant the Augmented Commission overturning the Committee's proposal. While I personally believe that it may have been a better choice to abolish a division other than Higgins, such as one of Hotham or Chisholm, I cannot see any adequate reason given for retaining Higgins specifically above other divisions.

Heathmont

A total of fifteen objections², some of which are identical, relate solely to the alignment of the Aston boundary with Deakin along Canterbury Road, specifically, through the suburb of Heathmont. The arguments presented do have some merit, in that splitting the suburb means organisations will need to conduct business with two members of parliament. Unfortunately, none of the objections provide any other solutions to how to increase the elector numbers in Aston. Several objections refer to restoring the Dandenong Creek boundary. This is all well and good, except that it means that Aston will either be below the numerical threshold or will need to expand in another direction. I do not support these objections. I believe that Canterbury Road is a clear boundary, and many other smaller suburbs are divided along major roads.

² Refer to

Manningham LGA and surrounding areas

At the other end of Deakin, we find several objections³ around the outer areas of Manningham LGA. The arguments in this area are varied with some suggesting that places like Wonga Park belong with Casey, others suggest with Menzies and others in Deakin. The actual arguments here are extensive, some rather detailed and I will admit this is an area of Melbourne I don't know incredibly well. Therefore, I will therefore leave any comments up to those more familiar with the individual characteristics of the suburbs.

Some of the objections I have included here actually contend with the other end of Menzies around either Box Hill or Balwyn. I won't speak specifically to these objections, as I believe my thoughts on this issue are covered elsewhere in this commentary.

South Yarra and Southbank

Most objections⁴ that speak to the issue of Macnamara and Melbourne agree that the Committee's proposal does not accurately reflect the community of interests in this area. When considering alternative solutions for this area, almost all of them reach the same conclusion. The division of Melbourne has a much better affinity Southbank, South Wharf and Fishermans Bend than they do with South Yarra and definitely with Prahran.

I will note there were five objections⁵ that argued in support of the proposed arrangements. While not diminishing their opinions, the reasons given for supporting this arrangement was related solely to combining the government housing in South Yarra with those in the north. However, I feel this in itself is not compelling reason to join Melbourne with parts of the former Higgins. The bulk of electors in South Yarra and Prahran is disparate from and has no connection with the electors to the north in Richmond or Abbotsford.

As everyone else agrees, Southbank, South Wharf and Fishermans Bend are the sensible option to transfer to Melbourne, with South Yarra and Prahran going into Macnamara.

Division of Wills

There are a large number of objections⁶ relating to the boundaries of the proposed Wills. Within these objections, there are main areas of contention. The first issue is that of Fitzroy and Carlton North being placed in Wills. The second is the areas between Moonee Ponds Creek and the Tullamarine Freeway being transferred to Maribyrnong. Finally, the suburbs of Glenroy and Oak Park being split along Pascoe Vale Road. This is probably the most notable of the proposed changes. A number of objections simply refer to Glenroy, Oak Park and Brunswick West in summary, but do not make any specific arguments about any area. Again,

³ Refer to Appendix C: Objections about Manningham LGA

⁴ Including **OB3 - Fab Scalia**, and **OB482 - Julian McCrann**

⁵ Objections supporting South Yarra being transferred to Melbourne were **OB396 - Abdella Umar**, **OB432 - Victorian Pride Lobby**, **OB439 - Ethiopian Community Association in Victoria**, **OB471 - Australian Vietnamese Women's Association**, and **OB486 - Farah Warsame**

⁶ Refer to Appendix D: Objections about the proposed Division of Wills

some of these objections are identical to one another. The argument in these objections is that the entire boundary of Wills should remain unchanged, which is unfeasible.

Of the objections making actual arguments about specific suburbs, those in Carlton North or Fitzroy are the most common. Next is Glenroy and Oak Park, and only a few specifically regarding Brunswick West.

Many of the objections, however, do not provide any tangible solutions, so the objections themselves can only be noted.

Bruce and the south east

The area around Bruce is problematic for a number of reasons. The division between Bruce and Isaacs through Dandenong divides communities of interests. The flow on effects to Isaacs, Bruce and even into Holt and La Trobe create multiple disparate communities. Ten objections⁷ were received regarding these changes. A number of the present the same issues and I am not sure that there are many solutions here that don't have widespread effects elsewhere throughout the south-eastern suburbs.

Objections dealing with multiple divisions

It was heartening to see a large contingent of objections that tried to provide solutions for multiple divisions or the entire state. Some of these read more like original suggestions, proposing further changes to the existing divisions, with little regard to the proposal by the Committee. While this makes analysis more difficult, these objections at least attempt to provide some semblance of a solution.

I have deliberately avoided comment on the political party objections. It is possible that some of them may have merit in some of their objections, and they may accidentally argue for actual communities of interests, but overall, their goal is to improve their own political success and therefore I don't pay much attention to their arguments.

OB1 and OB22 – Benjamin Close has provided an extensive reworking of the entire state. He seems to rely on the existing boundaries rather than providing any comment on the proposed boundaries. He does not address the proposal at all and provides no justification for his suggested divisions.

Some of the divisions he proposes are sensible, such as his proposal for Calwell, Macnamara or Maribyrnong. Others, however, such as Casey, Holt, and La Trobe, are awkward and do not contain logical community of interests. I do not support his proposal to abolish Menzies, or for Jagajaga to cross the Yarra River. I certainly appreciate the extensive effort he has put in with

⁷ Objections that reference Bruce, Isaacs eastern boundary or the general areas include **OB418 - Julian Hill MP**, **OB172 - Feras Jaber**, **OB175 - Rhonda Garad**, **OB369 - Glenn Ruddle**, **OB495 - Anonymous 24**, **OB177 - Louis Desribes**, **OB425 - Dave Perry**, **OB478 - Matthew Kirwan**, **OB389 - Isabelle Nash**, and **OB295 - Heather Louis**

this, and other suggestions. Given that he relies on the existing divisions, it would be difficult to implement only sections of his objection. Therefore, I do not support his objection.

Furthermore, I do not support any of the proposed name changes of divisions.

OB153 - James is very comprehensive, and I would agree with almost all of the specific objections that are raised. I would add that while this objection lists no specific objections for Corio or Lalor, the reversal of Corio crossing the Little River in their proposal confirms the objection to this in the boundaries proposed by the Committee.

I do fear that this is however too extensive to be adopted following the proposal from the Committee. I would also be hesitant for the new name Anderson after Maybanke Susannah Anderson, given she has little, if any, connection to Victoria. Her achievements seem mostly to relate to New South Wales, and it may be more fitting that a division named in her honour was in the state in which she lived.

OB235 - Jeffrey Waddell again is thorough in his objection although he does make a large number of suggested changes.

OB504 - Anonymous 25 provides an extensive objection. I do not find fault in any of the objections raised, and would be happy to accept any and all of the changes suggested. While I am not entirely happy with their suggested Kooyong, the suggested changes are eminently better than those proposed by the Committee, and overall the changes to the other division are indeed no worse than those in the proposal.

I would also note the section regarding retaining Higgins in favour of another division such as Hotham.

OB152 - Ben Mullin provides some accurate objections, and I agree with the points presented. I am not as keen on the suggested boundaries in the east and south-east, with many of the suggestions leading to overly elongated divisions, in particular the proposed Menzies and Higgins.

OB86 - Nimalan Sivakumar provides arguments again for retaining Higgins in favour of Hotham. I would also support the remaining of their arguments, except the objection regarding Menzies and Kooyong. While it's true that Balwyn and Doncaster are separate areas, the demographic characteristics of the areas are not that dissimilar. I do agree that Doncaster has logical and natural affinity with Box Hill, so I believe that Menzies could easily expand toward either Balwyn or Box Hill.

I cannot support the objection **OB411 - Mr Joel A McAlister**. His reasoning to expand Menzies far north of the Yarra River and split Aston through the middle of Knox LGA do not align with any community of interests.

I agree with the objections raised by **OB416 - Phillip Drake**. In general, I agree with the suggested changes in the west and north and central Melbourne area. I'm less inclined to

agree with the changes in the south-east flowing from Kooyong, and I believe there are other objections that have a better alignment of divisions. However, overall, this objection is better than that in the proposal by the Committee.

As always, **OB493 - Charles Richardson** provides a comprehensive analysis and I would support all of the suggested changes, with the exception of placing an importance on the boundary between the Boroondara and Whitehorse LGAs. The boundary though Surrey Hills is awkward and does not align with any major roads or natural features. Indeed, it is an anorichism from 1994 when the City of Camberwell and the City of Box Hill were amalgamated at different times. This boundary should not be considered a major division.

OB108 - Leon Shinkai provides arguments and solutions that are generally agreeable. The appearance of their suggested Bruce is somewhat awkward, but then again, the proposed Bruce is just as awkward, so I see little issue.

I would be happy to accept any suggestions put forward in **OB174 - Dr Mark Mulcair**. All proposed changes he makes are suitable. I also agree with his comments that the proposed report would be easier to read if the divisions were presented in geographic rather than alphabetical order.

I also have no issues and agree with **OB448 - Adam Ray**. All the issues raised here, and solutions are sensible.

I don't have any issues with the objections on boundaries raised by **OB462 - Michael Ritchie**. Likewise, I agree that the division of Corangamite is no longer appropriate for the area that the division occupies.

OB10 - James Longford again presents that Hotham should have been abolished instead of Higgins. The other suggestions in this objection are acceptable too.

OB53 - Crew Charleigh points out similar objections to the others above, and again, I support the changes that are suggested here.

OB503 - Liam Morris provides some reasonable arguments in the objection. While some of the suggestions provided are logical, others are not. I don't believe Macnamara is served well by including Fishermans Bend, Port Melbourne and Toorak. Additionally, some of the boundaries adjust divisions that are not compensated for such as changes to Holt or McEwen.

OB26 - PJ suggests some small changes. I support the change in Spotswood, but none of the other changes really do much to improve communities of interests. Indeed, placing Plenty in Jagajaga is actually to the detriment of the community. Likewise, Clarinda would be separated from the rest of Isaacs by the green wedge zone.

Miscellaneous

I note that four separate local councils⁸ lodged objections. In all four cases, the reasoning that they present amount to the single argument that the council wishes to remain intact within a single division. This is to be expected, as I'm sure councils would prefer dealing with a single member of parliament. I do not support this argument based solely on the grounds of convenient administration and believe that in many cases, a single LGA is better represented by splitting it into multiple divisions.

Quickly mentioning some other objections, I agree with both **OB457 – Jarrod** and **OB35 - Anonymous 9** about their objections to McEwen. Likewise, I would support the suggested changes proposed by **OB366 - D. G. Clarke** if the other divisions could accommodate them.

A number of objections⁹ continue to advocate Barak replace Casey. Some of these arguments are reasonable, particularly the fact that the division of Casey is not related to, but near enough to the Casey LGA. I don't really have an opinion on this one way or another.

I would not have any objections if the division of Calwell was renamed, as suggested by **OB4 - Anonymous 1**.

I support the objection of **OB85 – Matt** regarding Corio.

I do not support **OB120 - Lynn Ann Rowley** suggesting Nulla Vale be transferred to McEwen.

I agree with **OB87 - Michael Ilyine** and **OB2 - Dr Ken Latta PSM** that Corangamite has outlived its usefulness. I do not agree with the proposals for geographic based names, lest the same issue occur again in the future when the boundaries move again.

I would support the suggestion from **OB492 - Dr Tikoo** to unite Kensington and North Melbourne, but I do not think that they both belong in Maribyrnong.

The three objections raised by **OB499 - Will Douglas** are all sensible and I support the suggested changes.

Finally, a small number of objections¹⁰ do not make clear to which division or divisions they refer. And of course, there are the objections¹¹ that are non-serious, or not related to the scope of the redistribution. I cannot provide meaningful comments on any of these objections.

⁸ Local councils that lodged objections were **OB280 - City of Stonnington**, **OB376 - Maroondah City Council**, **OB465 - Manningham Council**, and **OB484 - Hepburn Shire Council**

⁹ Objections advocating for the name Barak were **OB302 - Alex Nottle**, **OB319 - Marimba Wilkie**, **OB321- Tanya Vernes**, **OB381 - Hayn Lindemans**, and **OB419/ OB468 - Voices for Casey**

¹⁰ Unidentified objections were **OB186 - Anne Abbott**, **OB224 - Anonymous 14**, **OB320 - Central Pontian Association**, and **OB329 - Christopher John Tandridge**

¹¹ Non-serious or out-of-scope objections were **OB485 - W-Class Tram Political Action Committee**, **OB488 - Michael Hogg** and **OB505 - Andrew M**

Higgins or Hotham?

In many objections, a case was put forward that perhaps Higgins may have been the wrong choice of division to abolish. While it was certainly the division with the lowest enrolment on the original projections, it may have looked like an easy outcome. It may well have been, except the Committee missed the opportunity to make a real effort to align community of interests. The abolition of Higgins should have easily fixed the almost comical panhandle of Macnamara, probably the most egregious feature of all Victorian electoral divisions. The fact that the Macnamara boundary with Higgins was left almost unchanged led to inferior outcomes throughout the eastern and south-eastern suburbs.

Many suggestions, and objections provide a better solution when Hotham is instead the division that is abolished. In my original deliberations, using the incorrect projected numbers, I initially considered Hotham as the division to abolish. Ultimately, I chose a different direction and have not readdressed my suggestion against the correct projections. Had I done so, I may have continued with the abolition of Hotham. Indeed, the name Hotham is one that I would strongly advocate for removal.

I believe **OB504 - Anonymous 25** summarised the argument coherently in their objection under the section *Was Higgins the Wrong Division to Abolish?*

Conclusion

As expected, there were many objections focussed on the objectors local division with several areas of contention. Some of these objections provide few suggested alternatives and amount to simply complaining that their local area is undergoing change.

There are clearly areas in the proposal that fail community of interest grounds and I would urge the Augmented Commission to review the objections that provide working solutions, including my own, to ensure outcomes are achieved that improve community of interests of Victorian electors, and not just changes that meet the numerical thresholds.

Of the objections provided that provide actual solutions, there is a wide disparity between some of the suggested outcomes. From statewide reworking of the proposed boundaries to minor tweaks, there is certainly a lot to consider. I do not envy the work ahead of the Augmented Commission and would like to hope that the announced date does not limit the deliberations. Should a meaningful change be warranted, and I feel that it should be, then the Augmented Commission should do what is required and provide another round of public consultation.

Should there be public hearings regarding these changes – and I note there is no mention of any in this round of redistributions – then I would like to be considered to provide further comments at a hearing.

Appendices

Appendix A: Objections about the abolition of Higgins

OB6	Samuel Tomlinson	OB140	Rosamund Stobie	OB278	Peter
OB7	Janine Bentley-Minns	OB141	Rosamund Stobie	OB279	Christopher Wilson
OB8	Anonymous 3	OB142	Robert Angel	OB280	City of Stonnington
OB9	Emma Minns	OB143	Marcel Kreis	OB281	Suzette Miller
OB11	Malcolm Allen	OB148	Fred S Grimwade	OB282	Veneto Club
OB12	Genevieve Sterling	OB149	Yaron Gottlieb	OB284	John Barker
OB13	Gabrielle Walters	OB150	Jane Bell	OB286	Anonymous 17
OB14	Jennifer Werbeloff	OB151	Robert Nicholson	OB287	Renate Williams
OB15	Anonymous 4	OB155	Chinese Senior Citizens Club of Manningham Inc	OB289	John Symons
OB16	Vesna Murphy	OB156	Arthur David Brous	OB290	Phillip Pease
OB17	Anonymous 5	OB158	Jennifer Thong	OB291	Sue Leidler
OB18	Peter Norman OAM	OB164	Noriko Bui	OB292	Dr Stephen Stuart Booth
OB19	Dr Michael Hedger	OB165	Dennis Meadows	OB293	Susan Booth
OB20	Anonymous 6	OB166	Sally Cohen	OB294	D. J Simpson
OB21	Anonymous 7	OB167	Jo McLean	OB296	Judith Troeth AM
OB23	Sasha Spivak	OB168	John Michaelis	OB297	Anonymous 18
OB24	Lisa Driscoll	OB169	Louisa Willoughby	OB299	Malcolm Allen
OB25	Isaac Spivak	OB171	John Corcoran	OB300	Chloe
OB28	Denzil Griffiths	OB176	Noel Wyndom	OB301	Mike Holmes
OB29	Simon Vinson	OB180	Peter G. Allaway	OB304	Corinne McLaren
OB30	Marco Nazzaro	OB181	Brian J Bergin	OB305	Trent Tucker
OB31	Peter Roach	OB182	John James Barry	OB310	Mario Vukic
OB33	Charlie Buxton	OB183	Gavin Davis	OB311	Cr Mike Scott
OB34	Jeanine Froomes	OB184	Lyn Kneale	OB313	Roger Velik
OB36	Andrew Gelbart	OB185	Elizabeth Fraser	OB314	Andrew Beischer
OB37	Howard Elton	OB187	Parthena Simone	OB315	Romy Blecher
OB38	Arthur B	OB188	John Britcliffe	OB316	Suzanne Birdseye
OB39	Thinus Keeve	OB189	Barbara Duff	OB322	Oliver Wu
OB40	Irene	OB190	Trent Mills	OB323	Sandra Masel
OB41	Andy Tran	OB191	Margaret Fisher	OB324	Sue Brink
OB42	Edgar Hartmanis	OB192	Dr Philip Bliss OAM	OB325	Lynne Roffey
OB44	Andrew David	OB193	Warren Tharle	OB326	Anonymous 22
OB45	Angela Brown	OB194	Deanne Asser	OB327	Diane Church
OB46	Anna	OB195	Simon Roberts	OB330	Drew Abercrombie
OB47	Elena	OB196	Karen Kim	OB331	Graeme Sanford
OB48	Lilly	OB197	Benjamin Mynard	OB332	Angela Colantuono
OB49	Fiona Mowbray	OB198	Andy Butler	OB335	Anonymous 19
OB50	Zoe Exton	OB199	Tony Burgess	OB336	Ross Fett

Redistribution of Commonwealth Electoral Divisions Comment on Objections
Victoria 2023

OB51	Sam Hayward	OB200	Kathryn Taylor	OB337	Stephanie Reeves
OB52	Kate Davis	OB201	Professor Phillip Hamilton RFD OLJ	OB338	Damien Grinsell
OB54	Vicki Brous	OB202	Susan Hinton	OB339	Susie Palmer
OB55	Lois Williams	OB203	Gabby Walters	OB340	Eugenia and John Tsaclidis
OB56	Nicholas Houseman	OB204	Helen Nixon	OB341	Sharann Johnson
OB57	Jeanine Froomes	OB205	Anthia Hinson	OB342	Dianne Power
OB58	Susan Tresider	OB206	James	OB344	John and Carol Smith
OB59	Fiona	OB207	Carmel Bakken	OB345	Natalie Webster
OB60	Alison Naughton	OB209	Vi Le	OB346	Phillip Starkins
OB61	Elliott A	OB210	A Strazdins	OB347	Helen Robinett
OB62	Naomi Barrie	OB211	Penny	OB348	Douglas Simonds
OB63	Barbara Joffe	OB212	Pamela Hutchinson	OB351	Paul Henshall
OB64	Jodi Wright-Neville	OB213	Robert Trafficante	OB352	Punjabi Club of Victoria
OB65	Janelle Howell	OB214	L. J. Suli	OB353	Raphael Geminder
OB66	Deborah Fewster	OB215	Maria Ellul	OB354	John Longo
OB67	Vicki Christofilopoulos	OB216	Owen Cheek	OB357	Josie Pearson
OB68	Luke Goodman	OB217	Suzanne Soares	OB358	Graeme Pearson
OB69	Peter Hay	OB218	Anonymous 13	OB360	John Longo
OB70	Anonymous 10	OB219	Vivien Rutter	OB361	Penny Goodman
OB71	Allan Harvey	OB220	Angela Morris	OB362	Dr Beverly Chia
OB72	Alan Cullen	OB221	Maria Ellul	OB363	Dr Beverly Chia
OB73	Carl Dowd	OB222	Diana Algie	OB365	Mr William Ma
OB74	Frederick Morgan	OB223	Ronald Gordon Vimpani	OB367	Virginia Wallace
OB75	Guido Melo	OB225	Vicky Dakis	OB368	Mary Thomas
OB76	Amy-Lee Young	OB226	Paul Townshend	OB371	Alan & Susie Stileman
OB77	Ira Felinski	OB227	Anonymous 15	OB372	North Eastern Jewish Centre
OB78	Felix Sher	OB230	John Apeitos	OB373	Kynan Barlow
OB79	Adrian Elton	OB231	Simon Lee	OB374	Virginia Hill
OB80	Harry Mowbray	OB232	Dorothy Phua	OB377	Sarah Sandaver
OB81	Annabel Myer	OB233	Stuart Redman	OB378	Susan Sandaver
OB82	Dr Robert Sward	OB234	Glen Boyes	OB379	Henry Boekemann
OB83	Gerald Kevin Sabel	OB236	Justine Kantanis	OB380	Robert Sandaver
OB84	Marcia Griffin	OB237	Luzviminda Agosta	OB382	Ross Boddington
OB88	Neil Pharaoh	OB238	Andrew	OB384	Adam Bandt MP
OB89	Tommy Auwardt	OB239	Karen Norman	OB387	Peter Norman OAM
OB90	Andrew Stephens	OB240	Anonymous 16	OB391	Anonymous 20
OB91	Isaac Gross	OB241	Richard Davies	OB392	Joy Evans
OB92	Jo Learner	OB242	Claire Filson	OB400	Hans Carlborg
OB94	Therese Mulholland	OB243	Dr Ralph Frank	OB401	James Russell
OB95	Lana Lyons	OB244	Colin Jevons	OB402	Paul Keating

OB98	Gary L Israel	OB245	Christina Matthews	OB406	Rob Wagon
OB99	Katherine Cole	OB246	David Hepworth	OB408	Ollie Batch
OB100	Tiffany Lucas	OB247	Pennie Kendall	OB410	Adnan Mansour
OB101	Julie McLean	OB248	Leah Calnan	OB412	Vicki Neil
OB102	Kate O'Sullivan	OB249	Josephine Phillips	OB414	Petition – 304 Signatures
OB103	Harry Stephens	OB250	Peter Headlam	OB417	Blind Sports & Recreation Victoria
OB104	William Allen	OB251	Grant Johnson JP	OB420	Gary Lewis
OB105	Harry Stephens	OB252	Peter Charles	OB421	Gregory Barger
OB106	Marcia Griffin	OB253	Janice M Crain	OB423	Michael A Jabour
OB107	Jenny Yanli Chin	OB254	Svetlana	OB427	Jennifer Frieden
OB109	Benjamin Dunn	OB255	Lionel M Krongold	OB428	Lynette Ruth Stewart
OB110	L Mavroulakis	OB256	Dominic V Crain	OB430	Lucy Bradlow and Bronwen Bock
OB111	May Shakespeare	OB257	Jonathan Hooper	OB433	Gregory Gange
OB112	Saul and Beatrice Bastomsky	OB258	Janet Worthington	OB434	Kieran Simpson
OB114	Lucinda Willshire	OB259	Wayne & Andrea Simmons	OB435	Jayne Garrett
OB115	Dorian Ribush	OB260	Peter	OB443	Malcolm Gray
OB116	Linda Fitzpatrick	OB261	George Zach	OB444	Rachel Westaway
OB117	Lisa Woolf	OB262	Elissa Epstein	OB451	Terrence and Vivienne Healy
OB119	Louise Hansen	OB263	Max Salveson AM	OB458	George Black
OB122	Mitch Fuller	OB264	Robyn Zablud	OB459	Anonymous 23
OB123	Joanna Hill	OB265	Gregory Digiari	OB461	Dr Carina Garland MP
OB124	Fiona Nicholson Stocker	OB266	Heather Porter	OB463	Matthew Lucas
OB125	Virginia H	OB267	HeaChin	OB464	Geraldine Kassim-Lakha
OB127	Anonymous 11	OB268	David J Casley	OB466	Professor Kim Rubinstein
OB130	Tania Baxter	OB269	Helen McManamny	OB474	Margaret Harrison
OB131	Phillip Starkins	OB270	Caroline and Ben Shearer	OB477	Barry and Raewyn Bond
OB132	Frank A Robert	OB271	Lesley M King	OB479	Callum French
OB133	Adriana	OB272	Lara Dowd	OB497	Professor Katie Allen
OB134	Justin	OB273	Atila Esener	OB501	Dr Monique Ryan MP
OB135	Jennifer Erdos	OB274	Jackie Yowell	OB502	Robert Rice and Corinne Meagher
OB136	Marie Grafen	OB275	G MacDougall	OB506	Anonymous 26
OB138	David and Sue Kaye	OB276	Peter	OB507	Wendy Kurka
OB139	Matilda Hope	OB277	Philip Streten	OB508	Fay Kaufman

Appendix B: Objections about the proposed boundary in Heathmont

OB137	Maroondah Business Group
OB317	David Harper
OB334	Malcolm McDonald
OB359	Ann Albrecht
OB388	Prue Gill
OB393	Don Kordick
OB395	Margaret Harrington
OB397	Neil Michael Harrington
OB426	Roslyn and Roland Ashby
OB438	Joanne Hart-Parker
OB442	David Gee
OB460	Donald Hamilton
OB473	Heathmont Tennis Club
OB475	Graeme and Lynette Tonkin
OB496	Graeme and Lynette Tonkin

Appendix C: Objections about Manningham LGA

OB160	Aaron Farr
OB27	Isabella
OB179	Dr Paul Rival
OB154	John Ryan
OB399	Liam Mogridge
OB403	Melbourne East Netball Association
OB498	David Barker
OB333	Rod Faulkner
OB370	Tunstall Square Traders Association
OB385	Park Orchards Ratepayers Association
OB440	Anonymous 21
OB456	Liam Dwyer
OB476	John Rashed
OB453	Henry Rees
OB298	Sandra Miller
OB157	Dot Haynes OAM
OB283	John Kostoulis
OB469	Clark McKenzie
OB328	Brad Sanders
OB449	Yarra Valley Business
OB455	Toby Millman, Ash Rankin, Anthony Simmons and Shaun Goodwin
OB468	Voices for Casey

Appendix D: Objections about the proposed Division of Wills

OB5	Anonymous 2	OB355	Naomi Blackburn
OB32	Anonymous 8	OB356	Australian Nepalese Multicultural Centre Inc
OB93	Abdullah Ates	OB364	Glenroy Neighbourhood House
OB96	Elisabeth Jackson	OB375	Abigail Zhang
OB97	Jack C	OB383	Pascoe Vale Hadfield Cricket Club
OB113	Andy	OB386	Federation of Nepalese Community Associations of Australia
OB118	Tony Nippard	OB390	Beryl Langer
OB121	Katerine Theodosis	OB394	Josephine Ryan
OB126	Margaret Ludowyk	OB404	Rubay Tessema
OB128	Sean	OB405	Lily
OB129	Anonymous 12	OB407	Edward Krutsch
OB144	S.Wakhlu	OB409	Kurdish Democratic Community Centre of Victoria
OB145	Mo	OB413	Bronwyn Cran
OB146	Marcus	OB415	John Hannon
OB147	Juan	OB422	Harry Black
OB159	Dr Molla Huq	OB429	Dr Tim Read MLA
OB161	Catherine Heywood	OB431	Wendy Rushby
OB162	Janice Dunn	OB436	Kurdistan Patriotic Association of Victoria
OB163	Lucie Reuter	OB441	Justine Woodford
OB170	Sai Komaragiri	OB445	Anonymous 27
OB173	Glenroy Bowls Club	OB446	Dr Fizza Sabir and Ms Mahrukh Qureshi
OB178	Bill Forrest	OB447	Ahmed and Ghassaq
OB208	Oak Park Community Sports Association	OB450	Alevi Federation of Australia
OB228	Zeinab Hosseini	OB452	Janine Rafferty
OB229	Jahangir Hosseini	OB454	William Robert Jacomb
OB285	Iranian Women's Association	OB467	Coburg Football Club
OB303	Reverend Mark J Dunn	OB470	Katerina Angelopolous
OB306	Astrid	OB472	Maryam Reshadati
OB307	Asad Daghhagheleh	OB480	Solidarity with Asylum Seekers in Australia
OB308	Sharzad Ghased	OB483	Kefayat Jahanpaima
OB309	Sasan Hosseini	OB489	The Australian Association of Kastorians
OB318	Fawkner Netball Club	OB490	Khushvi Patel
OB343	Ali Fahour	OB491	Amir Golriz
OB349	Glenroy Lions FC	OB494	Abedin Jaleh
OB350	Gulmi Samaj Victoria Australia	OB500	Mahin Alizadeh-Motlagh