



---

**Objection Number 41**

**Michael Ritchie**

**4 pages**

---

**From:** MIKE R  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 August 2010 8:51 AM  
**To:** VIC Redistribution  
**Subject:** objection to 2010 redistribution  
**Attachments:** vic redis objection letter.doc

Please find attached my objection(s) to the 2010 redistribution.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Ritchie

Michael Ritchie

**Re: 2010 Victorian Redistribution: -**

**Dear Sir/Madam,**

I wish to pass on some comments regarding the committees' proposals for the 2010 redistribution. I acknowledge that the committee was faced with considerable challenges regarding the redistribution due to the relevant requirements of the act and population movements leading to significant variance in population between divisions.

I also agree with the decision of the committee that local government boundaries in Melbourne are much less important as a marker of community interest boundaries than in the country.

**General comments regarding rural divisions: -**

I support the committees' proposal(s) for regional Victoria. Given population movements (both those that have occurred and anticipated) it is a certainty that the rural divisions located north and west will need to lose a seat either at this redistribution or next. By not shedding a seat at this redistribution the alternate boundaries would be inferior to those proposed by the committee.

I think that the committees' proposals are solid and well thought given the requirements of the act and superior to many submission(s) received.

I have no concerns re the proposed division of Lalor moving southwards to take in outer areas of Geelong. This move was inevitable at some stage as has already happened at state level.

**Detailed objections: -**

Please note that in this submission when I refer to a division by name I am referring to the proposed division(s) and its boundaries unless specifically stated to the contrary.

**Objection 1 – name of the division of Mallee:**

One objection I do have is to retain the name for the division of Mallee. Under the proposed boundaries much of the division no longer is relevant to the name of Mallee. I feel that the division would be better known as either Murray or Mallee-Murray.

**Objection 2 – Divisions of Wills / Calwell & Maribyrnong**

The transfer of the 2569 voters from Calwell to Maribyrnong creates a rather strange boundary. I feel that a better proposal would be to transfer the district of Strathmore north to Maribyrnong from Wills. The area of Strathmore I refer to is; bounded by the Tullamarine Freeway to the south and west, Ponds Creek to the west and the train line to the north. This would unify all of Strathmore in Maribyrnong. This would create better community of interest for both localities.

In order to balance out the numbers the boundary between Wills and Calwell could be moved north. Two options could apply. One would be to transfer the locality of Campbellfield (bounded by Hume Hwy, Barry Rd, Mahoneys Road and Merri Creek to Wills or alternatively by moving a portion of the voters in the area bounded by Pacoe Vale Rd, Camp Rd, West Ring Road and Hume Hwy to Wills.

### **Objection 3 – Divisions of Bruce, Isaacs and Chisholm & Deakin**

The numerical requirements of the act mandate very strict parameters on the committee. At times I suspect that other considerations such as community of interest / transport links at times need to be subservient to numerical requirements.

I feel that the boundaries of both divisions are poor and probably drafted to fit in with numerical constraints by a previous committee. In the division of Chisholm the voters of the city of Kingston will have no realistic public transport links or community of interest(s).

Likewise in Bruce the community of interest between the northern section of Glen Waverley and the southern sections around the Dandenong CBD are poor.

The division of Isaacs also suffers from split localities having bayside suburbs outer suburban growth areas and more established suburbs closer to the Dandenong CBD.

In order to correct these issues I broadly propose that: -

#### **Isaacs should move north westwards**

- Adding voters initially from the area south of Centre Dandenong Road. If additional voters were required the boundary could extend to include voters in the area bounded by Heatherton Road to the north, Centre Dandenong Road to the south, Clayton Road to the west. The eastern boundary would be the boundary between the city of Kingston and Greater Dandenong south of Heatherton Road.

#### **Bruce should move southwards**

- Adding voters from Isaacs bounded by Corrigan Road, Lower Dandenong Road and the Dandenong/Pakenham rail line.
- Adding voters from Hotham – the total portion of the city of Greater Dandenong that remains in the proposed division of Hotham.

#### **Chisholm should move northeastwards**

- Adding voters from the area bounded by Blackburn Road, Ferntree Gully Road, Highbury Road and Dandenong Creek.

#### **Hotham would move northwards.**

- Adding voters by moving the boundary north to include areas south of the Monash freeway.

I do not have access to the CCD database to detail exact movements of voters and acknowledge that the committee will almost certainly need to amend the suggestions for objections 2 & #.

I would however ask the committee to look at the general thrust of what I am suggesting and would note that a partial adjustment would be an improvement on the current boundaries especially around community of interest.

#### **Boundary between Deakin & Chisholm**

The committee may also like to consider extending Deakin westwards taking in the Box Hill area north of Canterbury Road currently in the proposed division of Chisholm so that the seat runs in a pure east west direction along the Maroondah corridor. The committee could then transfer electors south of Canterbury road in Deakin to Chisholm. This would produce a neater boundary for Chisholm.

I wish the committee well in it's future deliberations regarding this redistribution in 2010.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Ritchie