



## Objection 298

Colin McLaren

2 pages

From: Colin McLaren

To: FedRedistribution - VIC

Subject: Objection to Victorian Redistribution proposal

**Date:** Friday, 4 May 2018 12:28:03 AM

Importance: High

## Redistribution committee,

I have looked at the report prepared for the 2017 redistribution of the Victorian Electorates and the associated maps and whilst in general I believe the committee has come up with a well developed result which took account of many of the submissions that were made one aspect that stands out to me relates to the proposed electorate of **McEwan**. As it stands the areas particularly centred around Sunbury and Gisborne would need to traverse through the proposed division of **Calwell** to meet with the other major population centres of the division which are primarily centred around Whittlesea / South Morang. This does not seem highly desirable particularly on travel grounds and I believe needs to be remediated. The consequence of this remediation is that the proposed boundaries of a number of the proposed divisions primarily on the western side of Melbourne need to be altered. I believe this can be done without significantly impacting the work that the redistribution committee has done and it may actually reduce the overall number of electors moving to new divisions.

I have not had the opportunity to analyse the SA1 and SA2 data I accordingly provide the following as broad suggestions of the changes I believe are needed;

- 1. Looking firstly at the Sunbury / Gisborne situation mentioned above I would propose that this could be remediated by creating a division along the lines of that I proposed in my submission to the committee (s52) where I suggested a division broadly based on the Melton Sunbury corridor. I would suggest the division could also incorporate those areas proposed to be in **McEwan** which are in the Macedon Ranges Local Government area plus the Bulla area proposed to be in **Calwell**. The area of Melton to be included in this division is that broadly west of Leakes Rd. As per my suggestion S52 I would suggest this electorate is called **Burke** on account that a significant component of this area was previously covered by division of this name and that the division would NOT be comprised of a significant number of electors from an existing division
- 2. On account of moving the Sunbury / Macedon Ranges area from McEwan the Craigieburn area proposed to be in the division of Calwell moves to the division of McEwan. It should be noted that there is a much better line of travel and closeness of distance between Craigieburn and the Whittlesea / South Morang area than was the case with Sunbury / Gisborne. It should also be noted that a number of these electors are already in the division of McEwan thus this potentially reduces the number of electors needing to move to new divisions.
- 3. Calwell then needs to gain electors with this best being achieved by moving further south.

  I would suggest this be done by moving the required number of electors from the adjacent division of Maribyrnong. I do not believe the proposed boundary between Calwell and Wills should be altered to facilitate the movement of electors to Calwell
- 4. Maribyrnong then needs to extend further South to gain electors. I believe this could be done by moving the southern boundary to the boundary of the Maribyrnong local Government area. These electors are currently proposed to be in the division of Gellibrand. This then unites all of the Footscray area within the one electoral district and also overcomes confusion between the municipality, suburb and division as they are now all the same (FYI this was the source of confusion to a number of electors who attended to vote at the prepoll in this area at the last election where I was the OIC)

- 5. **Gellibrand** regains the areas around Braybrook / Sunshine North / Sunshine West / Sunshine from the proposed division of **Fraser** (NB: Sunshine West / Sunshine are currently in **Gellibrand**)
- 6. The remainder of the proposed division of **Fraser** moves to **Gorton** (NB: Many of these areas are currently in **Gorton**)
- 7. I would also suggest that the part of SA1 136814 which is North of Snydes Rd be moved from the division of **Lalor** to the Division of **Gellibrand**. This is suggested as this is a new housing area which is more closely aligned with the areas to its East (which is in the proposed division of **Gellibrand**) than the area immediately to its South (which is currently undeveloped land). This alteration retains clearly defined boundaries.
- 8. I note that there was much comment regarding the appropriateness of the inclusion of the Shire of Murrundindi in the division of **Indi** in the 2010 redistribution report. To address this I would suggest that consideration be given to moving the shire of Murrundindi to the proposed division of **Nicholls** with this being offset by the Shire of Moira moving to **Indi**. Depending on elector numbers consideration should also be given to incorporating the shire of Murrundindi's Kinglake residents in the division of **McEwan** on account that they have a much closer affinity with that division than within either the divisions of **Nicholls** or **Indi**.

In relation to division names I offer the following comments;

- On account that the above alterations remove the division name Fraser I suggest the
  proposed electorate of Cox take the name Fraser. This is along the lines of comments I
  previously made in CS7. I understand the current member for Corangamite Sarah
  Ferguson has objected to the division being renamed Cox and I would support her in that.
- 2. That the division of **Melbourne Ports** be renamed **Balaclava** rather than the proposed **Macnamara**. I suggest this on account that the suburb is within the division AND this was an original Federation division. Additionally, Dame Jean MacNamara may have been a prominent Australian but personally I am uncomfortable with the use of this criteria as what makes one person more prominent than another. Your report suggested a number of eminent people who could possibly have had a division named after them but what makes one worthier than another. Using a Federation name takes the subjectivity out of this.

I look forward to reading your final report Colin McLaren