



The Federal Redistribution 2008
Tasmania



Public Comment on Objection Number 9

James Walker

3 Page(s)

> comment on objections



james walker
<jameswalkerhobart@hotmail.com>

03/10/2008 05:26 PM

To <tas.redistribution@aec.gov.au>

cc

bcc

Subject comment on objections



aec federal electoral redistribution oct com.doc



> comment on objections

James Walker
PO Box 100
LINDISFARNE TAS 7015

2nd October 2008

Redistribution Committee for Tasmania
2nd Floor AMP Building
86 Collins Street
HOBART TAS 7000

tas.redistribution@aec.gov.au

Dear Redistribution Committee for Tasmania (RCT),

Thank you for the opportunity to offer comments on objections regarding the proposed boundary redistribution of Tasmania's 5 electorates.

There has not been a satisfactory resolution regarding changing the electorate currently named Denison to Clark.

There appears to have been limited objection with the proposed boundary changes to the electorate currently named Denison as well as the electorate of Bass. The proposed changes to the Lyons electorate and the resultant effects on both Braddon and Franklin require further consideration.

ELECTORATE NAME CHANGE FROM DENISON TO ANDREW INGLIS CLARK

I can not offer further information to the elegant, well researched and compelling objections (2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 25, 27, 31, 32, 41, 42, 43, 44) as well as the submissions made at each stage of the AEC redistribution process supporting a name change.

Given Clark's outstanding contribution to both the state and nation there is an inevitability that a change in electorate name from Denison to Clark will occur. I would ask the RCT to reflect on how history will judge a decision made in 2008 not to rename an electorate after such an important figure in both Tasmania's and the Nation's history when a opportunity (Denison) and two precedents (Darwin & Wilmont) are readily identifiable.

Given the nature of Denison's contributions it would seem more appropriate that he is acknowledged by naming a Legislative Council electorate in his honour. I believe many of the proponents in favour of changing the electorate currently named Denison to Clark would also support this suggestion.

BRADDON / LYONS PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION

Whilst a community of interest has been established between the West Coast LGA and the Braddon electorate it is not greater than the community of interest between the Latrobe LGA and Braddon. This point was made clear in Objections 1, 3, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 46, 47 and 48. Furthermore the RCT's proposed changes would require the movement of over 15 000 electors.

On current projections if left unchanged Braddon will have an enrolment of 73 530 by 2012 (one of only two electorates with less than a 1% variance from the quota). The RCT report noted population growth in Braddon is projected at 2.87%. This is below the average projected growth of 3.64%. The West Coast LGA population is projected to decline by 2.86%. Extrapolating from these projections it is probable that West Coast LGA could be transferred into Braddon at the next federal redistribution and still keep the electorate within quota tolerance without the wholesale disenfranchisement of the electors in the Latrobe LGA.

I would request that the RCT take heed of the numerous objections and avoid the unnecessary transfer of over 15 000 electors between Braddon and Lyons. It would be better to take a medium term approach by leaving the present Braddon boundaries unchanged until the next scheduled redistribution.

FRANKLIN / LYONS PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION

Two Objections (33, 39) proposed encroachment of Lyons into Cambridge in order to achieve quota requirements. It was claimed that Cambridge is "essentially rural". Cambridge has changed markedly in the last few years with new heavy commercial developments as well as the expansion of Hobart International Airport. It is difficult to consider such enterprises being essentially rural. Objection 33 claimed that Richmond and Cambridge sit in the Sorell LGA however these areas are part of the Clarence LGA.

Objections 13 and 45 (this authors) highlighted the benefits of incorporating the Clarence LGA around Richmond into Lyons (some 1499 electors by 2012). This would decrease the number of split LGA's in Franklin and Clarence and put the adjoining Clarence LGA tourism precincts of the Coal River Valley and Richmond into the one electorate

Objections to the Lyons and Franklin boundary within the Brighton LGA highlighted strong community of interest between the suburbs of Bridgewater and Gagebrook. Objection 20 provided compelling reasons why the community of interest between these two suburbs is a far greater concern than a geographical feature namely the Jordan River.

The electors of Gagebrook (1631 by 2012) can remain in the same electorate as Bridgewater by transferring the projected 1499 electors of the Clarence LGA around Richmond from Lyons into Franklin. It should be noted that the existing boundaries split the suburb of Bridgewater between Lyons and Franklin.

Seperation between Franklin and Lyons is still going to be required in the Brighton LGA at some point to keep electorate populations with quota tolerances. An electoral boundary division between the suburbs of Old Beach and Gagebrook will best achieve this on a community of interest basis.

There is strong support for Gagebrook and Bridgewater to be situated in the same electorate. Lyons is the electorate best able to accommodate all of the Bridgewater suburb as well as Gagebrook.

Yours Sincerely

James Walker