



THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
QUEENSLAND

Submission S55

Anonymous 9

A COHERENT INNER-NORTH-EAST LILLEY

An integrated statutory and evidence-led submission
Boundary proposal to the Redistribution Committee for Queensland

Lodgement details	
Submitted to	Redistribution Committee for Queensland, Australian Electoral Commission
Date prepared	16 October 2026
Legislation	<i>Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918</i> (Cth), particularly ss 64-66
Proposal focus	A strictly bounded set of proposed changes affecting Lilley, with a particular focus on the Lilley-Petrie interface and regional balancing consequences
Evidence base	AEC enrolment and quota files; ABS 2021 Census QuickStats; Queensland TMR traffic-census records; Queensland Rail network materials; Red and White Coaches published school-run descriptions; Queensland Government locality-boundary data

The proposal is a boundary concept for statewide testing, not a claim that the listed transfers are quota-compliant in isolation.

Contents

1. Executive summary and requested boundary outcome
2. Statutory framework and legislative interpretation
3. Community of interests
4. Means of communication and travel
5. Physical features, area and legible boundaries
6. Existing division boundaries
7. Projected quota, transfer ledger and statewide balance
8. Likely objections and responses
9. Requests to the Committee
10. Conclusion: representation, consistency and reasoned boundaries

Appendix A. Census comparison for boundary-change localities

A.1 Age and education comparison

A.2 Occupation comparison

Appendix B. Enrolment ledger and quota arithmetic

Appendix C. Required GIS and statewide checks

References and source register

Reading note

The legal order used below reflects s 66(3): the projected-enrolment requirement is addressed first as a statutory constraint; the qualitative criteria then follow the sequence in s 66(3)(b). Community of interests is treated first among those qualitative criteria, and existing divisional boundaries are expressly subordinate under s 66(3A).

1. Executive summary and requested boundary outcome

It is submitted that the Committee should test the proposed Lilley boundary as a coherent inner-north-east and northern-corridor option. The case should be assessed primarily by reference to the community of interests that a division is capable of representing, and then by its transport connections, physical features and legibility. The submission does not rely on political-party support or electoral results. Census indicators are used only as descriptive context, not as a proxy for political preference or as an independent basis for assigning electors.

The core proposal is deliberately bounded. It seeks, where practicable, to preserve the integrity of named localities rather than divide a locality between federal divisions. Where a locality must be divided, the statutory considerations in *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* (Cth)—including community of interests, communication and travel, and physical features—are generally applied to identify the most coherent boundary, subject to the projected-enrolment requirement.

Include in Lilley	Remove from Lilley
Ascot - whole current locality	Brighton - whole locality
Hamilton - whole current locality	Deagon - whole locality
Clayfield - whole current locality, including the area around Eagle Junction according to current locality geometry	Sandgate - whole locality
Hendra - whole current locality	Shorncliffe - whole locality
Bridgeman Downs - consolidate the whole locality, including the portions currently in Lilley, Petrie and Dickson	All of Lilley's current Stafford allocation; do not transfer an already-Brisbane portion merely by using the suburb name
Carseldine - only the area south of the railway alignment, as mapped and counted by the Committee	Everton Park - only the area south of the Old Northern Road-South Pine Road corridor
Aspley - transfer only the portion currently in Petrie to Lilley	

No other locality changes form part of the core package. Any additional moves needed to satisfy the State-wide quota test are consequential balancing work for the Committee and should be disclosed as such, not silently incorporated into this suggestion.

The package is not a complete quota-compliant map if all other boundaries are held fixed. The SA2-proxy calculation places Brisbane at 111,689 projected electors after the four whole inner-north-east localities move, and Dickson at 121,210 after its Bridgeman Downs component moves. Brisbane and Dickson require inflows or reduced outflows. Petrie requires further balancing if it receives the coastal localities. The submission asks for regional balancing, not for these constraints to be ignored.

How the evidence is used

- AEC enrolment counts and the AEC quota page control the quota arithmetic. Actual enrolment is as at 28 July 2026; projection time is 27 August 2028. [1]-[2]
- ABS Census data describe people and households in 2021. Census population is not electors, and a Census locality profile is not a proxy for a partial transfer area. [3]
- Traffic counts describe vehicles passing a counter. Rail maps and school-coach routes indicate connections and corridors; they do not establish each elector's travel behaviour or destination. [4]-[6]
- Where a locality crosses an SA2 or federal division, the transfer ledger labels the available figure as a proxy or a specific division component. Exact partial-area totals require GIS treatment. [1], [7]

2. Statutory framework and legislative interpretation

Section 66 of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* (Cth) governs the Redistribution Committee’s proposed redistribution. Under s 66(3)(a), the Committee must, as far as practicable, endeavour to keep projected enrolment in each division within 96.5% to 103.5% of the State’s average divisional enrolment at the statutory projection time. Under s 66(3)(b), subject to that projected-enrolment requirement, it must give due consideration to a specified set of criteria. Those criteria are not interchangeable: they address the community represented, the means by which it connects, and the geography of the division. Existing divisional boundaries are expressly subordinate to the first three qualitative considerations by s 66(3A). [1]

2.1 The order and weight of the statutory criteria

Provision	Statutory subject	Approach in this submission
s 66(3)(a)	Projected enrolment: as far as practicable, 96.5%-103.5% of projected State average	Treat as the first and controlling numerical task; do not claim compliance until all affected divisions are tested.
s 66(3)(b)(i)	Community of interests, including economic, social and regional interests	Address first among the qualitative criteria. Ask which communities can be coherently represented within Lilley and which ties are strongest.
s 66(3)(b)(ii)	Means of communication and travel within the division	Use road, rail, bridge and public transport evidence to test functional connections, with limits stated.
s 66(3)(b)(iv)	Physical features and area	Prefer legible features where they reflect real geography and do not artificially sever a locality.
s 66(3)(b)(v) and s 66(3A)	Existing divisional boundaries, expressly subordinate to community, communication/travel and physical features	History and continuity are relevant, but not a veto where another boundary better satisfies the higher-listed criteria.

It is important to state the hierarchy accurately. The projected-enrolment requirement is framed as a “subject to” condition. Within the qualitative criteria, community of interests is the first listed consideration, followed by communication/travel and physical features/area. Section 66(3A) specifically subordinates existing divisional boundaries to those three. The Act does not, however, expressly declare community of interests superior to the other two qualitative criteria; the case for the proposal must therefore show their combined operation.

2.2 Actual quota and projected quota

The AEC has determined an actual redistribution quota of 127,259, with a permitted range of 114,534-139,984 at commencement. The projected quota is 132,526 at 27 August 2028, with a preferred range of 127,888-137,164. The 3.5% projected test is expressed as “as far as practicable”; that wording is not a reason to disregard the target, but it recognises that boundaries must be drawn across the whole State and reconciled with the statutory criteria. [2]

2.3 What the Committee is being asked to test

The Committee is asked to test whether the proposed Lilley line is a sound building block in a statewide redistribution, not to accept an isolated suburb swap that leaves adjacent divisions out of range. The suggested treatment of coastal electors, Bridgeman Downs, Carseldine and the inner-north-east localities must be tested together with sufficient balancing changes across Brisbane, Dickson, Petrie and Longman. If a different receiving arrangement better satisfies the Act, the locality/community case should still be weighed on its merits rather than being rejected solely because an early local arithmetic model is incomplete.

3. Community of interests

Community of interests is the leading qualitative issue in this submission. The question is not whether every locality has an identical socio-economic profile; large metropolitan divisions rarely do. The question is whether a proposed division can represent related residential, employment, education, infrastructure and regional interests in a more coherent way, and whether the alternative arrangement better preserves a distinct community elsewhere. The demographic evidence is relevant only insofar as it helps describe those interests alongside geography and actual services.

3.1 Inner-north-east localities: Ascot, Hamilton, Clayfield and Hendra

Ascot, Hamilton, Clayfield and Hendra form an inner-north-east urban sector north of the Brisbane River, close to the airport-side transport network and linked by local roads and rail. The case for considering them together is functional and geographic: the inner-city/northside urban system, the airport and freight corridor, and transport lines serving the north-east. Their common setting does not mean their housing or household profile is uniform. Hamilton and Clayfield have substantial apartment shares; Hendra has a more detached-house profile; Ascot combines houses and apartments. That variation is a reason to base the argument on functional connection rather than describing the four as a single socio-economic type.

The current AEC locality finder associates Clayfield and Eagle Junction, and Eagle Junction should not be treated as a separate suburb for boundary design without checking current locality data. The proposed description should follow the current Clayfield locality polygon and then test the resulting boundary against the existing urban grid and rail infrastructure. [7]

3.2 Airport, aviation, freight and regional interests

The inclusion of Ascot, Hamilton, Clayfield and Hendra brings into a single division a cluster of communities that sit around Brisbane Airport and the Kingsford Smith Drive / airport access network. Aircraft noise, flight paths, airport operations, freight movements and surface access are matters of shared infrastructure policy. Grouping the localities could give the representative a more coherent set of constituents affected by these issues. This is an argument for testing a boundary, not a claim that every resident experiences the same impact or that the four suburbs' economic interests are identical.

To strengthen this strand before a final hearing, the Committee could be asked to examine airport noise exposure maps, aircraft track/noise contours, freight access routes, and local government planning documents. The current package does not attach a verified parcel-level noise contour or freight-origin dataset, so it does not state that all residents are equally affected.

3.3 Northern residential corridor: Aspley, Bridgeman Downs and Carseldine

Bridgeman Downs is the strongest locality-integrity component. The AEC enrolment table currently assigns electors within the Bridgeman Downs SA2 footprint to Lilley, Petrie and Dickson. The available division components are 3,908 projected electors in Petrie and 3,631 in Dickson, with Lilley's existing share retained. Consolidating the whole locality in Lilley would avoid a single named residential area being represented through three federal divisions, subject to exact boundary overlay and the statewide quota result. [1]

Carseldine is proposed only south of the railway alignment. This is a narrower physical-feature rule than transferring the entire locality or SA2. It is submitted that little or no residential Carseldine lies north of the railway within the locality boundary; that statement should be checked against current Queensland locality and rail geometry rather than turned into an assumed elector count. The whole Carseldine SA2 figure of 7,481 projected electors is an upper bound only, not the proposed transfer count.

The northern corridor argument is that Bridgeman Downs and the specified Carseldine area are linked to the established Lilley-side northside network, including the Aspley/Chermside urban service area and Gympie Road / Linkfield connections. In addition, the portion of Aspley currently allocated to Petrie should be transferred to Lilley, so that the Aspley locality is not split between Lilley and Petrie. The AEC SA2-by-division component is 2,297 actual and 2,336 projected electors; because SA2 and locality boundaries may not coincide exactly, the final transfer should be verified against locality and SA1 geometry. Aspley and Chermside themselves are not being transferred wholesale by this proposal. This is a limited request to improve the coherence of the northern residential edge without opening every adjacent locality to change.

3.4 The bayside sector: Brighton, Deagon, Sandgate and Shorncliffe

Brighton, Deagon, Sandgate and Shorncliffe have a recognisable bayside setting, including their relationship with Moreton Bay, foreshore access, coastal roads, wetlands and marine/coastal management issues. Sandgate and Shorncliffe retain particularly clear coastal settlement identities; Brighton faces Bramble Bay; Deagon is more inland than the other three but forms part of the surrounding bayside urban area and its road/rail network. The proposal is that this coastal-influenced group

should be considered for a destination aligned with the Redcliffe Peninsula and the Petrie side of Bramble Bay rather than being retained in Lilley simply because the current line has historically grouped it there.

That contention needs to be balanced fairly against a real counterargument: the Shorncliffe railway line runs through Deagon, Sandgate and Shorncliffe towards the Brisbane city centre; the road network connects those places south through the inner north; and the school-coach evidence discussed below demonstrates links between these coastal localities and schools in Clayfield and the inner-north-east. It would therefore be incorrect to assert that these suburbs have no community connection with Lilley. The stronger submission is that their coastal issues and cross-bay access are reasons for the Committee to test a regional transfer to Petrie as part of the wider northside balance.

The Ted Smout Memorial Bridge and Houghton Highway provide a substantial road connection between Brighton and Clontarf across Bramble Bay. The Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads describes the 2.7 kilometre Ted Smout Memorial Bridge as joining Brighton and Clontarf. This is evidence of physical access across the Bay, not conclusive proof that every Brighton resident's primary community of interest lies within Petrie. [8]

3.5 Stafford and Everton Park: narrow, map-defined treatment

"Stafford" in the proposal means the whole of Lilley's current Stafford allocation, not a transfer of any existing Brisbane allocation merely because it falls within the broader locality. The AEC-based projected component used here is 3,812 electors. The suburb name and the transfer footprint must not be conflated: the final map should show exactly which current Lilley SA1s or part-SA1s move to the receiving division.

Everton Park is different again. Only the area south of the Old Northern Road-South Pine Road corridor is proposed to leave Lilley. The 2021 ABS profile in the evidence table describes the whole Everton Park locality, not the southern slice. A whole-suburb median age, income or education percentage cannot fairly be attributed to the transferred slice until the relevant Census and SA1 geography is intersected with the corridor. This submission therefore treats the Census profile as background, not proof of the partial area's character.

3.6 Census indicators: age, education and occupation

The ABS 2021 Census profiles for the seven proposed inclusion profiles (including the whole-locality Aspley profile for context, although only its Petrie-side electoral component is proposed to move) show a materially different pattern across several listed indicators from the six affected exclusion profiles. The inclusion-profile median age is 39 years, compared with 42 among the exclusion profiles. Bachelor-degree attainment has an unweighted median of 40.2% for inclusion profiles and 31.2% for exclusion profiles. University/higher-education attendance has medians of 21.8% and 17.8%; vocational/TAFE attendance has medians of 7.2% and 6.5%. For secondary-school attendance, the median shares are 4.7% versus 9.3% for government, 7.4% versus 9.6% for Catholic, and 8.5% versus 3.0% for other non-government schools. These differences span multiple indicators and are relevant descriptive evidence of differing locality profiles. [3]

These figures show substantial and recurring differences across several measures, alongside some overlap. They support an argument that the proposed inclusion and exclusion profiles are compositionally different in ways relevant to community-of-interest assessment; they should not be dismissed as immaterial. The present tables are unweighted locality-level comparisons, not elector-weighted totals; weighting could change the size of group summaries and should be calculated from consistent locality/SA1 data rather than presumed to make every difference more significant. The indicators therefore provide relevant, cumulative descriptive evidence, to be considered with geography, transport, services and locality integrity rather than used as a stand-alone rule for allocating a community.

3.7 School services and daily social connections

The Red and White Coaches route maps are offered as indicative, comparative evidence. The routes appear to connect a number of the proposed northern-corridor inclusions with school services associated with the existing Lilley catchment, while the coastal localities proposed for transfer to Petrie appear more consistent with the school-service geography of the peninsula and bayside. This is not a claim that every child follows those routes or that school travel alone determines the proper boundary.

4. Means of communication and travel

Section 66(3)(b)(ii) requires due consideration to the means of communication and travel within a proposed division. The relevant evidence is the structure of roads and railways, public transport, cross-bay access and the location of shared destinations. Traffic counts alone cannot establish a community of interest, but they can identify the strategic significance of a corridor. [1], [4]

4.1 Gympie Road and the northern transit spine

The inclusion of the portion of Aspley currently in Petrie, Bridgeman Downs and part of Carseldine would bring more of the northern residential corridor into Lilley and avoid leaving Aspley divided between Lilley and Petrie. The Aspley component is 2,297 actual and 2,336 projected electors on the AEC SA2-by-division data; it must be checked against current locality/SA1 geometry. The Gympie Road corridor and Northern Busway form an important north-south spine for access to employment, education, retail and services. This is evidence of a connected urban system, not proof that every resident uses the same route or destination.

4.2 Queensland TMR traffic-census counts

The TMR traffic-census workbook for 2015-2025 was checked against the derived site summary. Selected 2025 average annual daily traffic (AADT) values are set out below. They are directional/context observations at specific sites. Counts from adjacent points are not added together, and the endpoint change is not treated as a causal estimate. [4]

Traffic counter site	2025 AADT (both directions)	First comparison	Endpoint change	Interpretation
Gympie Arterial Road, about 400 m north of Beams Road	74,249	74,399 (2015)	-0.2%	High-volume north-south road near the northern urban edge.
Gympie Road, near Darwin Street / Aspley permanent counter	61,700	69,660 (2015)	-11.4%	Large strategic corridor; this site's count fell over the endpoints, so it should not be described as traffic growth.
Linkfield Connection Road, at Carseldine Road	34,431	28,363 (2015)	+21.4%	Supports the significance of the Linkfield/Carseldine road network at this counter.
Linkfield Road overpass, eastern end	34,639	31,419 (2016)	+10.2%	A separate nearby counting point; not additive to the Carseldine Road counter.
Sandgate Sub-Arterial Road, 390 m north of Depot Road	24,407	15,862 (2015)	+53.9%	Shows change at this location; additional origin-destination evidence is needed.

The traffic evidence indicates that the northern arterials and Linkfield connectors are substantial parts of the metropolitan road network. It does not prove that the residents in the named localities share the same work trip, that each vehicle represents a separate person, or that any corridor should determine a federal boundary by itself.

4.3 Rail connections and barriers

Queensland Rail's South East Queensland network map identifies the Doomben line serving Ascot and Hendra, and the Shorncliffe line serving Deagon, Sandgate and Shorncliffe; Clayfield is adjacent to Eagle Junction, an interchange area. The Caboolture and Redcliffe Peninsula services run through Carseldine and the northern network. Rail corridors are therefore useful reference features for a boundary, but they are also connectors: the line's existence does not automatically divide a community. Crossing points, station access, road bridges and actual routes should be considered. [5]

The proposed Carseldine limit uses the railway as a readily identifiable line and reduces ambiguity compared with an informal description of "southern Carseldine". The final map should identify the rail alignment/corridor to be used, specify any station-area or crossing exceptions, and count actual/projection SA1 units intersected by the line.

4.4 The Brisbane Airport and Kingsford Smith Drive corridor

The inner-north-east sector's road/rail relationship to Brisbane Airport and Kingsford Smith Drive creates a coherent policy cluster around aviation, freight movement, access, noise and land-use compatibility. The airport-related argument is not that the proposed localities have exclusive reliance on this corridor, but that these related federal infrastructure issues can be addressed within one representative division more coherently than where the boundary cuts through the connected urban area.

4.5 Cross-bay travel

The Ted Smout Memorial Bridge/Houghton Highway gives Brighton direct road access to Clontarf on the Redcliffe Peninsula. This materially strengthens the geographic case for considering the coastal communities in a broader bayside/Petrie grouping. It is not a sufficient basis, by itself, to decide the destination of Brighton, Sandgate, Shorncliffe or Deagon: the receiving division's quota and its links to the remainder of the peninsula must also be considered.

4.6 Access to work, health, retail and recreation

The available material does not quantify the proportion of residents using particular work, health, retail or recreational destinations. A more modest proposition is warranted: all else being equal, facilities are more likely to be used by residents for whom they are nearer and more readily accessible than by residents facing longer journeys or barriers. The presence and location of facilities can therefore help identify plausible service catchments, but should be supported by route, catchment or usage data wherever available.

5. Physical features, area and legible boundaries

Section 66(3)(b)(iv) requires due consideration to physical features and area. A legible boundary can improve public comprehension and reduce the number of localities divided, but the physical feature must be accurately mapped and must not be given a false precision. [1]

5.1 Brisbane River as the southern edge

Bringing Ascot and Hamilton into Lilley would allow the Brisbane River to form a more readily understood southern edge for a northside division in this sector. A river is a prominent geographical feature and often a practical barrier to cross-river local connection, though bridges and travel routes should still be acknowledged. This argument must be evaluated against the whole proposed line; the river cannot resolve the numerical effects of transferring the inner-north-east localities out of Brisbane by itself.

5.2 Inland residential corridor versus bayside geography

The northern residential belt around Bridgeman Downs and Carseldine is distinct in its physical setting from the immediate foreshore and bayside lowlands around Brighton, Sandgate and Shorncliffe. The latter communities have direct relationships with Bramble Bay, shoreline access, coastal management and estuarine/wetland environments. These geographical contrasts may produce different local issues, but they should not be overstated as absolute ecological or social variations: the wider northside contains mixed vegetation and urban landscapes, and Deagon is not itself a foreshore suburb in the same way as Sandgate or Shorncliffe. Any detailed soil, vegetation or floodplain assertions should be supported by official Queensland mapping before they are added as factual findings.

5.3 Old Northern Road-South Pine Road corridor in Everton Park

The proposed Everton Park transfer is defined by the Old Northern Road-South Pine Road corridor, not by a whole-suburb label. A major road junction can provide a visible boundary, but the precise road segment and the side to be transferred need to be unambiguous on a map. The Committee should overlay the corridor with the locality boundary and AEC SA1/part-SA1 counts; if an SA1 crosses the corridor, a stated, reproducible allocation rule is required.

5.4 Queensland locality boundaries and local government context

Queensland's official Locality Boundaries dataset provides authoritative current locality geometry, and Brisbane City Council's suburb layer can provide a cross-check where appropriate. Bridgeman Downs is within Brisbane City Council but its electors are currently split between three federal divisions. That contrast is relevant to locality integrity; local government boundaries are context, not a determinative federal rule. The location and continued provision of libraries, pools, parks, sporting grounds and community centres is also evidence that public authorities or service providers have identified a catchment or community need worth serving. It would be an overstatement to infer that every nearby resident uses every facility, but it would be equally unreasonable to treat the existence and location of those facilities as having no evidentiary value. The Committee can weigh their catchments and accessibility alongside locality boundaries and transport routes. [7]

5.5 The Gateway Motorway as a practical barrier

The Gateway Motorway can function as a practical and relatively immovable boundary where the motorway corridor has few convenient crossing points and its entry/exit ramps are widely spaced. In those circumstances, pedestrians, cyclists and local vehicle trips may be forced into substantial detours to reach the other side; the motorway is therefore more than a line on a map and may separate everyday movement patterns. That conclusion should be tied to the actual stretch proposed as a boundary: the Committee should map bridges, underpasses, ramps and safe crossing opportunities and assess the detours they impose. The motorway is not an absolute barrier everywhere, and this submission does not suggest that the current core Lilley package follows the Gateway along its entire length. Where the mapped facts support it, however, the motorway is a substantial physical-feature and boundary-legibility consideration.

6. Existing division boundaries

The history of the division is relevant context, not a veto on change. Ascot, Clayfield and Hamilton (as well as Hendra) were formerly within Lilley; the 2009 final redistribution transferred those inner-north-east localities from Lilley to Brisbane. That episode demonstrates that the boundary between Lilley and Brisbane has previously been drawn differently and that past divisional boundaries may usefully inform, but cannot dictate, a future redistribution. The current line also groups bayside localities with inland northside residential areas while dividing Bridgeman Downs between Lilley, Petrie and Dickson. Existing lines can preserve local familiarity and representative continuity, but they can also split a locality or combine areas with different service and geographic relationships. Section 66(3A) of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* (Cth) makes existing divisional boundaries subordinate to community of interests, communication/travel and physical features. [1], [9]

The proposal does not assume that the historic coastal association with Lilley is irrelevant. It asks the Committee to compare that association with the coastal group's relationship to Bramble Bay and Clontarf, while also considering its rail and school links back toward Brisbane. The 2009 redistribution is especially instructive because the inner-north-east transfers to Brisbane were implemented, whereas the proposal to remove Brighton, Deagon and Sandgate from Lilley did not become the final boundary in that form. The two historical outcomes should not be conflated: the former is evidence of an actual change away from Lilley; the latter is a proposed coastal change that was not adopted as proposed. Neither episode settles the present question, but both make consistent, criterion-based reasoning important. [9], [10]

The current AEC locality finder and official boundary data should be used to verify each named locality and any locality split before the line is drawn. Where a suburb's named geography crosses a federal division, the transfer is the portion of the locality within that division—not the whole locality count unless the map actually transfers the whole locality. Past lines are one relevant consideration, but should not substitute for applying the statutory criteria to the geography and communities as they exist at the current redistribution.

7. Projected quota, transfer ledger and statewide balance

7.1 Published baseline and ranges

Measure	Actual / date	Projected / date	Interpretation
Queensland quota	127,259 (28 July 2026)	132,526 (27 August 2028)	AEC-published averages.
Acceptable range	114,534-139,984	127,888-137,164	Actual range is +/-10%; projected target is +/-3.5% as far as practicable.
Lilley baseline	119,613	122,571	Projected baseline is 5,317 below the preferred minimum.
Brisbane baseline	127,658	133,341	Within projected range before requested moves.
Petrie baseline	137,616	143,120	5,956 above preferred projected maximum.
Dickson baseline	121,147	124,841	3,047 below preferred projected minimum.
Longman baseline	148,218	156,827	19,663 above preferred projected maximum.

These are the AEC's published baseline division figures, not enrolment totals for the proposed boundaries. A whole-state redistribution has a number of divisions below or above the preferred range. That context is important: a local change must be evaluated through a regional balance, not Lilley alone. [2]

7.2 Transfer ledger: known components

Transfer item	Proposed direction	Actual electors	Projected electors	Precision / caveat
Ascot, whole locality	Brisbane to Lilley	4,679	4,840	SA2 proxy; locality overlay required
Hamilton, whole locality	Brisbane to Lilley	5,114	5,246	SA2 proxy; locality overlay required
Clayfield, whole locality	Brisbane to Lilley	7,794	7,905	SA2 proxy; locality overlay required
Hendra, whole locality	Brisbane to Lilley	3,700	3,661	SA2 proxy; locality overlay required
Bridgeman Downs share currently in Petrie	Petrie to Lilley	3,675	3,908	AEC division/SA1 aggregation; verify locality overlay
Bridgeman Downs share currently in Dickson	Dickson to Lilley	3,482	3,631	AEC division/SA1 aggregation; verify locality overlay
Brighton	Lilley out; Petrie proposed for testing	7,415	7,502	SA2 proxy; destination needs a statewide balance
Deagon	Lilley out; Petrie proposed for testing	3,150	3,163	SA2 proxy; locality overlay required
Sandgate and Shorncliffe, combined SA2	Lilley out; Petrie proposed for testing	5,218	5,300	Combined SA2; not an exact separate suburb count
Lilley's current Stafford allocation	Lilley out; Brisbane proposed for testing	3,762	3,812	Current allocation from AEC workbook; exact geometry required
Carseldine south of railway	Petrie to Lilley	C_actual	C_projected	Unknown until rail/locality/SA1 overlay

Transfer item	Proposed direction	Actual electors	Projected electors	Precision / caveat
Everton Park south of corridor	Lilley out	E_actual	E_projected	Unknown until corridor/locality/SA1 overlay
Aspley: portion currently in Petrie	Petrie to Lilley	2,297	2,336	AEC Aspley SA2-by-division component; verify against locality/SA1 geometry

7.3 Arithmetic for Lilley

Starting with Lilley's AEC baseline, the arithmetic adds the four inner-north-east components, the Petrie and Dickson portions of Bridgeman Downs, and the Petrie portion of Aspley; it subtracts the proposed coastal components and Lilley's current Stafford allocation. The Aspley transfer adds 2,297 actual electors and 2,336 projected electors on the AEC Aspley SA2-by-division component. The resulting subtotal before the partial Carseldine and Everton Park adjustments is 130,809 actual electors and 134,321 projected electors. The final arithmetic is $130,809 + C_{\text{actual}} - E_{\text{actual}}$ and $134,321 + C_{\text{projected}} - E_{\text{projected}}$, where C is the count for Carseldine south of the railway and E is the count for Everton Park south of the Old Northern Road–South Pine Road corridor. The partial-area counts remain to be established by GIS overlay; this subtotal is a model, not a final boundary count.

Calculation	Actual electors	Projected electors
Lilley baseline	119,613	122,571
Add Ascot + Hamilton + Clayfield + Hendra	+21,287	+21,652
Add Bridgeman Downs portions currently in Petrie and Dickson	+7,157	+7,539
Remove Brighton + Deagon + Sandgate/Shorncliffe	-15,783	-15,965
Remove Lilley's current Stafford allocation	-3,762	-3,812
Add Aspley portion currently in Petrie	+2,297	+2,336
Subtotal before partial Carseldine/Everton Park	130,809	134,321
Final formula	$130,809 + C_{\text{actual}} - E_{\text{actual}}$	$134,321 + C_{\text{projected}} - E_{\text{projected}}$

C is the elector count for the Carseldine area south of the railway; E is the elector count in the Everton Park area south of the defined corridor. Neither is yet an exact count. The full Carseldine SA2 contains 7,303 actual and 7,481 projected electors, but those figures are upper bounds only, not C. The whole Everton Park SA2 or locality count must not be used as E.

On the revised proxy subtotal, Lilley remains in the preferred projected range only if: $-6,433 \leq C_{\text{projected}} - E_{\text{projected}} \leq 2,843$. The partial-area GIS result can therefore affect the quota conclusion. This submission does not claim that Lilley's final projected count is already proven to comply.

7.4 Brisbane can be balanced through the broader map

The four whole inner-north-east additions total 21,652 projected electors on the SA2-proxy ledger. If they leave Brisbane without any compensating transfer, Brisbane falls from 133,341 to 111,689 projected electors—16,199 below the preferred minimum of 127,888—and from 127,658 to 106,371 actual electors, 8,163 below the actual minimum. This is a real constraint, not a minor rounding issue.

The submission nevertheless asks the Committee to test whether Brisbane can round out its shape and regain a sufficient number of electors through adjacent boundary adjustments elsewhere in the State. That balancing exercise should be designed around coherent adjoining areas, not by reassigning the proposed Lilley inclusions simply to erase a number. The possible boundary around split localities such as Enoggera, Gaythorne and Auchenflower may be examined by the Committee as broader balancing options, but these are not part of the core Lilley transfer request and no exact area or elector count is asserted here. The AEC should test each candidate line against both quota measures and the statutory criteria.

7.5 Dickson, Petrie and Longman require a northern balancing exercise

The Bridgeman Downs transfer removes 3,631 projected electors from Dickson, taking it from 124,841 to 121,210, a shortfall of 6,678 against the preferred minimum. The Aspley component moves 2,336 projected electors from Petrie to Lilley. Petrie begins at 143,120, 5,956 above the preferred maximum, while Longman begins at 156,827, 19,663 above it. This pattern makes it appropriate for the Committee to test a northward adjustment of Dickson alongside complementary changes in Petrie and Longman, rather than decide the Lilley/Petrie line separately from the northern regional balance.

If Petrie loses 3,908 Bridgeman Downs electors and the 2,336 Aspley component, loses C Carseldine electors to Lilley and receives all 15,965 projected coastal electors excluded from Lilley, its subtotal becomes 152,841 – C. To fall at or below 137,164 it would then need to transfer out at least 15,677 – C additional projected electors. Given the whole Carseldine SA2 upper bound of 7,481, the further outflow required would still be at least 8,196; it would be greater if C is lower. That is why the coastal assignment cannot be described as a final standalone transfer to Petrie without a matching regional adjustment.

Longman's substantial projected excess and Dickson's shortfall make a northward boundary adjustment for Dickson a plausible matter for the statewide map to test. This is a proposed balancing direction, not a completed map or proof that the three divisions can be made compliant without affecting further neighbours. The focus of this submission is Petrie's position at the Lilley interface: its possible receipt of coastal localities and its role in the northern regional balance. The precise adjustments to Dickson and Longman should be settled through the statewide map, supported by a full SA1 ledger for every affected division.

8. Likely objections and responses

8.1 “The changes disrupt long-standing boundaries.”

Continuity is relevant but not determinative. Section 66(3A) expressly subordinates existing divisions to community of interest, communication/travel and physical features. The proposal does not say the current connections are imaginary; it asks whether more legible locality and geographic relationships can be achieved without losing sight of statewide numbers. The whole-Bridgeman Downs proposal is especially direct: it removes a three-division split of one locality, subject to exact geometry.

8.2 “The coastal suburbs have long been part of Lilley and share the Shorncliffe line.”

This concern warrants consideration, but it is not determinative. The Shorncliffe rail line and inner-north school routes connect the bayside localities southward into Brisbane, so the proposal must not claim they lack ties to Lilley. Its answer is comparative: the coastal setting, foreshore/coastal-management concerns and the Ted Smout/Houghton cross-bay road connection make a Petrie-side regional grouping worthy of testing. The receiving division must be balanced through the full map; Petrie cannot simply absorb the whole coastal group while retaining every current boundary.

8.3 “The proposed inner-north-east suburbs have different socio-economic profiles.”

The ABS profiles show recurring descriptive differences across several measures, including age, degree attainment, education attendance and professional occupation. Those differences are relevant to the Committee’s assessment of community of interests, but they are not a self-sufficient rule for drawing a boundary. The Committee should weigh them with physical geography, transport, services, locality integrity and the exact enrolment consequences. The Aspley figures describe the whole locality; the proposed electoral transfer is only the portion currently in Petrie.

8.4 “The quota arithmetic does not balance.”

That objection is correct if the package is presented as a complete map while all other localities remain fixed. It is not presented that way. Brisbane needs a compensating inflow or smaller outflow; Dickson needs an inflow; Petrie needs an outflow if it receives the coastal group; and Longman’s starting projection is materially above the preferred range. The Committee’s statutory task is statewide. The submission asks the Committee to test this Lilley line as part of that statewide balancing exercise and not to treat the figures here as a completed redistribution.

8.5 “Traffic and school routes do not prove resident behaviour.”

Traffic counts and school-coach routes are useful contextual evidence, but neither alone establishes individual travel behaviour.

8.6 “The boundary descriptions are too imprecise.”

The Carseldine and Everton Park areas are deliberately described by physical lines, but they require a map-grade definition. The Committee should use the current Queensland locality boundaries and rail/road geometry, establish treatment of SA1s crossed by each line, and publish the resulting elector totals. Until that is done, the C and E counts and the final Lilley total must remain open.

9. Requests to the Committee

It is respectfully submitted that the Redistribution Committee should:

1. Test the inclusion of Ascot, Hamilton, Clayfield and Hendra within Lilley as a coherent inner-north-east/airport-side urban sector, subject to the State-wide projected-enrolment constraint.
2. Test the transfer to Lilley of the portion of Aspley currently in Petrie, using the AEC SA2-by-division component of 2,297 actual and 2,336 projected electors as a starting point and verifying the final line against current locality and SA1 geometry.
3. Test a whole-of-locality boundary for Bridgeman Downs, transferring only the portions currently in Petrie and Dickson and retaining Lilley's existing share until the locality polygon has been reconciled with the AEC SA1/part-SA1 data.
4. Test the south-of-railway Carseldine boundary by overlaying the current locality boundary and railway geometry and counting only the affected SA1/part-SA1 electors.
5. Test the exclusion of Brighton, Deagon, Sandgate and Shorncliffe with the Petrie/Brisbane/Dickson/Longman balance in view, rather than assigning the entire coastal group to Petrie without complementary changes.
6. Test the transfer out of Lilley of its current Stafford allocation and only the Everton Park land south of the Old Northern Road-South Pine Road corridor; do not substitute whole-suburb totals for partial-area electors.
7. Consider the inner-north-east airport/freight, school-transport, road and rail evidence in the round, including the evidence that some school travel routes connect both the inland corridor and the bayside localities.
8. Prepare a single statewide actual/projected quota reconciliation for every affected division, identifying the transfer of each SA1 or part-SA1 exactly once and showing the receiving division for every outgoing locality.
9. Give due consideration to community of interests, communication and travel, and physical features/area, treating existing divisional boundaries as subordinate in the manner required by s 66(3A).

The proposal is submitted as a criteria-led boundary concept for statewide testing. It does not assert that the changes can be adopted in isolation, that demographic indicators alone justify a line, or that the partial-area counts are already final. The strongest case is made when the locality-integrity, regional-connection and geographic arguments are tested alongside the full-state quota model.

10. Conclusion: representation, consistency and reasoned boundaries

The Committee is asked to choose a boundary that can be explained by evidence and by the statutory criteria, not merely defended as a permissible numerical outcome. The inner-north-east localities proposed for inclusion have urban, education, transport and airport-side relationships that can be assessed with Lilley's northern residential corridor; the bayside localities have a strong coastal orientation and established links towards Bramble Bay and the Redcliffe Peninsula; and Bridgeman Downs' division between three federal electorates is difficult to justify by community identity alone. The road and rail network, airport and freight corridor, school-service maps and Census indicators each contribute to the assessment, while none is conclusive in isolation.

The 2009 Queensland redistribution is relevant historical context, but the direction of the change must be stated correctly. The 2009 final redistribution transferred Ascot, Clayfield, Hamilton and Hendra from Lilley to Brisbane. In contrast, the proposal to remove Brighton, Deagon and Sandgate from Lilley did not become the final boundary in that form. The historical record therefore shows an actual inner-north-east transfer out of Lilley alongside a coastal exclusion proposal that was not adopted as proposed. It does not dictate the present result; it reinforces the need for the current Committee to assess both sectors afresh against community of interests, communication and travel, physical features, and quota consequences. [9], [10]

The democratic case is for reasoned, intelligible and consistent boundary-making. Where the Committee reaches a conclusion "on balance", its reasons should identify what was weighed, why it mattered and how the statutory criteria were applied across neighbouring divisions. That approach respects the electorate's ability to understand the decision, helps establish consistency between comparable localities, and gives public confidence that community of interests, travel and physical geography were genuinely considered before existing boundaries were retained or altered. This is a matter of institutional legitimacy and equal representation, not a request for special treatment.

The requested outcome is not a partisan allocation. It is a reasoned opportunity to reconsider whether a coherent inner-north-east community should be represented with Lilley, and whether the coastal localities are better considered with the broader bayside/Petrie grouping. If statewide quota constraints require adjustments, the Committee should identify them and explain how the adopted line preserves the strongest available community-of-interest fit. Electors should be able to see not merely the line on the map, but the reasons for it.

Appendix A. Census comparison for boundary-change localities

The following tables use the 2021 ABS Census QuickStats profiles for the 13 named localities affected by the core proposal. The purpose is to compare age, education and occupation indicators consistently, rather than to treat housing form as a stand-in for community of interest. All percentages come from locality (SAL) QuickStats geography. Whole-locality profiles are contextual only where the requested transfer covers a partial locality, including Carseldine, Everton Park, Stafford's current Lilley allocation and the Petrie-side Aspley component. [3]

A.1 Age and education comparison

Locality / requested treatment	Median age (years)	Secondary: government (%)	Secondary: Catholic (%)	Secondary: other non-government (%)	Tertiary: vocational / TAFE (%)	Tertiary: university / higher education (%)	Bachelor degree and above, age 15+ (%)
Ascot — include whole locality	38	2.3	5.1	15.8	5.7	24.3	40.6
Hamilton — include whole locality	40	2.9	6.4	6.9	8.9	28.6	40.2
Clayfield — include whole locality	37	3.9	7.5	8.9	8.5	26.9	44.5
Hendra — include whole locality	39	4.7	11.8	8.5	3.9	21.2	40.8
Bridgeman Downs — include whole locality	39	8.5	10.2	8.6	5.5	21.8	38.9
Carseldine — include south of railway only	41	12.8	7.4	3.8	8.0	18.3	30.8
Aspley — whole-locality profile; transfer Petrie portion only	43	12.9	7.0	2.8	7.2	17.0	29.2
Brighton — exclude from Lilley	42	12.0	11.6	2.5	6.6	13.9	25.9
Deagon — exclude from Lilley	42	16.9	7.2	0.8	6.3	15.4	22.1
Sandgate — exclude from Lilley	49	9.4	17.3	3.8	5.5	16.1	30.1
Shorncliffe — exclude from Lilley	47	7.1	17.3	3.5	5.3	19.5	35.3
Stafford — exclude Lilley's current allocation	35	9.2	5.8	2.2	7.4	21.9	32.3
Everton Park — exclude south of road corridor only	35	9.0	7.5	4.8	8.5	23.1	34.8

The seven inclusion profiles have an unweighted median age of 39 years; the six affected exclusion profiles have a median age of 42 years. Bachelor-degree attainment has unweighted medians of 40.2% among inclusion profiles and 31.2% among

exclusion profiles. University/higher-education attendance has medians of 21.8% and 17.8%; vocational/TAFE attendance has medians of 7.2% and 6.5%. For secondary-school type indicators (shares of people attending an education institution), inclusion medians are 4.7% government, 7.4% Catholic and 8.5% other non-government, compared with 9.3%, 9.6% and 3.0% among exclusion profiles. These are recurring descriptive differences across multiple measures and are relevant to the community-of-interest assessment. Education attendance percentages refer to people attending an educational institution, while qualification percentages refer to people aged 15 and over. [3]

A.2 Occupation comparison

The occupation percentages below are for employed people aged 15 years and over in the 2021 Census locality profile. They show professionals, managers, and clerical and administrative workers separately. A whole-locality result should not be attributed to a partial transfer polygon without an exact geographic overlay. [3]

Locality / requested treatment	Professionals (%)	Managers (%)	Clerical and administrative workers (%)
Ascot — include whole locality	35.3	19.0	13.6
Hamilton — include whole locality	31.7	19.6	14.7
Clayfield — include whole locality	34.8	14.6	13.7
Hendra — include whole locality	32.9	22.2	13.1
Bridgeman Downs — include whole locality	33.2	16.6	13.7
Carseldine — include south of railway only	29.2	12.0	14.7
Aspley — whole-locality profile; transfer Petrie portion only	28.9	13.1	14.7
Brighton — exclude from Lilley	25.1	14.6	14.2
Deagon — exclude from Lilley	23.6	11.2	16.0
Sandgate — exclude from Lilley	31.0	16.5	12.5
Shorncliffe — exclude from Lilley	31.9	17.8	12.4
Stafford — exclude Lilley's current allocation	30.8	12.6	13.1
Everton Park — exclude south of road corridor only	30.1	13.2	14.8

The unweighted median share of professionals is 32.9% among the seven inclusion profiles and 30.5% among the six exclusion profiles; the manager medians are 16.6% and 13.9%, while the clerical/administrative medians are 13.7% and 13.6%, respectively. These comparisons show a clear difference in professional representation and management, alongside overlap in clerical/administrative occupations. They should be considered as relevant descriptive evidence rather than treated as proof that all residents share one socio-economic identity or that any locality intrinsically “belongs” in a division. These data do not measure actual resident travel, service use or political preference.

Appendix B. Enrolment ledger and quota arithmetic

The figures in this appendix are a transparent arithmetic model using the AEC baseline, the available AEC SA1/SA2 aggregation and the current locality interpretation. The model includes the Aspley portion currently in Petrie (2,297 actual and 2,336 projected electors on the AEC SA2-by-division component). Proxy figures are shown as such. These figures require a statewide test: Brisbane needs compensating transfers or reduced outflow; Dickson is likely to need a northward adjustment or other inflow; Petrie cannot receive the coastal localities without substantial outflow; and Longman also needs net outflow. No result is proven until each transfer is counted once in a complete statewide map. Do not interpret the figures as a final GIS-verified boundary count.

Division / component	Actual	Projected	Calculation / consequence
Lilley baseline	119,613	122,571	AEC published baseline
Brisbane to Lilley: Ascot + Hamilton + Clayfield + Hendra	+21,287	+21,652	SA2-proxy subtotal
Petrie to Lilley: Bridgeman Downs share	+3,675	+3,908	AEC division/SA1 component
Dickson to Lilley: Bridgeman Downs share	+3,482	+3,631	AEC division/SA1 component
Lilley to proposed coastal receiving arrangement: Brighton + Deagon + Sandgate/Shorncliffe	-15,783	-15,965	SA2 proxy; combined Sandgate-Shorncliffe
Lilley Stafford allocation out	-3,762	-3,812	AEC current division allocation
Petrie to Lilley: Aspley portion	+2,297	+2,336	AEC Aspley SA2-by-division component; locality/SA1 overlay required
Lilley subtotal before C/E	130,809	134,321	Recalculated subtotal
Carseldine south of rail	+C_actual	+C_projected	Unknown; full Carseldine SA2 is upper bound 7,303 / 7,481
Everton Park south of corridor	-E_actual	-E_projected	Unknown; partial-area GIS count needed
Lilley final formula	130,809 + C_actual - E_actual	134,321 + C_projected - E_projected	Do not substitute Census population for C or E

B.1 Consequences for neighbouring divisions

Test	Projected calculation	Projected result	What must be done
Brisbane after four included localities leave	133,341 - 21,652	111,689	Needs 16,199 additional electors to reach 127,888, or equivalent reduction in outflow.
Dickson after Bridgeman Downs share leaves	124,841 - 3,631	121,210	Needs 6,678 to reach 127,888.
Petrie after Aspley, Bridgeman Downs and Carseldine, before coastal receipt	143,120 - 2,336 - 3,908 - C	136,876 - C	Aspley portion and Bridgeman Downs move to Lilley; count C exactly.
Petrie after coastal receipt too	143,120 - 2,336 - 3,908 - C + 15,965	152,841 - C	Needs further outflow of at least 15,677 - C to reach 137,164.
Longman baseline	156,827	156,827	Needs an outflow of at least 19,663 to reach 137,164.

Appendix C. Required GIS and statewide checks

Task	Required method	Output for auditable decision
Locality-to-SA1 reconciliation	Overlay current Queensland locality polygons, ABS SAL/SA2 geography and AEC SA1 / part-SA1 enrolment units. Identify boundary-edge cases and do not double count.	Crosswalk showing every affected SA1/part-SA1 and the locality/division it belongs to.
Aspley: Petrie-side portion	Overlay current Queensland locality polygon, Aspley SA2 and AEC division/SA1 enrolment units; isolate the portion currently assigned to Petrie.	Mapped portion and reconciled actual/projected transfer count; initial AEC SA2-by-division values 2,297 / 2,336.
Carseldine south of railway	Use current rail line/corridor geometry and the Carseldine locality polygon; specify how rail-side and boundary-crossing SA1s are allocated.	Mapped polygon plus C_actual and C_projected.
Everton Park corridor	Digitise/use the exact Old Northern Road-South Pine Road boundary segment and intersect with Everton Park locality and AEC units.	Mapped polygon plus E_actual and E_projected.
Bridgeman Downs whole locality	Reconcile current locality boundary against Lilley/Petrie/Dickson SA1 allocation, retaining Lilley's existing component and moving the two outside components only.	Deduplicated whole-locality total and exact receiving/losing division table.
Coastal exclusions	Map Brighton, Deagon, Sandgate and Shorncliffe locality boundaries; split the combined Sandgate-Shorncliffe SA2 elector proxy by SA1/part-SA1 and assign a receiving division.	Exact coastal component counts with destination and a regional explanation.
Stafford allocation	Map the current Lilley part of Stafford separately from the current Brisbane part.	Exact affected SA1/part-SA1 listing; do not transfer all Stafford by name.
Whole-State quota ledger	Recompute each affected division at actual and projected dates after every transfer; each elector component must appear exactly once.	Statewide balance table against 114,534-139,984 actual range and 127,888-137,164 projected target.
Travel/service checks	Use current QR network, school route schedules, journey-to-work, school catchment and facility data where available. Separate route existence from actual use.	Maps/data supporting or qualifying the claimed community relationships.
Boundary legibility review	Check Brisbane River, railways, main roads, airport/freight interfaces and locality boundary crossings at large map scale.	Final boundary map with road/rail names, line locations and crossings clearly marked.

References and source register

Legislation

- [1] *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* (Cth) ss 64-66, especially s 66(3)(a), s 66(3)(b)(i), (ii), (iv), (v) and s 66(3A), current compilation 1 July 2026. <https://www.legislation.gov.au/C1918A00027/latest>

AEC enrolment and redistribution materials

- [2] Australian Electoral Commission, “Redistribution and projected enrolment quotas – Queensland federal redistribution” (published 16 September 2026). <https://www.aec.gov.au/redistributions/2025/qld/quota.html>

Australian Electoral Commission, “Enrolment data – Queensland federal redistribution” (SA1 actual, projected enrolment and growth workbook; actual 28 July 2026 and projection 27 August 2028). <https://www.aec.gov.au/redistributions/2025/qld/enrolment-data.html>

ABS Census

- [3] Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2021 Census All persons QuickStats, Suburbs and Localities profiles: Aspley (SAL30095), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL30095>; Ascot (SAL30089), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL30089>; Hamilton (SAL31289), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL31289>; Clayfield (SAL30617), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL30617>; Hendra (SAL31320), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL31320>; Bridgeman Downs (SAL30369), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL30369>; Carseldine (SAL30553), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL30553>; Brighton (SAL30373), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL30373>; Deagon (SAL30818), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL30818>; Sandgate (SAL32508), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL32508>; Shorncliffe (SAL32558), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL32558>; Stafford (SAL32649), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL32649>; Everton Park (SAL31012), <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL31012>.

Transport and geography

- [4] Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads, “Traffic census for the Queensland state-declared road network”, including 2015-2025 AADT workbook (dataset updated 6 August 2026). <https://www.data.qld.gov.au/dataset/traffic-census-for-the-queensland-state-declared-road-network>
- [5] Queensland Rail, “Network map” and “Text version of SEQ network map”. <https://www.queenslandrail.com.au/Customers/Stations%20and%20Maps/Pages/Network-and-line-maps.aspx> ; <https://www.queenslandrail.com.au/forcustomers/stationsmaps/text-version-of-seq-network-map>
- [6] Red and White Coaches, “School Runs” and current route/timetable descriptions. <https://redandwhitecoaches.com.au/school%20runs.php> ; <https://redandwhitecoaches.com.au/schools.php>
- [7] Queensland Government, “Locality boundaries – Queensland” (official locality geometry dataset, updated 11 September 2026); Australian Electoral Commission, locality search. <https://www.data.qld.gov.au/dataset/locality-boundaries-queensland> ; <https://electorate.aec.gov.au/LocalitySearchResults.aspx>
- [8] Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads, “Ted Smout Memorial Bridge officially opens” (describes the 2.7 km bridge joining Brighton and Clontarf). <https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/~media/communityandenvironment/Regional%20information/Previous%20regions/Region%20local%20links/Metropolitan/LocalLinksIssue722July.pdf>

Supporting data files provided with this submission

The accompanying evidence package includes the transfer ledger; corrected quota and statewide-balance checks; the locality Census comparison with geography codes and source links; the TMR traffic-site summary; and a claim-validation audit of the supplied proposal. Each file records limitations where figures are proxies or partial-area counts remain unknown.

Historical redistribution materials

- [9] Australian Electoral Commission, Report of the Redistribution Committee for Queensland (2009), final report, including the table of transfers from Lilley to Brisbane. <https://www.aec.gov.au/electorates/redistributions/2009/qld/final-report/files/final-report-qld.pdf>
- [10] Australian Electoral Commission, “Proposed Redistribution” (Queensland, 2009), report index and proposed report. https://www.aec.gov.au/electorates/redistributions/2009/qld/proposed_report/index.htm