



Objection 37

Dr Mark Mulcair

14 pages

OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED 2020 VICTORIAN REDISTRIBUTION

(Dr Mark Mulcair)

Overall, I support the proposed boundaries set down by the Committee. The proposals are quite similar to what I and many of the other independents suggested in our original Submissions, and I think for the most part they are very logical and sensible.

OUTCOMES I SUPPORT

Before discussing my Objections, I would like to emphasise the aspects of the redistribution that I support. I would strongly encourage the Committee to stick with this aspects of their original proposals, and would be inclined to reject any Objections that proposed undoing them:

- The arrangement in rural Victoria, with Wannon moving eastwards, Ballarat and Bendigo focussing more on their namesake cities, and Maryborough remaining in Mallee
- The new seat being based on Melton, Bacchus Marsh, and Sunbury.
- McEwen retaining generally its existing form, instead of a radical redrawing of the outer north.
- The outer northern growth belt remaining split between several different seats (McEwen, Calwell, and Scullin).
- Footscray and surrounds being united in Fraser, with Maribyrnong moving decisively east of the river.
- Jagajaga expanding back into Eltham and surrounds, with Menzies moving south of the river.
- Chisholm pushing southwards into Wheelers Hill and uniting all of the Waverley area in a single seat.
- Higgins gaining Caulfield with South Yarra and Prahran going into Macnamara, leaving both seats as more clearly defined 'inner city' and 'suburban' Divisions.
- Latrobe taking in parts of West Gippsland, with Bruce and Holt adjusting within their existing general boundaries.

All of these proposals are extremely logical and sensible.

My Objections are to some of the specific proposals for boundaries of individual seats. In all cases, I believe that a small adjustment or rotation of seas can improve the community of interest outcomes. Most of my proposed changes are fairly minor, and in some cases will result in electors returning to their original Division.

EASTERN AND SOUTH-EASTERN MELBOURNE

My most significant Objections are for the Divisions in this part of Melbourne. It makes enormous sense for all Divisions in this part of Melbourne to move generally south and east, but I think the boundaries of individual seats could be tidied up a little, as follows:

OBJECTION 1: MENZIES/DEAKIN/CHISHOLM

I agree in principle with the proposal to push Menzies and Chisholm southwards. My original Suggestions proposed a more east-west configuration for Menzies and Deakin, but I accept the logic of the Committee (and several of the original Suggestions) that a more compact arrangement is preferable.

However, there are problems with some of the specifics, in particular:

- The southern boundary of Menzies along Whitehorse Road. This runs right through the centre of the Box Hill CBD, and splits the northern parts of Box Hill, Blackburn, Nunawading, and Mitcham off from the remainder of their suburb.
- The boundary between Chisholm and Deakin along Blackburn Road. This makes another split of Blackburn, resulting in central Blackburn being divided three ways.

I suggest the following changes to all three Divisions to help unite suburbs and make use of stronger boundaries:

1) *Move the southern boundary of Menzies to Canterbury Road.*

Canterbury Road is a major road that also serves as the suburb boundary of both Box Hill and Blackburn. This arrangement would allow all of Box Hill and almost all of Blackburn to be united within Menzies.

2) *From Canterbury Road, adopt Springvale Road, Whitehorse Road, and Surrey Road/Blackburn Road (to the Eastern Freeway) as the new boundary with Deakin.*

This change would re-unite all of Nunawading and Mitcham within Deakin, eliminating the proposed split of these suburbs. A small part of Blackburn is also transferred; this allows the use of Surrey/Blackburn Roads, since the suburb boundary runs along minor streets in this area.

I also suggest the small part of Donvale south of the Eastern Freeway be added to Deakin, as outlined in my original suggestions.

3) *Adopt Springvale Road and Burwood Highway as the boundary between Deakin and Chisholm.*

This returns those parts of Blackburn South, Burwood East and Forest Hill to Chisholm, as well as transferring a part of Vermont South.

I believe Burwood Highway is a stronger boundary than Highbury Road east of Springvale Road. While Highbury Road serves as the LGA and suburb boundary, it is quite a minor road in this area, and Burwood Highway seems a more significant divide.

These numbers balance very well, leaving all Divisions within tolerance.

MENZIES	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	112514	118193
+ From Chisholm (North of Canterbury Road)	9299	10111
+ From Deakin (North of Canterbury Road, West of Springvale Road)	4068	4258
- To Deakin (East of Surrey Road, south of Eastern Freeway, to Glendale Rd)	13168	13990
SUGGESTED	112,713	118,572

DEAKIN	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	115004	119311
+ From Menzies (East of Surrey Road, south of Eastern Freeway, to Glendale Rd)	13168	13990
- To Menzies (North of Canterbury Road, West of Springvale Road)	4068	4258
- To Chisholm (South of Canterbury Road, West of Springvale Road, south of Burwood Highway)	8827	8997
SUGGESTED	115277	120046

CHISHOLM	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	113624	118494
+ From Deakin (South of Canterbury Road, West of Springvale Road, south of Burwood Highway)	8827	8997
- To Menzies (North of Canterbury Road)	9299	10111
SUGGESTED	113152	117380

** I am proposing further changes to Chisholm in Objection 2. However, Chisholm will remain within tolerance whether both Objections are upheld, or either one is upheld independently.*

OBJECTION 2: CHISHOLM/HOTHAM/BRUCE

Again, I support the arrangements of these three Divisions, but I think the interface between them could be improved.

In particular:

- The intrusion of Bruce into part of Monash Council. This part of Mulgrave would seem to fit better in the proposed Chisholm, and Jacksons Road is not a particularly strong divide in this area.
- The proposed southern boundary of Chisholm along Wellington Road. This would split the northern parts of Oakleigh and Clayton off from the remainder of their suburb. These areas would have a stronger connection to Hotham (containing the main Oakleigh and Clayton shopping and business centres) than to the remainder of Chisholm.

I suggest that:

- 1) ***Chisholm should instead adopt Ferntree Gully Road, Monash Freeway and Police Road as its new southern boundary.***

This would transfer Mulgrave electors from Hotham and Bruce, while placing all of Clayton and almost all of Oakleigh in Hotham. Ferntree Gully Road is just as significant a road as Wellington Road, and Monash Freeway is a strong divide through Mulgrave.

2) *Continue the Hotham/Bruce boundary along Chandler Road instead of deviating onto Eastlink.*

In my original suggestions, I proposed Eastlink as the strongest eastern boundary for Hotham, but the Committee has proposed a slightly different arrangement here. In that case, to avoid voter confusion, it makes sense to straighten the boundary completely along the Jacksons Road/Elonera Road/Chandler Road corridor in instead of making the deviation onto Eastlink.

I believe this is a more sensible arrangement in this area; Bruce no longer needs to intrude into Monash Council, Clayton and Oakleigh are largely re-united in Hotham, the suburb of Mulgrave has a neater split than before, and all Divisions would still have very strong and sensible boundaries.

CHISHOLM	CURRENT	PROJECTED
After Objection 1	113152	117380
+ From Bruce (part north of Police Road)	3290	3337
+ From Hotham (part north-east of Monash Freeway)	1826	1917
- To Hotham (part south of Monash Freeway and FTG Road)	6346	6759
SUGGESTED	111922	115875

HOTHAM	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	111834	117010
+ From Chisholm (part south of Monash Freeway and FTG Road)	6346	6759
- To Chisholm (part north-east of Monash Freeway)	1826	1917
- To Bruce (part east of Chandler Road)	3798	3938
SUGGESTED	112556	117914

BRUCE	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	114876	118353
+ From Hotham (part east of Chandler Road)	3798	3938
- To Chisholm (part north of Police Road)	3290	3337
SUGGESTED	115384	118954

** I am proposing further changes to Bruce in Objection 3. However, Bruce will remain within tolerance whether both Objections are upheld, or either one is upheld independently.*

OBJECTION 3: BRUCE/HOLT/LATROBE

The proposed southern boundary of Bruce results in two less-than-desirable outcomes:

- A small part of Hampton Park is detached from the rest of the suburb.
- The proposed Bruce/Latrobe boundary appears to run right through the centre of Berwick.

My original Suggestions provided a way to unite all of Hampton Park in the Division of Bruce, but the Committee has proposed a different arrangement in this area. Instead, I propose the following changes:

1) *Return to the original Bruce/Holt boundary between South Gippsland Freeway and Greaves Road*

This reunites Hampton Park in Holt, as well as returning parts of Narre Warren that probably fit better with Holt.

2) *Adopt OShea and Soldiers Roads as the new boundary between Bruce and Latrobe.*

This unites central Berwick in Bruce, and makes greater use of the Berwick suburb boundary as the new south-eastern boundary of Bruce.

3) *Transfer the semi-rural southern parts of Holt into Latrobe.*

The Committee has already chosen to go part of the way by transferring Tooradin to Latrobe, so I think it makes sense for the remaining semi-rural Westernport communities to be united in the same seat. The Committee's proposed Latrobe is significantly more rural than at present, so these towns probably fit better in this Division than in Holt.

BRUCE	CURRENT	PROJECTED
After Objection 2	115384	118954
+ From Latrobe (north of OShea Road, west of Soldiers Road)	6400	6875
- To Holt (part south of Hallam and Berwick Town Drains)	5958	6263
SUGGESTED	115826	119566

HOLT	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	99534	117807
+ From Bruce (part south of Hallam and Berwick Town Drains)	5958	6263
- To Latrobe (south of Browns Road)	6419	6918
SUGGESTED	99073	117152

LATROBE	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	98272	120106
+ From Holt (south of Browns Road)	6419	6918
- To Bruce (north of OShea Road, west of Soldiers Road)	6400	6875
SUGGESTED	98291	120149

OBJECTION 4: HIGGINS/KOONYONG

I do not support the proposed boundary changes in the Glen Iris area. While Baker Parade does serve as the suburb boundary, it is a relatively minor road, and the boundary splits a well contained residential area.

Possibly this was done to better balance the numbers between Higgins and Kooyong. In this case, I suggest an alternative of transferring the triangle between Gardiners Creek, Toorak Road, and Burke Road.

Burke Road is a major road that would be a more significant boundary in the area, and has in fact served as the Higgins/Kooyong boundary previously. The number of electors transferred would be less than currently proposed, but the boundary would be much stronger and clearer.

HIGGINS	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	111179	116976
+ From Kooyong (south of Toorak Road)	2953	3132
- To Kooyong (west of Burke Road, north of Gardiners Creek)	734	766
SUGGESTED	113398	119342

KOONYONG	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	111031	116886
+ From Higgins (west of Burke Road, north of Gardiners Creek)	734	766
- To Higgins (south of Toorak Road)	2953	3132
SUGGESTED	108812	114520

NORTHERN AND WESTERN MELBOURNE

The Committee's proposals are very similar to my own Suggestions, and I have only a couple of minor comments.

OBJECTION 5: LALOR/GELLIBRAND/FRASER

I have two Objections to the seats in the south-western suburbs:

- 1) The proposed Gellibrand/Lalor boundary along Hacketts Road would leave a small part of Point Cook cut off the remainder of the suburb. This area is almost completely isolated from the remainder of Lalor by the Princes Freeway, and would be a far more sensible fit in Gellibrand.

It appears the Committee has followed the SA2 boundary here, whereas I strongly suggest using the suburb boundary along Princes Freeway; a very major road and a significant divide in the area.

- 2) The proposed boundary between Gellibrand and Fraser makes a deviation from Francis Street onto Somerville Road. I would suggest that the boundary be straightened to run along Francis Street in its entirety, uniting the vast majority of Yarraville in Fraser.

If my suggestion (1) was adopted above, there would be more than enough electors in Gellibrand for this change to be made.

LALOR	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	100493	116592
- To Gellibrand (balance of Point Cook)	1494	2361
SUGGESTED	98999	114231

GELLIBRAND	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	105930	117361
+ From Lalor (balance of Point Cook)	1494	2361
- To Fraser (north of Francis Street)	3447	3673
SUGGESTED	103977	116049

FRASER	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	110937	116440
+ From Gellibrand (north of Francis Street)	3447	3673
SUGGESTED	114384	120113

OBJECTION 6: GORTON/HAWKE

The proposed boundary along Melton Highway leaves the northern part of Hillside somewhat isolated within Hawke. While there is suburban development taking place in this area, there is still a large amount of undeveloped open space between Hillside and Melton, and between Plumpton and Diggers Rest. I think this area would fit better with the remainder of Hillside in Gorton.

In exchange, I suggest that Rockbank and Mount Cottrell (everything west of Hopkins Road) be transferred from Gorton to Hawke. These areas fit well with Gorton, but I think they also have strong links with Melton and surrounding areas currently in Hawke.

This change has the benefit of consolidating Gorton as a purely suburban Division, with the developing semi-rural areas west of Melbourne being united in Hawke.

GORTON	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	106192	116508
+ From Hawke (balance of Hillside suburb)	6913	8338
- To Hawke (west of Hopkins Road)	4170	7122
SUGGESTED	108935	117724

HAWKE	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	102921	117105
+ From Gorton (west of Hopkins Road)	4170	7122
- To Gorton (balance of Hillside suburb)	6913	8338
SUGGESTED	100,178	115,889

OBJECTION 7: McEWEN/JAGAJAGA/COOPER/SCULLIN

I would suggest a slight clockwise rotation of the boundaries of these four seats:

- 1) ***Adopt Greensborough Bypass and the LGA boundary between McEwen and Jagajaga***
The proposed boundary appears to run along the Greensborough suburb boundary, but I think the bypass and LGA boundary through open space is a stronger divide in the area.
- 2) ***Transfer Latrobe University and the remainder of Macleod into Jagajaga***
I suggest following Darebin Creek and Plenty Road, both strong boundaries in the area. Many submissions have emphasised the strong links between the University and surrounding suburbs currently in Jagajaga, and Plenty Road seems more logical than the LGA used as the existing boundary.
- 3) ***Return the northern boundary of Cooper to the Ring Road.***
I think the Ring Road is a stronger boundary than the LGA boundary, and the part of Bundoora around Settlement Road fits better with Cooper than with Scullin. This area was previously part of Batman/Cooper before the last redistribution.
- 4) ***Straighten the Scullin/McEwen boundary along Bridge Inn Road.***
This makes for a neater split of Mernda, avoiding the current dog-leg boundary along fairly minor streets.

Each change involves only a few thousand electors, leaving each Division well within tolerance.

McEWEN	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	101104	116913
+ From Jagajaga (north of Ring Rd, G'borough Bypass, and LGA boundary)	3907	3990
- To Scullin (south of Bridge Inn Rd)	2405	3331
SUGGESTED	102606	117572

JAGAJAGA	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	114328	118508
+ From Cooper (east of Darebin Creek and Plenty Road)	3907	3990
- To McEwen (north of Ring Rd, G'borough Bypass, and LGA boundary)	2864	3182
SUGGESTED	113285	117700

COOPER	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	109021	115519
+ From Scullin (south of Ring Road)	4156	4262
- To Jagajaga (east of Darebin Creek and Plenty Road)	2864	3182
SUGGESTED	110313	116599

SCULLIN	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	107312	116741
+ From McEwen (south of Bridge Inn Road)	2405	3331
- To Cooper (south of Ring Road)	4156	4262
SUGGESTED	105561	115810

RURAL VICTORIA

Most Suggestions proposed this type of arrangement for the rural seats. I personally would have liked to see Corio and Corangamite/Tucker redrawn into more clearly ‘northern’ and ‘southern’ Geelong Divisions, but I accept that this will probably not happen at this late stage.

My two proposals are very minor.

OBJECTION 8: CORIO/“TUCKER”

Assuming no major changes to Corio, I instead propose a minor adjustment between Corio and the proposed Tucker.

The existing boundary in the Moolap area leaves electors on the eastern side of Coppards Road isolated from their community of interest in Corio. Currently, this area is in Corangamite/Tucker, but is separated from Leopold and other communities in this Division by several kilometres of open space to the east. Local residents would seem to have a far stronger connection to Newcomb in the west (in Corio).

I suggest moving the boundary from Coppards Road to Moolap Station Road. This transfers the ‘suburban’ part of Moolap into Corio, and makes use of mostly undeveloped areas as a clearer boundary between these two seats.

This change would also reduce electors in rapidly-growing Tucker, and donate them to more stable Corio, which may help balance the numbers better in the longer term.

CORIO	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	110886	117383
+ From Tucker (west of Moolap Station Road)	1394	1456
SUGGESTED	112280	118839

TUCKER	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	101000	119685
- To Corio (west of Moolap Station Road)	1394	1456
SUGGESTED	99606	118229

OBJECTION 9: WANNON/BALLARAT

The proposed boundary between these two Divisions follows the Golden Plains LGA boundary; however, this leaves the town of Inverleigh isolated from other communities along the Hamilton Highway, which are currently in Wannon. While LGA boundaries are often useful in rural areas, in this case I think it makes more sense to place Inverleigh in Wannon.

This change would provide a strong communication link along the Hamilton Highway, and reducing slightly the north-south stretch of Ballarat. While this would make a further split of Golden Plains LGA, this Shire consists of several distinct areas and spans different highway corridors, and somewhat lends itself to being split multiple ways.

Around 1000 electors are involved, leaving both Divisions well within tolerance.

WANNON	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	113223	114051
+ From Ballarat (Inverleigh)	1151	1292
SUGGESTED	114374	115343

BALLARAT	CURRENT	PROJECTED
Proposed	107896	116988
- To Wannon (Inverleigh)	1,151	1,292
SUGGESTED	106745	115696