



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
NEW SOUTH WALES**

Comment on objections 118

Charlotte Bonnar

3 page

23 July 2024

FAO: Redistribution Committee for New South Wales

Dear Australian Electoral Commission

Re: Boundaries of Mackellar Electorate

I thank the AEC for the work it has undertaken to date in relation to the enormous task of boundary redistribution for New South Wales.

As a resident of the Mackellar electorate, I am delighted to see that the changes to the Mackellar boundary proposed by the AEC, make good sense geographically, socially and economically. I strongly support the AEC's proposal and consider it to be logical and sensible in that it:

- Finally reunites previously divided communities of Frenchs Forest and Dee Why, which are both currently split between Mackellar and Warringah electorates. The northern parts of Dee Why and Frenchs Forest currently fall within Mackellar and the southern parts in Warringah. The AEC's proposed new boundary for Mackellar will sensibly reunite these communities of interest within Mackellar.
- Utilises strong natural, physical, geographic features and major roads to delineate the new boundary. That being, Garigal and Ku-ring-gai National Parks, Cowan Creek, Davidson Park, Warringah Road and North Curl Curl Lagoon and of course the ocean to the east. Mackellar communities sit logically and wholly within the area that is bounded by these features.
- Reflects the movement of local traffic within the Mackellar electorate, being primarily north / south up and down the Northern Beaches and along the main transport corridors of Pittwater Road, Wakehurst Parkway, Mona Vale Road up to Forest Way and Warringah Road.
- Sensibly retains the Mackellar electorate within one local council area – Northern Beaches Council.

I have set out below my comments on specific objections lodged against the AEC's proposal, which suggest the Mackellar boundary be extended west, beyond the Northern Beaches Council area, to include the communities of St Ives and St Ives Chase.

I believe this approach would be inferior to the current AEC proposal for Mackellar, as it does not make sense geographically, commercially or socially and would potentially disadvantage the St Ives communities.

Objection 671 – Member for Warringah

1. The Member for Warringah states that the areas of Dee Why, North Curl Curl, Frenchs Forest, Killarney and Forestville should be retained within Warringah. These communities are currently split in half between Warringah and Mackellar. It is important that the divided communities of Dee Why and Frenchs Forest **should be reunited**, as proposed by the AEC.
2. I do not support the Member for Warringah's suggestion that Mackellar should be extended west to include the areas of St Ives and St Ives Chase. These areas are inextricably linked to the Upper North Shore and have no clear connection or relationship with the Northern Beaches.

I agree with the Major of Ku-ring-gai Council (**Objection 82**) that St Ives is considered part of the Upper North Shore.

The characteristics of the Upper North Shore and the Northern Beaches are quite different. From my experience as a resident of the Northern Beaches, communities within the Beaches, do not generally have a strong affinity with the Upper North Shore in terms of social and community groups, sporting groups and commercial activities. Social, community and sporting groups tend to operate within the Northern Beaches and do not usually traverse the National Parks.

In terms of commercial activity, living in the Northern Beaches, I would almost never visit St Ives for shopping, healthcare or other commercial activities. However, I regularly travel within the Northern Beaches Council area for these activities.

For shopping I will regularly travel to Dee Why, Warringah Mall, Frenchs Forest and even occasionally further south to Mosman, rather than west through the National Parks, to St Ives.

3. If St Ives is integrated in to Mackellar as proposed by the Member for Warringah (**Objection 671**) and others, not only would St Ives be geographically isolated from the rest of Mackellar by the immense natural partition that is the Garigal and Ku-ring-gai National Parks, but the St Ives community would become a minority group within the Mackellar electorate, separated from the rest of their local council area.

In this regard I support the Major of Ku-ring-gai Council's comment (**Objection 82**) that states:

‘Ultimately it is our constituents who suffer from having federal members with divided attention, and it is in their interests to retain the current situation where the Ku-ring-gai Local Government Area sits entirely within the electorate of Bradfield’.

The Member for Warringah considers “*the argument that a Division should be kept within a local Government boundary and natural features*” is usually only relevant to non-metropolitan Divisions, where “*local Government boundaries are larger and physical boundaries are more pronounced*”.

In my view, the physical boundary of Mackellar, to the west being the swathe of land that is Ku-ring-gai and Garigal National Parks and to the east the ocean, **could not be more pronounced**. Therefore, I believe it is relevant and reasonable for the Division of Mackellar to be kept within one local council area – that being the Northern Beaches Council.

Mackellar although within metropolitan Sydney, is quite unique in its environment and topography, being nestled between water on the east and north sides and national parks and Cowan Creek to the west.

Objection 686 – Member for North Sydney

I do not support the Member for North Sydney’s suggestion that Mackellar be extended west to include St Ives (SA2 121031410), for the same reasons stated above. I agree with the Mayor of Ku-ring-gai’s objection (**Objection 82**) that this **would not be in the best interests of the people of St Ives** and makes no geographical sense to be included within Mackellar.

In conclusion, as a resident of Mackellar and understanding what it is like living, working, socialising and schooling my children within the electorate, I consider the AEC’s proposal both logical and sensible.

Once again I thank the AEC for its commitment to unbiased, independent consideration in this process.

Many thanks

Charlotte Bonnar