



# Objection 437

Colin McLaren

20 pages

# Objection to the proposed redistribution report

Augmented Australian Electoral Commission

Re Victorian Redistribution 2024

Members,

I write to express my concerns at the proposed redistribution report and as a consequence object to the outcome the committee has determined. Sadly, in my view, the revision of the proposed 2028 elector numbers by the ABS is such that fundamentally the suggestions made re the redistribution, and which are extensively reported on in the redistribution report, and which appear to have been used in determining the proposed boundaries are totally floored. I went back and had a look at my own submission S49 and can find 69 references to it in the report. With a couple of exceptions the changes in 2028 elector numbers are such that almost all of the suggestions I made are now of no relevance. Consequently my preference is that these NOT be referred to in the report as doing so creates a misleading view of what I was suggesting.

As an example, my suggestion included the following;

- That there will be no changes in the divisions of

Flinders	Fraser	Gellibrand	Gippsland
Gorton	Indi	Lalor	Wannon

The changed numbers, particularly the large number of projected voters in Lalor is such that now of this list only Indi is the only division not requiring any change. Flinders, Fraser and Wannon are ALL below the lower quota limit whilst Gellibrand and Gorton will require alteration on account of the growth in electors in the adjoining division of Lalor from 127,852 in the original data to 144,313 in the revised data.

Staying with Lalor a number of persons suggested some minor alterations to the current boundaries (which I note have in part been adopted by the committee) however the growth in electors from 127,852 in the original data to 144,313 in the revised data means that a much more radical alteration is needed. None of the submissions contemplated such a change.

I will return to the redrawn boundary for Lalor in my comments below.

Another example of the impact of the elector number revision occurs in relation to the divisions of Corangamite and Corio. Originally only minor change was needed to the

boundaries of these divisions however the revised data has necessitated a far more major alteration. Consequently any suggestions made are totally redundant and are realistically of no value in aiding the committee in their decision making, It was however fortunate that in this case that the number of electors Corangamite needed to lose broadly equated to those required in the adjoining divisions of Wannon and Corio making this one of the easier changes to make.

In relation to the findings of the report I cannot agree with the decision that HIGGINS is the division to be abolished. Whilst in my submission I recommended based on the original elector numbers that CASEY be the division abolished after looking at the revised numbers I believe that ASTON should in fact be the division abolished as it provides greater opportunities to enhance the electoral boundaries in Melbourne's South and East. Again an example of how my submission became redundant and the fact the report includes reference to this in Table H on page 32 of the report is in essence inaccurate (noting I was not the only person suggesting Casey be the division abolished and that in Table I the committee does indicate that not only was the division of Casey considered for abolition there were other divisions considered for abolition which were not detailed by any of the submissions)

I note the following comments from Page 33 of the report;

81. By contrast, the Redistribution Committee considered abolition of an eastern electoral division was a better way to address all growth corridors across Melbourne while minimising the movement of electors between electoral divisions. In considering the different potential redistributions, the Redistribution Committee contemplated how each different abolition would impact communities of interest.

82. As a consequence of making the necessary adjustments to ensure that all electoral divisions would meet the numerical requirements of the Electoral Act, the Redistribution Committee unanimously proposes abolishing the existing Division of Higgins.

In commenting on the report I do feel it would have been beneficial to have provided more detail on these points in particular how the proposed changes impact on communities of interest and also what difference there was between each of the alternatives detailed in Table I. The subsequent commentary in my mind provides statistical detail re the proposed changes and little else to justify the particular change and in particular how the division of Higgins came to be the preferred division for abolition.

I also note the following on Page 37 re the principles the committee sought to apply;

- limit the movement of electors between divisions, where possible

I must profess to being disappointed that the significance of the division to be abolished in terms of Australia's history and also the length that the division have been in existence do not seem to have formed part of the consideration. To that end specifically related to the divisions of Higgins and Aston, over time the members for Higgins have played a far greater part in Australia's history than that of the division of Higgins noting that it was the seat of two prime ministers. Additionally the division was created in 1949 whereas the division of Aston is much more recent having only been created in 1984.

Whilst I am interested in the outcome of all divisions, as an elector in the division of Gellibrand I am particularly interested in what is being proposed for that division. To that end it is evident that beginning from the division of Lalor the limitation of movement has particularly impacted on the proposed boundaries of that division and as a result flows through to the division of Gellibrand. I have to say that personally this approach is detrimental to achieving a good outcome.

Personally in redrawing the boundaries I do believe the committee has been remiss in seemingly not considering where relevant the boundaries which existed following the 2018 redistribution, given that this redistribution related to 38 divisions as is the case with the 2024 redistribution, and additionally the historic ties localities have to particular divisions. An example of such is the locality of Footscray which has had a long association with the division of Gellibrand up until the 2021 redistribution where it was moved to the division of Fraser. My evaluation of the 2023 and 2028 data indicates that the boundaries can be drawn so that much of the division of Gellibrand that was relocated to the division of Fraser in 2021, and which had been part of the division of Gellibrand for an extended period can be returned to the division of Gellibrand. Flowing from this the division of Gorton can return to the division of Fraser much of what was removed in the 2021 redistribution including localities such as Sydenham and Keilor.

It is noted that the 2024 redistribution is now the third to occur in Victoria in six years. Both the 2018 and 2021 redistributions resulted in locations which had had a long association with a particular division moving to a new division and this MUST be considered in the boundary redraw.

Continuing on that theme I also found it worthy to look at electoral maps dating back as far as 2011 in order to ascertain historic relationships. That particularly became relevant when determining how to draw the boundary of the division of Lalor. It was noted that the division of Lalor in 2011 extended as far North as Melton and also incorporated localities such as Rockbank and Aintree which are currently in the division of Gorton. Based on this premise, and acknowledging the impact of the creation of the division of Hawke in the 2021 redistribution it seemed appropriate to relocate the areas in the northern parts of the division of Lalor into the division of Gorton. It also enables the newly developing areas in the North of the division of Lalor to be united with areas with the same characteristics in the Southern end of the division of Gorton. This also enables the locality of Truganina to be incorporated into a single division rather than being split across three divisions as is currently the case. This cannot be achieved if fundamentally the minimisation of elector movement is the prime driver of the changes.

Using this principle it is noted that at the 2021 redistribution;

- the SA2's of Truganina – North, Truganina - South East and Point Cook – South were moved from the division of Lalor to the division of Gellibrand at the 2021 redistribution (NB: I didn't support the move of the Truganina SA2's to Gellibrand particularly due to the distance between them and the prime areas of the division of

Gellibrand as evidenced by the Laverton North SA2 having a negligible population as well as these being newer housing areas as against the majority of the division of Gellibrand being well established). I believe this redistribution provides the opportunity to return Point Cook – South to the division of Lalor whilst the two Truganina SA2's are moved to the division of Gorton particularly to facilitate the unification of all Truganina locality related SA2's into a single division thus consolidating like communities of interest, plus these SA2's have more in common with the other newly developing areas in the division of Gorton around the Rockbank, Aintree and Deanside localities.

- The division of Gellibrand in turn lost the SA2's of Footscray, Seddon – Kingsville, West Footscray – Tottenham and much of Yarraville to the division of Fraser and I believe these can now be returned.
- The division of Fraser in turn lost the SA2's of Delahey, Keilor, Keilor Downs, Sydenham and Taylors Lakes to the division of Gorton and they also can be returned.
- In addition to the Truganina areas mentioned above the division of Gorton also gains from the division of Lalor the SA2's of Tarneit – Central, Tarneit – North, Tarneit (West) - Mount Cottrell (each of which is experiencing very high growth between 2023 and 2028). To enable the divisions to remain within quota the Cairnlea SA2 is transferred from the division of Fraser to the division of Gorton as is the SA1 of 21301157017 in order to enable a clear boundary to be established

It is acknowledged that this may result in additional electors changing divisions which is contrary to the committee has adopted however I firmly believe it produces a better outcome.

I believe this better outcome is confirmed when the committee's proposed division of Gellibrand boundary is examined with the Spotswood locality along with a small component of the Yarraville SA2 change from the division of Gellibrand to the division of Fraser. Spotswood is a significant component of the Hobsons Bay municipality and its relocation breaks this nexus and I cannot support the proposed boundary for the division of Gellibrand.

Due to the 2021 redistribution and the changes the committee has proposed the nucleus of the division of Gellibrand has moved significantly further South such that the historic characteristics of the division have altered. Consequently it may be appropriate to rename the division. I have been against changes in the name in the past however I am now more inclined to a change. I have no suggestions although I note that suggestions have been made in that regard in the past and it may be worth revisiting this.

Similarly it was noted that in 2011 the Sunbury locality was part of the division of Calwell (with the municipality of Hume City forming a significant component of that division) and thus it was not inappropriate to look to relocate the locality back to the division of Calwell. In regard to Sunbury it is an example of a locality which seemingly each redistribution moves from division to division given it moved from the division of Calwell to the division of McEwan and at the last redistribution the division of Hawke. These changes have broke the nexus between the locality and the municipality and I see restoring this as a good thing. Yes it probably increases the number of electors changing divisions but when it puts then in a better situation

re their community of interest is that a bad thing? In terms of replacing Sunbury in the division of Hawke please see comments below.

It was also noted that in 2011 the division of McEwan incorporated localities such as Healesville and Warburton and thus relocating these areas from the division of Casey to the division of McEwan is not without precedent. This is a change that I see occurring if the division of Aston were abolished.

I will say that overall the revised numbers made the task of establishing boundaries quite challenging due to the need not to fall below the lower quota for 2023 yet not exceeding the maximum quota for 2028. The following SA2's are good examples of this dilemma;

Division	SA2	Actual enrolments 9/08/2023	Revised projected enrolment 24/03/2028	Growth
CALWELL	Mickleham - Yuroke	14,433	29,502	15,069
CORANGAMITE	Charlemont	7,480	13,193	5,713
HOLT	Cranbourne South	12,399	19,706	7,307
LA TROBE	Beaconsfield - Officer	16,124	22,770	6,646
LA TROBE	Clyde North - South	9,748	15,951	6,203
LALOR	Werribee - West	15,551	24,183	8,632
LALOR	Wyndham Vale - North	5,572	10,630	5,058
MCEWEN	Wallan	16,079	21,341	5,262
SCULLIN	Wollert	10,630	17,466	6,836

It is noted that the committees proposals see the following divisions barely exceeding the lower voter limit as at 2028

Division	2023 var to minimum	2023 var to maximum	2028 var to minimum	2028 var to maximum
<b>Ballarat Total</b>	6,528		135	
<b>Bendigo Total</b>	9,904		94	
<b>Casey Total</b>		9,045	40	
<b>Jagajaga Total</b>		10,054	366	
<b>Macnamara Total</b>	8,198		161	

This is of concern and with the exception of the division of Ballarat I believe there are opportunities that provide a better overall balance. As an example I believe it is possible to return the Woodend SA2 from the division of McEwan to the division of Bendigo the division this SA2 was placed in prior to the 2021 redistribution. Again it may result in a greater number of electors changing divisions but it restores the status quo.

Particular matters of issue I have with the proposal include;

- Relocating that area of the locality of Little River North of Little River (the river not the locality) from the division of Lalor to the Division of Corio. The river not only forms the municipal boundary it also forms the statistical boundary for Melbourne. Apart from during Covid times I don't believe there has been any effort to create the unification of this area as proposed by the committee and thus I don't support this change.
- The division of Melbourne based on its current boundaries sits close to quota for both 2023 and 2028 and I see no need for change to occur other than a small move of electors in the area which formed the 2006 Commonwealth Games village to the division of Maribyrnong and thus I see no need for it to cross the Yarra river as has been proposed
- As mentioned above a number of suggestions were made re altering the boundaries of the division of Kooyong to incorporate those SA2's currently in the division of Higgins (Ashburton / Glen Iris East) with this being something I support and which I believe was part of my own submission. I was only able to find 1 submission

suggesting that areas such as Malvern and Armadale migrate to the division of Kooyong but I didn't find ANY suggesting areas such as Toorak or Prahran become part of the division of Kooyong. I personally don't agree with the committee in that regard. It is noted that your proposal re the abolition of the division of Higgins does not facilitate this and consequently I believe it provides a reason to reassess the suitability of abolishing the division of Higgins

- It is noted that the proposal sees the Box Hill locality relocated from the division of Chisholm to the division of Menzies. Over many years Box Hill has been the epicentre of the division of Chisholm and I believe it is important that this remain the case. I have been able to determine a set of boundaries that enable this to continue and thus recommend this be revisited.
- It is noted that the boundary of the proposed division of Bruce and Isaacs runs along the Princes Highway and Lonsdale St in Dandenong. This results in the CBD of Dandenong being split in ½. This is a VERY poor option. Dandenong is often referred to as Melbourne's second city and it is NOT appropriate to split such a significant area in this manner. In my submission I advocated that all of the City of Greater Dandenong be incorporated into a single division rather than the 3 it is currently split into and which this proposal also sees occurring. Personally were the division of Aston to be abolished I see it enabling the division of Bruce to move further North to incorporate the 3 Rowville SA2's and the Scoresby locality thus enabling all of Dandenong to be incorporated in a single division. I am suggesting that the division of Hotham moves further East to facilitate this and that broadly it swaps areas with the division of Isaacs. The other benefit of this is that it reduces the number of divisions the Kingston municipality is split over.
- In relation to the division of Nicholls is it felt appropriate that in addition to the changes proposed by the committee the localities of Bylands, Wandong, Heathcote Junction and Clonbinane were also incorporated in the division of Nicholls rather than the proposed division of McEwan. Whilst this puts Nicholls close to quota it enables other relocations re the division of McEwan to occur. If this can't be accommodated at least the locality of Waterford Park should be considered for inclusion in the division of Nicholls as should the possibility of aligning the boundaries with the state boundary of the electorate of Euroa / Yan Yean.
- I have issues re the splitting of the Mt Eliza locality in creating the proposed boundary for the division of Flinders. Yes it facilitates the inclusion a greater part of the Mornington Peninsula municipality in the division but it leaves at least 1/3 of the locality still in the division of Dunkley and also I believe leads to poorer boundaries on the Northern side of the division of Dunkley. My belief is that it would have been better to incorporate the Pearce Dale - Tooradin SA 2 which is currently in the division



of Holt into the division of Flinders. It is noted that this area has been part of the division of Flinders in previous times and that much of the SA2 has an orientation to Westernport Bay as does the Eastern side of the division. Such a change also aids in the division of Holt being within quota.

- At its Northern end the committee has recommended relocating the area around Carrum, Bonbeach and Chelsea from the division of Isaacs into the division of Dunkley. I do not favor this on account that it splits the localities of Chelsea and Chelsea Heights across divisions. Leaving the Mount Eliza boundary as it currently is then enables the Carrum - Patterson Lakes SA2 to be relocated from the division of Isaacs to the division of Dunkley. In the Patterson Lakes locality it is noted that the Northern boundary becomes the same as with the state electorate of Carrum with this being a benefit. This also results in a decrease in the number of residents in the Kingston municipality that will fall within the division of Dunkley with that seen as a benefit.
- Suggestions were made in relation to SA2's in the Macedon Ranges shire being placed together. Whilst the proposed move of the Woodend SA2 back to the division of Bendigo doesn't facilitate this in full I believe that the committee has erred in not relocating the remaining Macedon Ranges SA2's currently in the division of McEwan into the division of Hawke. This places these areas much more central to their communities of interest than is the case being in the division of McEwan particularly noting that division currently spreads from Gisborne across to Hurstbridge and Pantom Hills. In many ways the division of Hawke becomes similar to the old division of Burke which existed for many years and was something I advocated for in a previous redistribution.
- As mentioned above I believe that Aston is the division that should be abolished.
  - At its Northern end I believe that electors in the SA2's of Bayswater, Wantirna, Wantirna South, Boronia (part) and the locality of Knoxfield being moved to the division of Deakin.
  - At its Eastern side the SA2's of Ferntree Gully – North, Ferntree Gully (South) - Upper Ferntree, The Basin and Boronia (part) moved to the division of Casey
  - At its southern end the SA2's of Lysterfield, Rowville – Central, Rowville – North, Rowville – South and the locality of Scoresby are moved to the division of Bruce

These changes then flow on to other divisions and ultimately result in an overall better outcome. I have previously mentioned the impact in the Dandenong area but the flow on to the division of Deakin then flows on to the divisions of Menzies and Chisholm and negates the need to move the Box Hill locality from the division of Chisholm as was commented on previously.

- I am not in favor of the redrawn division of Maribyrnong and particularly moving the Eastern boundary from the Moonee Ponds Creek to Pascoe Vale Rd and Citylink. These new areas seem to have minimal association with the areas currently in the division and also split localities such as Oak Park and Pascoe Vale South. The SA2 of Gladstone Park – Westmeadows is currently split between the divisions of Maribyrnong and Calwell and this provides the opportunity to unify the SA2 into a single division.
- This then flows on to the Division of Wills. I've already mentioned how I don't see the need to alter the division of Melbourne and thus I don't support Fitzroy North / Brunswick East being moved into the division of Wills. Wills however can extend further North and gain the SA2 of Broadmeadows from the division of Calwell in order to meet its quota
- The changes mentioned at the previous 2 points have seem electors moved from the division of Calwell. Calwell is bought back to quota by incorporating the SA2's of Sunbury, Sunbury – South, Sunbury – West and SA1 2124620 from the division of Hawke. Points in support of this are mentioned previously. The excising of the Kalkallo area to the division of Scullin is not supported.
- Noting the significant growth at the Northern end of the division of Scullin I feel it inappropriate that the locality of Wollert remains split between the divisions of Scullin and McEwan. Being cognizant of other changes I believe are appropriate in the western end of the division of McEwan I believe it is appropriate that the division of Scullin is extended North to pick up the growth areas extending south from Wallan and also incorporating the localities of Beveridge and Donnybrook in the Whittlesea SA2 plus the component of Wollert SA2 currently in the division of McEwan. These changes then require Scullin to shed electors and that is achieved by locating the Eastern boundary at the Darebin Creek. Electors beyond that are moved to the division of McEwan. It is also necessary that Scullin sheds a small number of electors from the Thomastown SA2. The division of Jagajaga has the capacity to accept these electors. The relevant SA1's still facilitate a strong boundary.
- As a consequence of the above the Division of McEwan takes on quite a different format than has been the case. The benefit however is that the distance between the Eastern and Western boundaries of the division are significantly reduced. It was determined that it was necessary to extend the Eastern boundary to incorporate the upper yarra valley areas including Healesville and Warburton which have been in the division of Casey however as was mentioned earlier there is some precedent for including these areas in the division of McEwan.

- By excluding the upper Yarra Valley the division of Casey is then able to incorporate areas from the division of Aston which are closely associated with the Dandenong Ranges thus making then a good fit for the division. This has necessitated the Boronia locality being split between the divisions of Deakin and Casey. The areas suggested to move to the division of Deakin are on the Northern and Western edge of the Boronia SA2 with the centre and Eastern side of the SA2 being incorporated in the division of Casey.
- Having gained electors from the division of Aston the division of Deakin loses electors on its Western side to the divisions of Menzies and Chisholm. Primarily these are electors located in the Whitehorse municipality and thus this loss enables the residents of the municipality to be better concentrated in a single division. This also enables Box Hill to be a key component of the division of Chisholm as has been mentioned previously. The division of Deakin also still retains its strong focus on the Maroondah municipality as was requested in a number of suggestions.
- This redistribution provides an opportunity to unite the electors in the Mitcham and Nunawading SA2's (NB: I note the committees proposal does unify these SA2's but in the division of Deakin). Currently these are partly in the division of Menzies and I suggest they be unified in that division. In addition the Vermont SA2 along with that part of the Forest Hill SA2 East of Springvale Rd are incorporated in the division of Menzies. having gained electors To offset these gains it is proposed that the component of the Box Hill SA2 currently in the division of Menzies be incorporated in the division of Chisholm. In addition It is suggested that the Research - North Warrandyte SA2 be returned to the division of Jagajaga and in addition the adjoining Warrandyte - Wonga Park SA2 is transferred to the division of Jagajaga. This may be considered controversial as it results in the division of Jagajaga crossing the Yarra River however it is felt that there are many similarities between the Warrandyte and Wonga Park localities and localities such as North Warrandyte, Research and Kangaroo Ground which form part of the division of Jagajaga.
- As was mentioned above the division of Deakin loses electors in the Blackburn, Blackburn South (NB: This results in this SA2 being unified in a single division), Forest Hills (west of Springvale Rd) and Vermont South SA2's to the division of Chisholm and the division of Menzies loses their component of the Box Hill SA2. The division of Kooyong also loses the Surrey Hills (East) - Mont Albert SA2 to the division of Chisholm. The division of Chisholm then sheds electors at its Southern boundary to the divisions of Hotham and Isaacs. These electors are primarily in the Wheelers Hill and Clayton

(North) - Notting Hill SA2's. It is worthy of note that the division of Chisholm received these areas in the 2021 redistribution and thus they are going back to where they came from which was a theme I noted earlier. Thus Box Hill becomes a central part of the division.

- Turning now to the division of Hotham this undergoes a significant change primarily to better align with the municipal structure and also to enable a division strongly focussed on the Dandenong area as was mentioned previously. It was noted that there was quite a degree of crossover between the municipalities included in the divisions of Isaacs and Hotham and consequently much of the change to the division of reflective of this matter. To provide for the unification in the Dandenong area the division of Hotham gains from the division of Bruce electors in the Dandenong – North, Dandenong North, Mulgrave, Noble Park North, Noble Park East SA2's (NB: This unifies the Mulgrave, Noble Park North, Noble Park East SA2's into a single division). It then gains from the division of Chisholm electors primarily in the Wheelers Hill and Clayton (North) - Notting Hill SA2's. As was previously mentioned it is worthy of note that these SA2's were in the division of Hotham prior to the 2021 redistribution and thus they are going back to where they came from which was a theme I noted earlier as being worthy of consideration by the committee. The division of Hotham also gains from the division of Isaacs the Dandenong – South, Keysborough – North and Keysborough – South SA2's. It should be noted that this unifies the Keysborough – North SA2 into a single division. It is noted that over time the division of Hotham has moved from having its eastern boundary at Port Phillip bay to potentially being much further East. Whilst I am not proposing a change to the name of the division thus may be something the committee may desire to consider.
- Having lost the areas mentioned above to the division of Hotham the division of Isaacs now gains from the division of Hotham electors in the SA2's of Bentleigh East – North, Bentleigh East – South, Clarinda - Oakleigh South, Clayton – Central, Clayton (North) - Notting Hill, Clayton South, Oakleigh – Huntingdale. It also gains from the division of Chisholm electors in the Clayton (North) - Notting Hill and Oakleigh – Huntingdale SA2's noting that this results in these SA2's being unified. This change also means the division has a much stronger alignment with the Kingston municipality than is currently the case. Isaac's losses to the division of Dunkley have previously been commented on.
- Returning to the division of Higgins as I say I cannot support the committees decision to abolish it. The division needs to extend further west through until it reached Port Phillip Bay. In doing so it takes in the SA2's of Docklands, Port Melbourne, Port Melbourne Industrial, Royal Botanic Gardens Victoria, South Melbourne, South Yarra – West, Southbank – East, Southbank (West) - South Wharf and the locality of Albert Park from the division of Macnamara. It then loses

- To Kooyong the SA2's of Ashburton (Vic.) and Glen Iris – East due to these being located in the municipality of Boroondara and allowing a better alignment of the municipality.
- To MacNamara it loses the SA2's of Carnegie, Murrumbeena and Ormond - Glen Huntly

The division of Higgins retains strong boundaries with these changes.

- The division of Macnamara loses and gains the SA2's detailed above in the comments re the division of Higgins. In addition;
  - It gains electors from the division of Goldstein in the SA2's of Caulfield – South, Elsternwick 14 SA1's in the Ormond - Glen Huntly SA2 that are North of North Rd (with North Rd forming the Southern boundary of the division) and 12 SA1's in the Brighton SA2 which are also North of North Rd (NB this requires the SA 1 2116922 to be split given it crosses North Rd. It should be noted that the SA2's of Caulfield – South and Elsternwick are currently split between the divisions of Macnamara and Goldstein with this split particularly bisecting the Elsternwick shopping centre thus this unification had great benefits.
  - It gains the Hughesdale SA2 from the division of Hotham, noting that this SA2 has been included in the division of Higgins prior to the 2021 redistribution

This sees the Eastern boundary of the division running along Warrigal Rd whilst the Southern boundary is North Rd both are strong boundaries.

- Having lost electors to the division of Macnamara the division of Goldstein needs to gain electors. This is done by;
  - transferring the Highett (East) – Cheltenham (noting that part of this SA2 is already part of the division of Goldstein), plus the 21 SA1's in the Mentone SA2 and 16 SA1's in the Moorabbin – Heatherton SA2 from the from the division of Isaacs. These SA1's are West of Warrigal Rd with Warrigal Rd forming a strong boundary.
  - Additionally 10 SA1's in the Bentleigh East – South SA2 are transferred from the division of Hotham to the division of Goldstein to enable the division to be within the quota requirements. These are as follows

Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Code (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Name (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) (2021 SA1s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) Code (7-digit) (2021 SA1s)
208021427	Bentleigh East - South	20802142705	2142705
208021427	Bentleigh East - South	20802142707	2142707
208021427	Bentleigh East - South	20802142708	2142708
208021427	Bentleigh East - South	20802142709	2142709
208021427	Bentleigh East - South	20802142717	2142717
208021427	Bentleigh East - South	20802142718	2142718
208021427	Bentleigh East - South	20802142720	2142720
208021427	Bentleigh East - South	20802142723	2142723
208021427	Bentleigh East - South	20802142728	2142728

These changes continue the focus of the division of Goldstein on the bayside suburbs. The retention of the division of Higgins is the reason the division deviates from the boundaries proposed by the committee.;

- Above mention has been made of Transfers from the division of Aston to the Division of Bruce as well as Transfers from the Division of Bruce to the division of Hotham. Additionally to remain within quota the following 16 SA1's within the Narre Warren South – West SA2 within the division of Holt need to be transferred to the division of Bruce;

Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Code (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Name (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) (2021 SA1s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) Code (7-digit) (2021 SA1s)
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145801	2145801
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145802	2145802
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145803	2145803
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145805	2145805
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145810	2145810
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145814	2145814
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145815	2145815
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145817	2145817
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145819	2145819
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145823	2145823
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145825	2145825
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145832	2145832
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145833	2145833
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145835	2145835
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145836	2145836
212031458	Narre Warren South - West	21203145837	2145837

It should be noted that this SA2 is currently split between the 2 divisions with this change resulting in it being roughly equally split between the divisions

- Mention has been made above re transfers FROM the division of Holt to both the divisions of Flinders and Bruce. To remain within quota limits it is necessary to transfer electors in 12 SA1's at the southern end of the Clyde North – South SA2 from the division of La Trobe to the division of Holt. These are as follows;

Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Code (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Name (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) (2021 SA1s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) Code (7-digit) (2021 SA1s)
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155602	2155602
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155619	2155619
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155621	2155621
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155622	2155622
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155623	2155623
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155624	2155624
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155625	2155625
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155626	2155626
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155629	2155629
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155630	2155630
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155635	2155635
212031556	Clyde North - South	21203155637	2155637

These SA1's are much more aligned with the Cranbourne locality than localities within the division of La Trobe thus supporting this relocation.

- Following on from this loss of electors to the division of Holt the division of La Trobe is still over quota. This is best remediated via returning electors broadly in the Lang Lang locality to the division of Monash noting that they were in that division prior to the 2021 redistribution. The SA1's involved are;



Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Code (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Name (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) (2021 SA1s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) Code (7-digit) (2021 SA1s)
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154801	2154801
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154802	2154802
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154805	2154805
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154810	2154810
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154811	2154811
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154812	2154812
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154815	2154815
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154818	2154818
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154819	2154819
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154822	2154822
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154823	2154823
212011548	Koo Wee Rup	21201154824	2154824

- As a consequence of the division of Monash gaining these electors it was pertinent to shed some electors to the division of Gippsland. This has the benefit of bringing the currently under quota division closer to the quota. An evaluation indicated that 14 SA1's in the Foster SA2 (these are primarily centred on the Foster locality) along with the Wilsons Promontory SA2 are best to relocate to the division of Gippsland. These are;

Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Code (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Name (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) (2021 SA1s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) Code (7-digit) (2021 SA1s)
205031087	Foster	20503108703	2108703
205031087	Foster	20503108704	2108704
205031087	Foster	20503108705	2108705
205031087	Foster	20503108706	2108706
205031087	Foster	20503108707	2108707
205031087	Foster	20503108708	2108708
205031087	Foster	20503108709	2108709
205031087	Foster	20503108711	2108711
205031087	Foster	20503108712	2108712
205031087	Foster	20503108713	2108713
205031087	Foster	20503108717	2108717
205031087	Foster	20503108722	2108722
205031087	Foster	20503108724	2108724

- This now leaves the divisions of Cooper and Jagajaga. Looking at the data it became apparent that a better outcome could be achieved by making Cooper a division based more on the inner suburbs with Jagajaga taking in the more Northerly areas before continuing into the existing areas such as Greensborough and Eltham. This may be considered controversial and is contrary to the AEC's desire to minimise the number of electors transferring divisions but I do feel it provides a better and more balanced outcome. Looking specifically at the division of Cooper;
  - it retains all SA2's South of the 2 Reservoir SA2's and the Coburg North SA2.
  - It then gains from the division of Jagajaga the SA2's of Ivanhoe, Ivanhoe East – Eaglemont, Heidelberg West, Heidelberg – Rosanna and Viewbank – Yallambie
- Turning now to the division of Jagajaga, having lost the 5 SA2's mentioned above to the division of Cooper it gains from the division of Cooper the following;

- The SA2's of Coburg North, Reservoir - South West, Reservoir - South East, Reservoir - North West, Reservoir - North East and Kingsbury.
- It also gains from the division of Scullen the Bundoora – West SA2 along with the following 14 SA1's from the Thomastown SA2

Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Code (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) Name (2021 SA2s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) (2021 SA1s)	Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) Code (7-digit) (2021 SA1s)
209041223	Thomastown	20904122301	2122301
209041223	Thomastown	20904122302	2122302
209041223	Thomastown	20904122303	2122303
209041223	Thomastown	20904122305	2122305
209041223	Thomastown	20904122316	2122316
209041223	Thomastown	20904122320	2122320
209041223	Thomastown	20904122321	2122321
209041223	Thomastown	20904122322	2122322
209041223	Thomastown	20904122324	2122324
209041223	Thomastown	20904122325	2122325
209041223	Thomastown	20904122344	2122344
209041223	Thomastown	20904122350	2122350
209041223	Thomastown	20904122354	2122354

Bringing the Bundoora West and Kingsbury SA2's into the division of Jagajaga means that the Bundoora locality largely sits within the one division as against being split to three divisions currently. This is also a reason for altering the division boundaries between the divisions of Cooper and Jagajaga.

Fundamentally much of the above is a consequence of the committees decision to abolish the division of Higgins and the outcomes that occur if that had NOT been the case and rather the division of Aston had been abolished. In one sense this almost becomes a resubmission however I sense that is necessary to address the concerns I have re the committees decision. I also wish to re-emphasise that I believe it wrong if the primary consideration is minimising elector movement. As was stated above Victoria has undergone three redistributions in relatively quick succession particularly when compared to all states other than Western Australia and thus I do believe this bears consideration when redrawing the boundaries.

I Include the following table to detail the impact that the movements detailed above have on the proposed elector numbers. Please note that the column **2028 var to minimum** identifies

divisions below quota but how far they are above the lower limit. Similarly the column **2028 var to maximum** identifies divisions above quota but how far they are below the lower limit

Colin's Workings re revised data - POST submission to AEC											
Division post 2021 redistribution	Actual enrolments 9/08/2023	Revised projected enrolment 24/03/2028	Colin's Actual enrolments 9/08/2023	Colin's Revised projected enrolment 24/03/2028	Colin's Actual enrolments 9/08/2023 var to quota	Colin's Revised projected enrolment 24/03/2028 var to quota	2028 var to minimum	2028 var to maximum	2023 enrolment change	2028 enrolment change	
ASTON Total	110,768	113,457 X							-110,768	-113,457	
BALLARAT Total	112,875	124,120 N	112,875	124,120	-4,019	-3,118	1,335		0	0	
BENDIGO Total	113,379	121,056 F	119,234	127,288	2,340	50		4,403	5,855	6,232	
BRUCE Total	114,307	119,135 F	119,845	124,611	2,951	-2,627	1,826		5,538	5,476	
CALWELL Total	115,327	140,187 F	106,700	129,196	-10,194	1,958		2,495	-8,627	-10,991	
CASEY Total	115,634	118,846 F	127,595	131,003	10,701	3,765		688	11,961	12,157	
CHISHOLM Total	110,672	119,806 F	115,850	125,690	-1,044	-1,548	2,905		5,178	5,884	
COOPER Total	110,943	119,120 F	116,935	125,364	41	-1,874		6,327	5,992	6,244	
CORANGAMITE Total	116,531	138,344 F	105,726	126,855	-11,168	-383	4,070		-10,805	-11,489	
CORIO Total	113,985	116,944 F	120,913	124,586	4,019	-2,652	1,801		6,928	7,642	
DEAKIN Total	113,714	118,427 F	122,232	126,256	5,338	-982	3,471		8,518	7,829	
DUNKLEY Total	112,715	117,651 F	121,811	127,266	4,917	28		4,425	9,096	9,615	
FLINDERS Total	114,469	118,874 F	120,359	124,996	3,465	-2,242	2,211		5,890	6,122	
FRASER Total	113,089	119,856 F	126,173	129,534	9,279	2,296		2,157	13,084	9,678	
GELLIBRAND Total	112,851	124,789 F	120,016	129,298	3,122	2,060		2,393	7,165	4,509	
GIPPSLAND Total	116,664	123,685 F	120,360	127,652	3,466	414		4,039	3,696	3,967	
GOLDSTEIN Total	111,083	118,919 F	118,377	126,758	1,483	-480	3,973		7,294	7,839	
GORTON Total	118,708	129,465 F	105,614	129,277	-11,280	2,039		2,414	-13,094	-188	
HAWKE Total	111,225	128,336 F	106,154	123,180	-10,740	-4,058	395		-5,071	-5,156	
HIGGINS Total	109,335	116,654 F	118,025	127,269	1,131	31		4,422	8,690	10,615	
HOLT Total	113,159	135,088 F	105,596	128,736	-11,298	1,498		2,955	-7,563	-6,352	
HOTHAM Total	117,702	126,984 F	120,143	126,427	3,249	-811	3,642		2,441	-557	
INDI Total	118,876	125,526 N	118,876	125,526	1,982	-1,712	2,741		0	0	
ISAACS Total	113,084	120,165 F	118,788	127,692	1,894	454		3,999	5,704	7,527	
JAGAJAGA Total	114,336	118,664 F	124,565	128,900	7,671	1,662	6,115		10,229	10,236	
KOONYONG Total	113,586	121,455 F	120,895	128,454	4,001	1,216		3,237	7,309	6,999	
LA TROBE Total	113,306	139,719 F	107,303	131,117	-9,591	3,879		574	-6,003	-8,602	
LALOR Total	116,506	144,313 F	109,351	130,314	-7,543	3,076		1,377	-7,155	-13,999	
MACNAMARA Total	112,881	122,119 F	115,424	124,334	-1,470	-2,904	1,549		2,543	2,215	
MALLEE Total	121,563	125,051 N	121,563	125,051	4,669	-2,187	2,266		0	0	
MARIBYRNONG Total	110,438	115,904 F	118,999	124,750	2,105	-2,488	1,965		8,561	8,846	
MCEWEN Total	114,082	135,348 F	118,769	126,990	1,875	-248		4,701	4,687	-8,358	
MELBOURNE Total	115,139	128,869 N	113,838	127,487	-3,056	249		4,204	-1,301	-1,382	
MENZIES Total	112,994	120,222 F	121,597	129,748	4,703	2,510		1,943	8,603	9,526	
MONASH Total	113,398	127,031 F	112,805	127,126	-4,089	-112	4,341		-593	95	
NICHOLLS Total	114,691	120,106 F	124,292	130,755	7,398	3,517		936	9,601	10,649	
SCULLIN Total	111,244	121,829 F	106,141	130,693	-10,753	3,455		998	-5,103	8,864	
WANNON Total	116,485	119,402 F	120,362	123,249	3,468	-3,989	464		3,877	3,847	
WILLS Total	110,228	119,582 F	117,871	127,500	977	262		4,191	7,643	7,918	
Grand Total	4,441,972	4,835,048	4,441,972	4,835,048					0	0	

Personally I find this represents a better fit to the quota's than arises from the committees report and I do think that needs be considered.

I submit these for your consideration

Colin McLaren

[REDACTED]

Altona Vic [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]