

APPENDIX D

**Comments on Proposal Notice &
Public Submissions**

LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHANGE COMMISSION

Divisional Boundary Review of Gympie Regional Council

The Gympie Regional Council advised its electoral divisions no longer meet the voter enrolment requirements set down in the *Local Government Act 2009*. As a result, the Minister for Local Government has referred the matter to the Change Commission for independent assessment.

The Change Commission has proposed changes to the Council's internal boundaries (divisions) following a period of public suggestions.

INVITATION FOR COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL

Comments on the Change Commission's proposal will be accepted until 5pm on 12 August 2019. Late submissions cannot be considered.

To view the proposal and make a submission, please see the Electoral Commission of Queensland's website: <https://ecq.qld.gov.au/lgr/gympie> or phone 1300 881 665.

When making a comment, please remember each division must have relatively the same number of voters (quota) to ensure each person's vote has the same value. The quota for the Gympie Regional Council is 4,592 with a lower limit of 4,133 (-10%) and an upper limit of 5,051 (+10%).

Comments can be lodged through:

- Online Form

<https://ecq.qld.gov.au/lgr/gympie>

- Email

LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au

- Personal Delivery

Electoral Commission of Queensland
Level 20, 1 Eagle Street, BRISBANE QLD 4000

- Post

Local Government Change Commission
GPO Box 1393, BRISBANE QLD 4001

Submissions will be made available for public inspection. To discuss any privacy concerns, please phone 1300 881 665.

Pat Vidgen PSM

Electoral Commissioner

**Divisional Boundary Review of Gympie Regional Council
List of Comments on the Proposal**

Comment	Name / Organisation
1	Wayne Sachs
2	Brian Williams
3	Jessica Milne
4	Jamie Barnes

From: Susie Sachs
Sent: Thursday, 1 August 2019 7:30 AM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Fwd: Gympie Regional Council Review

Begin forwarded message:

From: Susie Sachs
Subject: Gympie Regional Council Review
Date: 31 July 2019 6:35:15 am AEST
To: ecq.qld.gov.au/lgr/gympie
Cc: LGCC submissions@ecq.qld.gov.au

Good morning, I would like to submit a brief submission in relation to Gympie Regional Council, following on from the boundary review.

I have served three terms on both the Cooloola Shire (Gympie) and Gympie Regional Councils since 2000, and have always believed that an undivided council is far more cohesive and democratic. I believe that divisions should be abolished in favour of whole-of-area (non-divisional) representation. There is always an argument for and against any system, however it has always been my view that divisions are not in the best interests of ratepayers, for a number of reasons. The two main reasons being that you allow everyone the opportunity to democratically elect the whole council with a better pool of talent, and secondly you don't have councillors working against each other when competing for funds, services or infrastructure.

The first Gympie Regional Council after amalgamation (2008-2012) was undivided, and all of the councillors elected to that council who had experienced both systems believed that there was much more cohesion and excellent team work associated with an undivided council, with no infighting, flowing over to the public arena. Everyone worked together as one team, not divided. And every elected councillor, being elected by the region at large, had to take an interest in all areas of the region, not just their division.

So, in a nutshell, the benefits are:

1. Councillors elected much more democratically with all voters having a say in the makeup of their council
2. Councillors work together much more cohesively as a team
3. Councillors are required to take an interest in the whole region not just their division
4. Would attract a better pool of talent region-wide
5. Eliminates competition between councillors for funding, services and infrastructure
6. Complements a preferential voting system to align across the entire region in a more democratic way.

Thankyou for your time to consider the above.

Regards
Wayne Sachs
Gympie

From: Brian
Sent: Friday, 9 August 2019 5:00 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Re : Boundary realignment Zone 1 Tin Can Bay, Cooloola Cove & Rainbow Beach.

Hi ECQ,

The Brisbane based Boffins have made a substantial stuff up by placing the light Industrial area, The Community complex , The Men's shed & the Nursery into division 2! Obviously this mistake MUST be overcome. Suggest those involved have a hard look @ what The Cooloola Coast is all about well prior to next years GRC elections.

The Cooloola Coast Development group request that advise of a revision of the boundaries is to be carried out as a matter of course in the interest of this coastal area.

Your response would be appreciated re a revision of the boundaries between Division 1 & 2.

Many Thanks.

Brian Williams

From: Brian
Sent: Monday, 12 August 2019 4:52 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Re: Boundary realignment Zone 1 Tin Can Bay, Cooloola Cove & Rainbow Beach.

Hi Elise.

Thank you for your reply.

Quite frankly the obvious realignment starting in the east from where Queen Elizabeth Drive meets Rainbow Beach Rd . Rainbow Beach Rd to the intersection @ Tin Can Bay Rd, then to the Maryborough Rd West to a point where the Wide Bay Military reserve meets the road to Maryborough. Then return back along the Military reserve boundary to the Wallu area & then proceeds along the military reserve boundary to where it meets Snapper Creek.

By this realignment you will not divorce long term Wallu residents who are a part of coastal culture, The Coast Cemetery , the Water Tower , the Phone tower & those areas & buildings noted in my August 9 email as per attached.

This suggestion is a simple solving of mistakes made in the published boundary changes.

I hope these changes will be made well prior to GRC elections.

Regards.

Brian. Williams

From: LG CC Submissions
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2019 9:40 AM
To: Brian
Subject: RE: Re : Boundary realignment Zone 1 Tin Can Bay, Cooloola Cove & Rainbow Beach.

Good morning Brian,

The Local Government Change Commission acknowledges receipt of your submission and thanks you for your contribution to the review process.

Regarding the proposed Divisions 1 and 2, the Change Commission has sought to reduce enrolment in Division 1 in line with the enrolment requirements of the *Local Government Act 2009*. See page 7 of the proposal for more information.


If there are any alternative boundaries you would like considered, please advise by return email. Please note comments on the proposal close at 5pm today.

For more information about the review or key dates, please see the ECQ website: <https://ecq.qld.gov.au/lgr/gympie>


Yours sincerely,

Elise Arklay

Secretary
Local Government Change Commission

 1300 881 665

 LGboundaries@ecq.qld.gov.au

 L20/1 Eagle Street, Brisbane, Queensland, 4000



**Electoral
Commission**
QUEENSLAND



ecq.qld.gov.au

From: Brian

Sent: Friday, 9 August 2019 5:00 PM

To: LG CC Submissions <LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au>

Subject: Re : Boundary realignment Zone 1 Tin Can Bay, Cooloola Cove & Rainbow Beach.

Hi ECQ,

The Brisbane based Boffins have made a substantial stuff up by placing the light Industrial area, The Community complex , The Men's shed & the Nursery into division 2! Obviously this mistake MUST be overcome. Suggest those involved have a hard look @ what The Cooloola Coast is all about well prior to next years GRC elections.

The Cooloola Coast Development group request that advise of a revision of the boundaries is to be carried out as a matter of course in the interest of this coastal area.

Your response would be appreciated re a revision of the boundaries between Division 1 & 2.

Many Thanks.

Brian Williams

**Local Government Change Commission
Divisional Boundary Review of Gympie Regional Council
Submission by Jessica Milne**

I am writing in response to the Divisional Boundary Review of Gympie Regional Council and the effect these changes will have within Division 1. I have concerns that the proposed divisional boundaries made by the Local Government Change Commission (Change Commission) are not in the best public interest and do not allow for sensible further boundary changes that are anticipated in the near future due to projected population growth within Division 1. After reading the review I also independently consulted various residents, businesses and community groups affected by the move from Division 1 into Division 2 and have made the following observations-

1. Wallu may not have been viewed as having strong ties with the Cooloola Coast.
2. The Change Commission may not have been aware that by using the boundary lines of Riflefish Rd, Tin Can Bay Rd and Bayside Rd that there are several community groups and the whole of the Cooloola Cove Industrial Estate will be moved into Division 2 by simply being on the ‘other side of the road.’
3. Proposed new divisional boundaries may not allow for sensible and definable boundary lines in a further anticipated split of Division 1 to satisfy legislative requirements in the future due to the projected population growth.

Geographically the Cooloola Coast is isolated from the rest of the Gympie Region Local Government area by the Great Sandy National Park, Toolara Forestry and Wide Bay Training Area. The Cooloola Coast is locally considered to include the townships of Tin Can Bay, Cooloola Cove, Rainbow Beach and the Wallu area. Access to the Cooloola Coast is by one main roadway; Tin Can Bay Rd, with both Rainbow Beach and Tin Can Bay being ‘terminating destinations by road’ however Rainbow Beach does have through traffic taking the barge to Fraser Island. Cooloola Cove is situated midway between and has direct road access to both the Tin Can Bay and Rainbow Beach townships. Cooloola Cove, Tin Can Bay and Wallu all lie within close proximity to one another while Rainbow Beach is separated by the Great Sandy National Park and located approximately 22km from Cooloola Cove and 30km from Tin Can Bay by road.

The Change Commission has projected population growth on the Cooloola Coast to be quite strong which will potentially put Division 1 out of quota in the near future and therefore against legislative requirements set out by the Local Government Act 2009. I am supportive to having divisions within a local government area, as it allows for communities to have an elected representative geographically responsible to be familiar with local issues. I also acknowledge that residents and businesses can contact any Councillor from any division to discuss council matters; especially if it is related to their portfolio, therefore it does not limit electors to having access to just one representative in Council.

I am opposed to the proposed divisional boundary that removes the Wallu area from the division containing the Tin Can Bay and Cooloola Cove townships. I would like the

Change Commission to consider the following before making a final determination on the proposed divisional boundaries, especially in Division 1.

Communities of Interest

The Report outlined the Change Commission made a ‘concerted effort to unite suburbs so that they are wholly contained within individual divisions.’ The contraction of the western boundary of Division 1 has moved the area of Wallu to Division 2 as well as several community groups and businesses located between Tin Can Bay and Cooloola Cove. The affected community groups and businesses fall just outside the proposed boundary and may have not been considered when the Change Commission decided on using Riflefish Rd, Tin Can Bay Rd and Bayside Rd as boundary lines. All of the affected organisations have obvious strong social, economic, service and cultural ties to the Cooloola Coast area.

The area of Wallu is locally considered to be part of the coastal community with residents either shopping, working, schooling or socialising on the Cooloola Coast. All residents I spoke with felt they would be isolated if moved to Division 2 as Wallu has a relatively small population and they would be geographically separated from the rest of Division 2 by the Toolara Forestry. The Report considered the townships of Tin Can Bay, Cooloola Cove and Rainbow Beach to have ‘unique seaside relationships’ however the Cooloola Coast is locally considered to consist of two areas. These are-

1. Rainbow Beach and Inskip
2. Tin Can Bay, Cooloola Cove and Wallu

This is reflected by each area being represented by a separate Chamber of Commerce and Tourism.

Means of Communication and Serviceability

The proposed Division 2 boundary to include the Wallu area involves only a small population and from my inquiries residents felt they would experience limited access to the elected political representative as there is little infrastructure and services at Wallu including limited mobile/internet access (several people I spoke to do not have service at all.)

The community groups and businesses I spoke with that fall just outside the proposed Division 1 boundary also felt they would experience limited access to the political representative due to the separation from the rest of Division 2.

This isolation is compounded by the fact the Cooloola Coast is a ‘terminating destination’ by road therefore it can be assumed that any Division 2 representative would not be passing by or through the area and would have to make a specific trip to service a small population.

Create Sensible and Definable Boundaries

As outlined above, using Riflefish Rd, Tin Can Bay Rd and Bayside Rd may be definable on a map but they are not sensible as they unnecessarily exclude several community organisations and businesses from Division 1 with no real effect on quota.

The existing Division 1 boundary is shared with both Division 2 along the boundary of Maryborough Cooloola Rd and Gympie Rd (Tin Can Bay Rd) and with Division 5 along the Cooloola Locality/Toolara Forestry boundary. The proposed Division 1 boundary will be solely bordered by Division 2 which potentially limits further future boundary reduction and reallocation of enrolled electors out of Division 1 to just Division 2.

By defining the shared Division 1 and 2 boundary by Riflefish Rd, Tin Can Bay Rd, Bayside Rd and the Cooloola Cove Locality Boundary it appears that the Change Commission is anticipating, and preparing for, a projected future Division 1 split to occur in either the Tin Can Bay or Cooloola Cove townships and to be taken by Division 2.

Specific Requirements for Divisional Boundary Reviews

While it would be preferred to keep all localities together as a whole Cooloola Coast division the legislative requirements combined with higher than Gympie Region average population growth means that a split between divisions on the coast will be inevitable.

I understand the aim of the reviews is to keep divisions within quota for as long as possible while also taking community interests into consideration. In preparation of the proposed boundary changes the Change Commission has adopted some very good public suggestions and has allowed for many areas to be united and other Divisions to be realigned in a manner that keeps the enrolment quota deviations within acceptable percentages that allow for fluctuation in projected population.

However, the Report acknowledges the fact that Division 1, even with the proposed constricted boundaries, will have a higher than typically preferred number of projected enrolled voters in 2024 at 8.23%. It is also noted the existing Division 1 enrolment projected deviation from quota will be still within legislative requirements in 2024 at 9.59%. Being a coastal community that has ample available land for residential development it can be assumed that there will be continual strong population growth so it is anticipated that Division 1 boundaries will have to be revisited in the near future regardless of the proposed new boundaries.

I believe to split any township on the Cooloola Coast would not be in the best interest of the community as it would potentially cause frustrating division within communities. The Change Commission has displayed a concerted effort to keep connected areas wholly within one division and it would be preferred that if there is to be a split on the Cooloola Coast then a whole township be moved to another division instead of dividing a community.

There are not enough enrolments for either identified area (Rainbow Beach/Inskip or Tin Can Bay/Cooloola Cove/Wallu) to form its own division at this time however if the projected population growth (and my maths) is correct the Tin Can Bay/Cooloola Cove/Wallu area could possibly have a quota (on the very lowest percentage deviation) within legislative requirements by 2024. This would however mean that the smaller township of Rainbow Beach and Inskip area would have to be moved to another division. The geographic location and layout of the Cooloola Coast communities around the inlet, combined with the isolation by being surrounded by the Wide Bay Training Area, Great Sandy National Park and Toolara Forestry does make it difficult to create sensible and definable boundaries that accommodate community interests.

The Rainbow Beach/Inskip area may be geographically the furthest community to move into another division but would allow the Tin Can Bay/Cooloola Cove/Wallu area to remain together. The Wallu area is limited in population growth due to non-developable bordering properties therefore a move to another division would not have a substantial long term effect on quota deviation unlike the other coastal townships which have predicted strong population growth.

With respect to the above considerations I suggest the following alternatives-

1. Keep the existing Division 1 boundary that runs south down the Maryborough Cooloola Rd, east along Gympie Rd (Tin Can Bay Rd) to approximately Coondoo Crk then southeast in a direct line to the Great Sandy National Park/Toolara boundary then following that to the Noosa Shire boundary and retain all of the Cooloola Coast communities being that of Wallu, Tin Can Bay, Cooloola Cove and Rainbow Beach in Division 1 as the projected enrolment quota deviation for 2024 is still within legislative requirements. This would allow for enrolment growth distribution over the 4 main Cooloola Coast localities to be accurately monitored over time. If growth in the Cooloola Cove, Tin Can Bay and Wallu areas are equal to or above the Change Commissions projections then a possible split on the Cooloola Coast could be made without dividing a township or area, as outlined above. By keeping Wallu in Division 1 for the time being would prevent the small population being prematurely moved between divisions and keep their strong ties with the Cooloola Coast politically represented. Division 2 would still remain within acceptable quota deviation after the removal of the projected 65 enrolled electors in Wallu.

Community groups and businesses on the 'other side of the road' of the proposed new Division 1 boundaries would no longer be affected by being moved to Division 2 which makes logical sense due to their close position between Tin Can Bay and Cooloola Cove.

Further to retaining the existing Division 1 boundary, it may be beneficial to have both Division 2 and Division 5 to remain bordering Division 1 so any future split can be absorbed by either division. This would require the Division 2 boundary to be retracted back to the existing boundary and the Division 5 boundary to be extended back out to the Cooloola/Toolara boundary.

2. If the Change Commission decides that the Wallu area must be moved into Division 2 then I suggest the Division 1 boundary be extended to follow Snapper Creek southwest from the inlet to the Tin Can Bay Rd then west to the Rainbow Beach Rd, east along the Rainbow Beach Rd then follow the Cooloola Locality Boarder around to the Noosa Shire boundary. I believe this would not really affect the quota deviation percentage however would allow for several community groups and the Cooloola Cove Industrial Estate to remain in Division 1 where they have strong community ties.
3. To prevent a further review of divisional boundaries within the Gympie Region Local Government Area due to the possibility of Division 1 being out of quota

in the not too distant future, the Change Commission could re-evaluate the proposed divisional boundaries and split the Cooloola Coast by the two locally defined areas of Rainbow Beach/Inskip and Tin Can Bay/Cooloola Cove/Wallu. This would result in Division 1 retaining Tin Can Bay/Cooloola Cove/Wallu but having to expand northwest along Tin Can Bay Rd to take in eastern areas (Kia Ora/Neerdie) of Division 2 to make up elector enrolment quota to acceptable deviation percentage.

The median average of the sum of Divisions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 is 4832; which is very close to the 2024 quota target, indicating the high enrolment quota of Division 1 is preventing the other divisions from obtaining close to quota targets. Divisions 2, 3, 4 and 5 are all projected to be under median quota and share many common boundaries so they could be slightly adjusted amongst themselves to allow for either Division 2 or Division 5 to take in all of Rainbow Beach/Inskip by extending the boundary to take in the Toolara Forestry south of Tin Can Bay Rd and the Great Sandy National Park to Rainbow Beach Rd east to Carland Crk and then follow Carland Crk along the Cooloola Cove Locality Boarder through the centre of the inlet to the Fraser Coast Council boundary.

The Neerdie/Kia Ora area does have some connection to the Cooloola Coast through social, schooling and sporting so a move to Division 1 could be considered acceptable. Also, a Division 1 representative would ordinarily travel by the area on a regular basis to the Gympie township allowing for ease of access. Moving Rainbow Beach/Inskip into another division would still make it geographically separated from the rest of its division (as it is in Division 1) however the area would still hold approximately 20% of the division enrolled electors therefore would remain a substantial population suburb within the new division.

By extending the Division 1 boundary to include country areas and the Division 2 or Division 5 boundary to include coastal areas allows for elected representatives to have access to different environments instead of just one person representing the Coastal area.

Options 1 and 2 will require a further review of divisional boundaries in the not too distant future and Option 3 will significantly split Division 1 and make changes to other current proposed divisional boundaries but keep divisions within quota for longer. I would prefer not to have Option 2 as it will result in Wallu being moved into another division from Tin Can Bay and Cooloola Cove but was included to address the issue of affected community groups and businesses.

If the Change Commission has any questions regarding my observations, references or proposals then please do not hesitate to contact me on the supplied information.

From: Jamie Barnes
Sent: Monday, 12 August 2019 2:10 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Re : Boundary realignment Division 1 Tin Can Bay, Cooloola Cove & Rainbow Beach.

Good Afternoon,

I note with interest the proposed boundary realignments for Division 1. Unfortunately the proposal takes an area of Community sports and service facilities the Division 1 residents rely on and places them in Division 2. There are no votes in this proposal as all buildings are for community services and commercial operations with no residences involved. In addition it has come to my attention that a number of residents of Wallu would prefer to remain in Division 1 and feel they are being alienated and excluded from the community in Division 1. There is similar sentiment with the Army Barracks personnel who feel a community connection with this area.

I am not able to find a way to display the community pods that you see however the boundary should follow the Cooloola - Maryborough to the west, Tin Can Bay Road to the junction of the Rainbow Beach Road.

The growth area in Division 1 is Cooloola Cove and with a longer view the natural divide in the area will be a non community division between Rainbow Beach and the Tin Can/Cooloola Cove areas. At that time Rainbow Beach would probably be appended to Division 5. Wallu should be retained in Division 1 until that time to avoid the social impacts of any alienation. From a community standpoint the area south of the most Southerly point in the road is barren.

In any event Snapper Creek should be followed as the boundary until the intersection with Tin Can Bay Road to ensure the Model Aero Club in Riflefish Road, The Bowls Club, Community Centre, a council Nursery and The Men's Shed are retained in Division 1. Additionally the industrial area based around Scullett Drive must be retained in Division 1. To reiterate there are no residential premises in these areas!

I trust you are able to see the the growth potentials in this area and that isolating villages into a council Division that is centred around the highway many kilometres west is folly to say the least. A longer term view dictates that the changes required will make these changes damaging to a community that struggles as it is.

Regards,

James Barnes,
