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INVITATION FOR COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO PUBLIC OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION

On 12 October 2007, the Queensland Redistribution Commission, in accordance with the requirements of the Electoral Act 1992 (“the Act”), commenced a redistribution of Queensland’s 89 Legislative Assembly electoral districts by publishing notices in the Queensland Government Gazette which stated that the need for an electoral redistribution had arisen, advised of the composition of the Commission and invited members of the public to lodge written suggestions on the redistribution. The notice also appeared in the Courier Mail and major regional newspapers. Following the closure of suggestions, the Commission published notices inviting written comments on the suggestions to be lodged with the Commission. Once the time for lodging comments on the suggestions closed on Monday, 17 December 2007, the Commission commenced preparation of its redistribution proposals.

The Quota and Other Legislative Criteria for the Redistribution

In determining electoral boundaries the Commission is governed by the general principle that there should be an equal number of enrolled electors in each district. To this end, at the conclusion of the period prescribed for lodging suggestions and comments which occurred on 17 December 2007, the Commission is required to determine an enrolment quota for the State as a whole. The quota, or “average number of electors”, is determined by dividing the total number of people on the electoral roll across Queensland by the total number of electoral districts (89 in all). The quota thus arrived at, for the purposes of the 2008 distribution, is 29,560.

As a general rule, the number of electors in each of the proposed districts should correspond as closely as possible to this number. The Act recognises, however, that such precision is not always practicable and authorises the Commission to deviate from the quota by a maximum of 10% above or below. For the 2008 Redistribution, this results in a minimum of 26,604 and a maximum of 32,516 electors required for each district.

Since it is desirable for electorates to be of a manageable geographic size, the Act prescribes a special “weightage” formula for large electorates. For districts that exceed 100,000km² in area, a figure equal to 2% of the total area of the electoral district is added to the actual number of electors enrolled in that district. For example, an electoral district 250,000km² in area would have 5000 (i.e.: 2% of 250,000 km²) “notional” electors added to its actual number of electors. This adjusted figure (the total number of actual and notional electors) must fall within the margin of tolerance prescribed by the Act, that is, be no more than 10% above or below the quota.
Other Criteria
Subject to the overriding numerical requirements, the Commission is required to have regard to a number of other elements that may be indicative of desirable electoral boundaries. These criteria, set down in Section 46(1) of the Act, are:

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district;

(b) the ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district;

(c) the physical features of each proposed electoral district;

(d) the boundaries of existing electoral districts; and

(e) demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends, the need for another electoral redistribution will not arise before the stipulated time.

The Commission, when carrying out the redistribution, “may also consider the boundaries of local government area to the extent that it is satisfied that there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each local government area”.

The Commission is authorised by section 46(3) of the Act to give such weight to each of the abovementioned matters as it considers appropriate.

Invitation to Submit Written Comments on Objections

All objections to the Commission’s proposed redistribution received by the Commission by 5.00 pm on Monday, 23 June 2008 have been bound into two volumes. Copies of these objections can be viewed at the Commission’s office, Level 6, Forestry House, 160 Mary Street, Brisbane between the hours of 9.00 am and 5.00 pm (Monday to Friday). Copies are available at major Public Libraries and selected Post Offices throughout Queensland. The Objections are also available on the Commission’s website – www.ecq.qld.gov.au

In accordance with section 49(2) of the Act, the Commission now invites written comments on the objections to the proposed redistribution. Comments on the objections should be marked “QRC/OBJ/COM” and may be lodged with the Commission by hand delivery, post, facsimile or email before 5.00 pm on Monday, 14 July 2008:

By Hand:
The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Level 6/160 Mary Street BRISBANE QLD 4000

By Post:
Locked Bag 3304 BRISBANE QLD 4001

By Fax: (07) 3229 7391
By Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au
Remainder of the Redistribution Process

In accordance with section 49(3) of the Act, copies of the comments on the objections will be available for public perusal at the Commission’s office at Level 6, Forestry House, 160 Mary Street, Brisbane as soon as practicable after the closing time for comments on the objections. Copies of the comments on the objections will similarly be available for perusal at Public Libraries and selected Post Offices throughout Queensland. A list of these locations is available on the Commission’s website: www.ecq.qld.gov.au

From the date of closure of public objections to the redistribution proposals (23 June 2008), the Commission is allowed a period of 60 days to complete its determination of the State’s electoral districts. The 60 day period will end on Friday, 22 August 2008. Under section 54 of the Act, the final determination and associated documents will be given to the Honourable the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland who must table the documents in Parliament within 5 sitting days of their receipt.

A notice containing details of the Commission’s final determination of the State’s electoral boundaries will then be published in the Queensland Government Gazette and within 21 days of publication of this notice (subject only to any appeal being lodged in the Supreme Court) the State is redistributed into the electoral districts, and those districts have the names, set out in the notice. Queensland remains redistributed in this way until the next electoral redistribution becomes final.

Table 1 shown below details the statutory timetable associated with the conduct of the State electoral redistribution.
The *Electoral Act 1992* prescribes the following timetable for the conduct of the redistribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Commission invites written suggestions from public – s42(1)</td>
<td>12 October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Suggestions</strong></td>
<td>30 days – s42(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Closing date for written suggestions</td>
<td>12 November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions available for public comment</strong></td>
<td>21 days – s43(1) and s43(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Closing date for written comments</td>
<td>Monday, 17 December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Commission determines State quota – s45(1), considers suggestions</td>
<td>No time specified to formulate proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and comments and develops a set of electoral district boundary proposals</td>
<td>– s44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public objections to the proposals</strong></td>
<td>30 days – s48(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Commission prepares its report, publishes and exhibits maps</td>
<td>Friday, 23 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>showing proposed boundaries and names and invites public attention to the maps – s47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections available for public comment</strong></td>
<td>10 days – s49(1) and s49(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Closing date for written objections</td>
<td>Monday, 23 June 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections available for public comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Closing date for written comments in response to objections</td>
<td>Monday, 14 July 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Commission considers objections and comments and makes a final</td>
<td>60 days since close of objections – s51(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boundary determination – ss50-51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final date for the Commission’s determination</strong></td>
<td>Friday, 22 August 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inquiries

Persons or organisations who have any inquiries concerning the conduct of the State redistribution should direct them to the Commission.

The Commission's locality address is:

QUEENSLAND REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSION
LEVEL 6, FORESTRY HOUSE
160 MARY STREET BRISBANE  Q  4000

TELEPHONE:  1300 881 665
# LIST OF PUBLIC OBJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Jeffrey Hartnett</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ms Elizabeth Boyd JP</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3             | Ms Connie Aylett                      | PO Box 659
                 |                                       | HERBERTON Q 4887               |
| 4             | Mr Ron Kane                           | 12 Lerra Street
                 |                                       | MAREEBA Q 4880                 |
| 5             | Mr Mark Freeman                       | PO Box 777
                 |                                       | KURANDA Q 4881                 |
| 6             | Mr Kenneth D Ritchie                  | 120 Mason Street
                 |                                       | MAREEBA Q 4880                 |
| 7             | M Hamilton                            | 23 Rita Circuit
                 |                                       | ATHERTON Q 4883                |
| 8             | R & J Guernier                        | Email Address Provided         |
| 9             | Mr Peter and Mrs Janice Lynch         | Email Address Provided         |
| 10            | Mr Graham Goss                        | Email Address Provided         |
| 11            | Ms Glenda Brown                       | 2 Aster Street
                 |                                       | LAWNTON Q 4501                 |
| 12            | Mr Ross and Mrs Patrice Martin        | Email Address Provided         |
| 13            | Mr Ronald Kneubuhler                  | 24 Cook Street
                 |                                       | ATHERTON Q 4883                |
| 14            | Mr Terry Cullen                       | 20 Mooloolah Connection Road
                 |                                       | MOOLOOLAH Q 4553               |
| 15            | Mr John Cherry<br>Chief Executive<br>Officer Queensland Farmers’ Federation | PO Box 12009
                 |                                       | BRISBANE Q 4003                |
| 16            | Mrs Berit Williams                    | 17 Killara Crescent
<pre><code>             |                                       | PETRIE Q 4502                  |
</code></pre>
<p>| 17            | Evan and Carol                        | Email Address Provided         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mr David Wise Solicitor</td>
<td>PO Box 120 WOOMBYE Q 4559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ms Carol Peirce and Mr Albert Riester</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr Kenneth D Ritchie</td>
<td>120 Mason Street MAREEBA Q 4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ms Carol Finger</td>
<td>PO Box 9 DUARINGA Q 4712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ms Lorna Bessell</td>
<td>280 Struck Oil Road STRUCK OIL Q 4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mr John and Ms Pam Tendero</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mr Wilfred C Merefield</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ms Fran Clayton</td>
<td>12 Theresa Close WOREE Q 4868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr Richard Hole</td>
<td>9 Leonard Street TOLGA Q 4882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dr Nicky Moore PIA</td>
<td>63 Wooleys Road MILLAA MILLAA Q 4886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mr Eric D Barnes</td>
<td>6 Spring Street MOUNT MORGAN Q 4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>G S Prior</td>
<td>PO Box 322 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ms Elisa Wright and Mrs Arne Platte</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ms Marcia Zoe Brooks</td>
<td>1D / 30 Kuradilla Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mr W M Marsh</td>
<td>16 Ceola Drive MAREEBA Q 4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mr Allyn and Mrs Natasha Zabel</td>
<td>Percyvale Station EINASLEIGH Q 4871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ms Barbara Jennings</td>
<td>PO Box 1532 MAREEBA Q 4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ms Penelope Ann</td>
<td>PO Box 211 KURANDA Q 4881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mr Kevin Rouse</td>
<td>60 Kuran Street CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary/Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnie Brae Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mr Bruce Alexander</td>
<td>2 Mari Place NARANGBA Q 4504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mr Frank &amp; Mrs Beryl Grepo</td>
<td>1 Ray Road MAREEBA Q 4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mr Jim Hooper</td>
<td>222 Main Road MONTVILLE Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mr Christopher</td>
<td>57 Valley View Drive MERINGANDAN WEST Q 4352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Townley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ms Linda Barns</td>
<td>C/- Post Office EINASLEIGH Q 4871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kidston &amp; District Progress Association Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The Dressage Co-op and Ms Christine Doan</td>
<td>PO Box 700 ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>M W Zapala</td>
<td>PO Box 136 MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ms C Court</td>
<td>132 Hemmings Lane UPPER BARRON 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>K Muller</td>
<td>15 Lillian Street HERBERTON Q 4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>A J Closset</td>
<td>38 Croft Road MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>G Closset</td>
<td>1/7 Sixth Avenue ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>J Closset</td>
<td>Unit 1, 7 Sixth Avenue ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>K M Casey</td>
<td>2/7 Sixth Avenue ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 50 | Mr John Fry | 34 Finch Street  
ATHERTON  Q  4883 |
| 51 | C J Fry | 34 Finch Street  
ATHERTON  Q  4883 |
| 52 | D F & L J Severns | 24 Wattlebrush Court  
PARK RIDGE  Q  4125 |
| 53 | Mr George Thomas  
President  
Crestmead Community Association Inc | PO Box 597  
MARSDEN  Q  4132 |
| 54 | Mr C V Hill | PO Box 569  
TOLGA  Q  4882 |
| 55 | Ms Clare Boulter  
President  
Mt Gravatt District Historical Association | 73 Invermore Street  
MT GRAVATT  Q  4122 |
| 56 | Mr Derek L Weier | 764 Talgai West Road  
VIA ALLORA  Q  4362 |
| 57 | Ms Luella Tyler | PO Box 554  
RAVENSHOE  Q  4888 |
| 58 | Dr Diana O’Connor | 1 Alice Dixon Drive  
FLAXTON  Q  4560 |
| 59 | Mrs Eileen and Mr Fred Cole | Email Address Provided |
| 60 | Mr Phillip Herlihy | PO Box 180  
DIMBULAH  Q  4872 |
| 61 | Mr I Fabbro | 51 Argyle Street  
DIMBULAH  Q  4872 |
| 62 | Mr J P Shanahan | 2 Poinciana Drive  
BORONIA HEIGHTS  Q  4124 |
| 63 | Ms Rhonda Hales | PO Box 13  
DIMBULAH  Q  4872 |
| 64 | Mr John T Hunter | 1 Ethel Street  
RAVENSHOE  Q  4888 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Ms Leonie Lane</td>
<td>63 Byrnes Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOUNT MORGAN Q 4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Hans-Joachim Sachse</td>
<td>3 Storer Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mr Max Farquharson</td>
<td>86 Loder Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Mrs Patricia Sachse</td>
<td>3 Storer Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Mr Clem Wright</td>
<td>PO Box 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KURANDA Q 4881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Ms M A Lilley</td>
<td>PO Box 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Mr J Lilley</td>
<td>PO Box 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Mr P J Reynolds</td>
<td>PO Box 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MILLAA MILLAA Q 4886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>L M Turner</td>
<td>PO Box 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>G Raccanello</td>
<td>PO Box 771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MALANDA Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mr G A and Mrs E M West</td>
<td>8 Mazlin Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Mr Colin Watson</td>
<td>PO Box 724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOLGA Q 4882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mr Tony Ford</td>
<td>PO Box 507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Ms K N Russell</td>
<td>3/6 Parkview Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>J E Wyatt</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>D Berry</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Ms Elizabeth Warwick</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>H Wurzel</td>
<td>1149 Dimbulah Wolfram Road DIMBULAH Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Mr David Innes</td>
<td>58 Mylne Street CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Mr C C and Mrs R McDowall</td>
<td>2 Jamieson Street MAREEBA Q 4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Mr Mick Gillam Councillor for Division 8</td>
<td>PO Box 5070 STRATHPINE Q 4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moreton Bay Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Mary Lewendon</td>
<td>PO Box 622 KURANDA 4881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>E Ferris</td>
<td>5 Corrie Street CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>D J Semple</td>
<td>1 Alamanda Close YUNGABURRA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mr Joachim Torgau</td>
<td>Villa 46 Sapphire Gardens 196 Logan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAGLEBY Q 4207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Ms Nannette Sully</td>
<td>3511 Mt Lindsay Highway HILLCREST Q 4118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Ms Judith Grieve Cooroy-Doonan District Branch of the Australian Labor Party</td>
<td>C/- 49 Justin Road DOONAN Q 4562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Ms Cherith Weis Honorary Secretary Australian Pensioners’ &amp; Superannuants’ League</td>
<td>PO Box 228 GRACEMERE Q 4702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Ms Jane Gibbs</td>
<td>15 Allara Street FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Mr Kett Kennedy</td>
<td>2 Melville Street CHARTERS TOWERS Q 4820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>M Day</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>C N Todd</td>
<td>21 Stephens Street DIMBULAH Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Ms Janet M Helmrich</td>
<td>53 Alice Dixon Drive FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Ms Doreen Mortimore</td>
<td>PO Box 252 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Mr Glenn Doyle and Ms Lisa Devlin</td>
<td>PO Box 1422 MOSSMAN Q 4873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Mr Michael Franzmann Queensland Manager The Maxima Group</td>
<td>PO Box 1499 BROWNS BC Q 4118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Ms Charlotte Golding</td>
<td>101 Flaxton Mill Road FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Diana O’Connor</td>
<td>1 Alice Dixon Drive FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Ms Robyn and Mr Rob Wing</td>
<td>PO Box 1523 MAREEBA Q 4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Mr Edward H Burke</td>
<td>52 Flaxton Mill road FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Ms Johanne Wright President EDV Action Group Incorporated</td>
<td>PO Box 2028 NOOSA HEADS Q 4567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Ms Anne Mitchell</td>
<td>PO Box 180 MOUNT MORGAN Q 4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Ms Carmel Cox</td>
<td>46 Reindhold Crescent CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Mr Gary Cox</td>
<td>46 Reindhold Crescent CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Mr William and Mrs Joy Storer</td>
<td>67 Oleander Drive YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Ms Janette R Semple</td>
<td>1 Alamanda Close YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No. (QRC/OBJ...)</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>K L Matthews</td>
<td>46 Mylne Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Ms Delphie Atkinson</td>
<td>2/40 McConnell Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>R J Hooper</td>
<td>222 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MONTVILLE Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Ms Nada M Herron</td>
<td>67 Hodgkinson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Ms Madeline E Harris</td>
<td>23 Stephens Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIMBULAH Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Mr Noel Edser</td>
<td>53/46 Playfield Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Ms Adrianne Smith</td>
<td>PO Box 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Ms Maria Bajema</td>
<td>PO Box 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HERBERTON Q 4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Ms Marion Ockenden</td>
<td>8/4 William Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HERBERTON Q 4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Mr J P M Williams</td>
<td>PO Box 770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Miss S K Fulloon</td>
<td>22 Ballantine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>W G Spitzers and G C Berg</td>
<td>PMB 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Ms Pamela Saul</td>
<td>21 Mylne Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Clover Wrigley</td>
<td>17 Mylne Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Roger and Lynalee Strickland</td>
<td>PO Box 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Clive, Lorelle and Ross Plater, Michael and Gayle Schell, Kevin and Shirley Hansen</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No. (QRC/OBJ...)</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Mr D I Nicholson</td>
<td>7 Maher Street, AHERTON, Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Mr J Matthews</td>
<td>46 Mylne Street, CHERMSIDE, Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Ms Yvonne Zappala</td>
<td>77 Kuran Street, CHERMSIDE, Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>D G Dingwall</td>
<td>PO Box 413, RAVENSHOE, Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>R M Dingwall</td>
<td>PO Box 413, RAVENSHOE, Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>B Turnbull</td>
<td>PO Box 146, DIMBULAH, Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Mr Ian Rolle</td>
<td>Villa 95, 21 Baywater Drive, TWIN WATERS, Q 4564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Helen and Stan McConnell</td>
<td>18 Ethel Street, RAVENSHOE, Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Chris Sartori Secretary/Manager, Kedron Wavell Services Club Inc</td>
<td>PO Box 107, CHERMSIDE SOUTH, Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Dan and Lilian C Doyle</td>
<td>27 Meemar Street, CHERMSIDE, Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>R G Bewick Secretary, Ravenshoe &amp; District Chamber of Commerce Inc</td>
<td>PO Box 277, RAVENSHOE, Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Mr Ray Stevens MP Member for Robina</td>
<td>PO Box 1056, BROADBEACH, Q 4218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Mary Adcock</td>
<td>PO Box 146, DIMBULAH, Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Harry Berwick</td>
<td>36 Playfield Street, CHERMSIDE, Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Julianna Jobe</td>
<td>36 Playfield Street, CHERMSIDE, Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No. (QRC/OBJ...)</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Ms W M Board</td>
<td>PO Box 72 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>May Shanahan</td>
<td>2 Trainor Street ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>H Johnstone</td>
<td>7 Wattle Close YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Mrs K O’Neill</td>
<td>48 Mylne Street CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Ron Shanahan</td>
<td>PO Box 553 TOLGA Q 4882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Judy and Brian Ridge</td>
<td>PO Box 63 HERBERTON Q 4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>L C James</td>
<td>751 Tully Falls Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>D E Gilfoyle</td>
<td>165 Jacaranda Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>John Rigg</td>
<td>Address Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Edith J Smith</td>
<td>33 John Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Dennis Gilfoyle</td>
<td>165 Jacaranda Drive MILLSTREET Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>R A Blankers</td>
<td>Address Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Judy Jenner</td>
<td>Herbert Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>G Nevard</td>
<td>592 Wooroora Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Raiti Malbetsi</td>
<td>80 Kookaburra Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>R H Coe</td>
<td>20 Ethel Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Alice Grinstead</td>
<td>433 Millstream Parade RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>R Hutton</td>
<td>4 Greys Lane MILLSTREAM Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Bruce Roulstone</td>
<td>295 Greys Lane MILLSTREAM Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Robin Fairweather</td>
<td>C/- Railway Yards RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Jack Brumby</td>
<td>16 Herbert Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Chris Fryer</td>
<td>18 Wormboo Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Nicole Baker</td>
<td>PO Box 492 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>M McKechnie</td>
<td>271 Baillie Road INNOT HOT SPRINGS Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Lyn C James</td>
<td>751 Tully Falls Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Wayne Rigg</td>
<td>2A Bolton Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Veronica Earl</td>
<td>PO Box 240 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Starr West</td>
<td>PO Box 673 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Bruce Rea</td>
<td>125 Carrick Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Daniel Kelso</td>
<td>26 Grevillea Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>J &amp; J Jacob</td>
<td>12 Wavell Drive TINAROO Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Dorothy Chadwick</td>
<td>18 Dalrymple Drive MILLSTREAM Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Trev Wakely</td>
<td>781 Herbert River Road INNOT HOT SPRINGS Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Dawn Mackay</td>
<td>170 Millstream Parade RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>F Winkel</td>
<td>15 Rankine Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No. (QRC/OBJ...)</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Hilary Smith</td>
<td>15 Ascham Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>R H and Peter Richardson</td>
<td>Grigg Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>P R &amp; C J Venner</td>
<td>Lot 5 Bew Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Tony Messina</td>
<td>249 Millstream Parade RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Cassandra Angove</td>
<td>100 Opal Street MOUNT GARNET Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>L Martin</td>
<td>PO Box 400 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Patricia Ward</td>
<td>21 Lydia Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Gary Burgess</td>
<td>RN 428 Wooroora Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Kathryn Larsen</td>
<td>2 Nita Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Cliff Dawes</td>
<td>515 Tully Falls Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>J Mitchell</td>
<td>4 Anzac Avenue MILLSTREET Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>V Barklay</td>
<td>35 Kays Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Christine Butterworth</td>
<td>Tall Timbers Caravan Park RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>K F Nichols</td>
<td>11281 Kennedy Highway EVELYN CENTRAL Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Mrs Bev Gentle</td>
<td>460 Millstream Parade RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Miriam Hoedt</td>
<td>PO Box 493 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>W J Woodland</td>
<td>1 Kynara Street TUMOULIN Via RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Eric Harrison</td>
<td>10 Herbert Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Peter Martin</td>
<td>36 Dalziel Street ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>M Beersham</td>
<td>86 Jacaranda Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Shannon Brennan</td>
<td>6/B Grigg Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Barry Harwood</td>
<td>9 Blue Gum Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Markeeta Rasmussen</td>
<td>9 Blue Gum Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Ivan Wilkinson</td>
<td>35 John Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Robert Slade</td>
<td>24 Tully Falls Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Gary Kennedy</td>
<td>9 Ferntree Pocket Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Fiona Dempsey</td>
<td>2 Rankine Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>A J Richardson</td>
<td>11337 Kennedy Highway RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>K Pratt</td>
<td>36 Kennedy Highway RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Ray Boldero and June Mackay</td>
<td>15 Moore Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Deidre Brophy</td>
<td>134 Western View Crst RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Freia Lee</td>
<td>20 Binbrook Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Mick Reed</td>
<td>MS 415 MOUNT GARNET  Q  4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Karen Collins</td>
<td>PO Box 840 RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Bill Mackay</td>
<td>Top Nettle INNOT HOT SPRINGS  Q  4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Janet Elizabeth Turner</td>
<td>73 Eucalyptus Drive RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>J Surha</td>
<td>4 Theta Street RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Isabel De Lacey</td>
<td>PO Box 399 RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Jeffrey De Lacey</td>
<td>PO Box 399 RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>A McIntosh</td>
<td>1/35 Grigg Street RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Christine M Hill</td>
<td>90 Cockram Road RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Kate Lewis</td>
<td>350 Millstream Parade MILLSTREAM  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Tony Lyngkvist</td>
<td>19 Grigg Street RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Anita Walker</td>
<td>30 Grigg Street RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Sharon Berridge</td>
<td>29 Gordon Earl Drive RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Jane Rodwell</td>
<td>55 Herbert Street RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Judy Plant</td>
<td>11 Moore Street RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Teresa Staines</td>
<td>Lot 50 Gold Coast Road RAVENSHOE  Q  4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Kevin M Larsen</td>
<td>2 Nita Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Gayleen Shailer</td>
<td>389 Millstream Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Vera Vanderviet</td>
<td>1/13 Wakooka Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Elsie Davis</td>
<td>9 Monument Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>387 Millstream Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MILLSTREAM Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>J Hedges</td>
<td>10 Major Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Nicole Yuen</td>
<td>719 Wooroora Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Caroline Baillie</td>
<td>27 Pink Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atherton Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Hermine Griffner</td>
<td>1125 Wooroora Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Peter Puschenjak</td>
<td>1125 Wooroora Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>3 Grigg Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>J Haworth</td>
<td>166 Jacaranda Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MILLSTREAM Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Sally Ann James</td>
<td>C/- 2/68 Imlay Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eden NSW 2551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Roy Johnston</td>
<td>Lot 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Millstream Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>N Palmer</td>
<td>Timoulin Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Nicole Widmer</td>
<td>PO Box 645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Eva Molnar</td>
<td>65 Herbert Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Mellissa Keune</td>
<td>19 Kent Close RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Zoe Brooks</td>
<td>1D / 30 Kuradilla Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Jarrah John Parkinson</td>
<td>4 Mabel Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>21 Euciptus Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Petrea Pont</td>
<td>RP 196 Grey’s Lane RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Peter Karius</td>
<td>305 Wooroora Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Lawrie Green</td>
<td>186 Jacaranda Drive MILLSTREAM Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Lynette Stanford</td>
<td>906 Wooroora Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ferris</td>
<td>6 Grevillea Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Margaret Ferris</td>
<td>6 Grevillea Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Noel Alexander</td>
<td>2143 Palmerston Highway RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Mr L I Winkel</td>
<td>PO Box 614 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Yvette Walsh</td>
<td>Lot 622 Wooroora Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>L Loury</td>
<td>38 John Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Marie J Smith</td>
<td>6 Ascham Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No. (QRC/OBJ...)</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>L Mitchell</td>
<td>42 River Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Marilyn Newland</td>
<td>9 Ascham Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Miss J R Winkel</td>
<td>PO Box 614 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Stan Morge</td>
<td>63 Kookarra Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>F Brooks</td>
<td>Tully Falls Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Jesse Crichton</td>
<td>3 Wormboo Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Jack Roberts</td>
<td>203 Jacaranda Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Rod Ranclaud</td>
<td>203 Jacaranda Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>196 Silver Valley Road SILVER VALLEY Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Helen Daw</td>
<td>145 Ross Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>Address incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Ian Fletcher</td>
<td>Lot 7 Brodie Road INNOT HOT SPRINGS Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Rena Woods</td>
<td>PO Box 306 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>B Atkinson</td>
<td>3 Major Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Christian Julian</td>
<td>Lot 3 Kennedy Highway INNOT HOT SPRINGS Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Terry Cansdale</td>
<td>PO Box 616 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Rebecca Guilfoyle</td>
<td>PO Box 535 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Alan John Daniel</td>
<td>8 Maple Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Jean Needham</td>
<td>PO Box 198 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Pat Gollan</td>
<td>13 Wormboo Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Robert Martin</td>
<td>R L No 170 Dixon Hill Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>A Rose</td>
<td>720 Russell Road MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Noreen Allan</td>
<td>232 Jacaranda Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Eileen Roots</td>
<td>49 Tully Falls Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Cedric Cashmere</td>
<td>Lot 6 Marl Street MOUNT GARNET Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Elizabeth Cashmere</td>
<td>Lot 6 Marl Street MOUNT GARNET Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Yvonne Santos</td>
<td>132 River Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Tania Mazzer</td>
<td>241 Millstream Parade RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Leigh Miller</td>
<td>326 Greys Lane RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Jennifer Beckham</td>
<td>10 Kerr Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Pat Woodland</td>
<td>1 Kynara Street TUMOULIN Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Cherie Bevan</td>
<td>PO Box 116 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Kelly Payn</td>
<td>7 Theta Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Kitt Payn</td>
<td>7 Theta Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Ken Stewart</td>
<td>36 Kays Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Jason McHugh</td>
<td>455 Wooroora Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Lyndell Royee</td>
<td>14 Ascham Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Ian Soper</td>
<td>252 Millstream Parade RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Diane Dorman</td>
<td>12 Ascham Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>G F Cornwell</td>
<td>8 Herbert Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Dot Cornwell</td>
<td>8 Herbert Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Karina Simpson</td>
<td>49 Anzac Avenue MILLSTREAM Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Bruce Frazer</td>
<td>R 34 Bellview Drive BELLVIEW ESTATE VIA RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>M E Bolton</td>
<td>15 Roger Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Cassandra Pengelly</td>
<td>21 Herbert Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Kristal K Earl</td>
<td>26 Grevillea Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Joshua Earl</td>
<td>125 Carrick Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Ian Pitman</td>
<td>PO Box 731 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No. (QRC/OBJ...)</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Sheryll LaTrobe</td>
<td>3 Mica Street MOUNT GARNET Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Heather Walsh</td>
<td>RN 91 Eucalyptus Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Ian Walsh</td>
<td>RN 91 Eucalyptus Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Ronnie Smithers</td>
<td>54 Western View Crescent RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Julie Brotherton</td>
<td>250 Ross Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Reuben Paul</td>
<td>135 Ross Road CHILVERTON RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>24 Herbert Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Mrs S McDonnell</td>
<td>RN 4 Smith Close RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>B Smith</td>
<td>Address Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>121 Millstream Parade RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Shelley Barnes</td>
<td>801 Millstream Parade RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>PO Box 67 MOUNT GARNET Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Mrs E Fatur</td>
<td>24 Pozieres Street TUMOULIN Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Albert Biddle</td>
<td>78 Grigg Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Jayme Dempsey</td>
<td>32 Herbert Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Kerin Van Gelder</td>
<td>3 Kennedy Highway INNOT HOT SPRINGS Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Linda Lawton</td>
<td>RN 136 Millstream Parade RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>I Dodds</td>
<td>90 Garnet Street MOUNT GARNET Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>9 Moffatt Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>P Foley</td>
<td>4 Opal Street MOUNT GARNET Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Troy Walsh</td>
<td>622 Wooroora Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>G &amp; G Turner</td>
<td>92 Otto Road Kennedy Hwy MILLSTREAM Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Josephine Cooper</td>
<td>1409 Tumoulin Road TOUMOULIN Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Emma Burns</td>
<td>1 Monument Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Jodie Masson</td>
<td>104 Tully Falls Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Judith Manger</td>
<td>36 Jacaranda Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Melda Wycherley</td>
<td>204 Bew Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Richard Butt</td>
<td>35 Anzac Avenue RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Harry Kune</td>
<td>161 River Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>M G Smith</td>
<td>13 Ascham Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Hamish and Anne Borthwick</td>
<td>146 Balmoral Road MONTVILLE Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Robert and Joan Allen</td>
<td>47 Western Avenue MONTVILLE Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leeroy Hutton</td>
<td>176 Western Avenue MONTVILLE Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Luke Law</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Kathleen May Langtree</td>
<td>16 Golflinks Road ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Rose Molloy Secretary Australian Labor Party – Mount Morgan Branch</td>
<td>139 East Street MOUNT MORGAN Q 4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Shirley E Coxan</td>
<td>55 Wompoo Road LONGREACH Q 4730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Mr N J Buck</td>
<td>PO Box 139 HERBERTON Q 4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Ms E N Brown</td>
<td>6 Ballantine Street CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Ms L Crossie</td>
<td>PO Box 770 MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>S A Chaffey</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Ms L Brack</td>
<td>21 Reinhold Crescent CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>S M Cooley and R G Agnew</td>
<td>PO Box 589 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Scott Stewart and R Agnew</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Christine Rees</td>
<td>30 West Street MOUNT MORGAN Q 4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>T Lambert</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Judith Brown</td>
<td>10 Beatrice Street ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Lothar and Glenda Heidorn</td>
<td>254 Western Avenue MONTVILLE Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Mr Gerald Aston</td>
<td>PO Box 1072 MOSSMAN Q 4873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>L A Farrell</td>
<td>21 Harper Avenue YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>R &amp; T Ettlin</td>
<td>17 Harper Avenue YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Geoff Smith</td>
<td>21 Carinya Street CRESTMEAD Q 4132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>W P Womersley</td>
<td>PO Box 556 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>M G Womersley</td>
<td>PO Box 556 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Browns Plains Printing &amp; Office Supplies Pty Ltd</td>
<td>98 Anzac Avenue BROWNS PLAINS Q 4118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>Mr Thaddeus and Mrs Lavinia Ryan</td>
<td>MS 956 FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Jennifer J Collins</td>
<td>MS 1575 MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Sharon Montgomery</td>
<td>61 Meemar Street CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Alice, Richard and Bronwen Winn</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Candice McDonald</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Peter Wellington MP Member for Nicklin</td>
<td>PO Box 265 NAMBOUR Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Pat Booker</td>
<td>24 Doon Street BLACKWATER Q 4717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Bronwyn Thorogood</td>
<td>Address Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>Maryann Nicholson</td>
<td>MS 627 Laglan Road CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Calley Thompson</td>
<td>50 French Street CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Rhonwen J Tighe</td>
<td>“Greenmantle” 2314 Kenlogan Road VIA CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Laura Murphy</td>
<td>209 Peakvale Road CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Gary and Rebecca Broad</td>
<td>Broady’s Bobcat &amp; Truck Hire 14 Daintree Street CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Mary Snell</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Noel and Suellen Finger</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Carlie Guilfoyle</td>
<td>C Guilfoyle &amp; Associates Solicitors PO Box 342 MORANBAH Q 4744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Sarah Guilfoyle</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Danny and Pauline McKay</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Valda Bettridge</td>
<td>6 Davis Court CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Valeska and John Jago</td>
<td>T/As Moramana Farming Co “Moramana” CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Col Kimber</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Kenleigh Mather</td>
<td>PO Box 1014 ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>W E &amp; J Moull</td>
<td>25 Mt Lewis Road JULATTEN Q 4871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Roxanne Hodda Hon Secretary Bouldercombe Progress Association</td>
<td>83 Richmont Drive BOULDERCOMBE Q 4702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>C A Jenkins</td>
<td>Lot 21 Otto Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>J A Nicholl</td>
<td>PO Box 354 SMITHFIELD Q 4878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>W J Nicholl</td>
<td>PO Box 354 SMITHFIELD Q 4878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Jennifer Cruickshank</td>
<td>66 Box Street CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Nadine Cluff Technical Support Officer</td>
<td>PO Box 229 CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>David Fletcher Operations Engineer –</td>
<td>PO Box 97 MORANBAH Q 4744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clermont Isaac Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Rhiannon Moriarty</td>
<td>“Telarah” CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Brendon Finger</td>
<td>“Telarah” CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Naomi Goodale</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Richard Beale</td>
<td>3 Blamey Street CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Dale Lorraway &amp; Marcia Brennan</td>
<td>PO Box 175 YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>Joseph and Ellena Bray</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Carl Moller</td>
<td>Springvale Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4522 Pioneer Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Richard Hughes</td>
<td>“Wentworth” CLERMONT Q 4721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Clement McMillan</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Shirley &amp; Vince Jeffrey</td>
<td>849 Wooroora Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>William and Wendy Hodge</td>
<td>PO Box 61 EUDLO Q 4554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No.</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Ray Hawley</td>
<td>4 Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FOREST HILL Q 4342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>D C Martin</td>
<td>240 Ipswich Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BURANDA Q 4102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Mr R V &amp; Mrs D I Byrnes</td>
<td>55 Kulara Drive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Mark Townend Chairman St Paul de Chartres</td>
<td>12 Fedrick Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BORONIA HEIGHTS Q 4124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Sister Teresa Lau Sisters of St Paul de Chartres Australia</td>
<td>12 Fedrick Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BORONIA HEIGHTS Q 4124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>J V &amp; M K Coles</td>
<td>59 Akala Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Patricia Ward</td>
<td>52733 Burnett Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOULDERCOMBE Q 4702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Janet and Brian West</td>
<td>12 Allara Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Ms Linda Lavarch MP Member for Kunwongbah</td>
<td>PO Box 2216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STRATHPINE CENTRE Q 4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Ben &amp; Lyn Wash</td>
<td>18 Lindsay Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Ellen Peard</td>
<td>Unit 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12-20 Ballantine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHERMSIDE Q 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Edna Bauld</td>
<td>13 Oleander Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YUNGABURRA Q 4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>M Balas</td>
<td>7 Moore Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Julie Castree</td>
<td>17 Kingsview Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi there,

I would like to state why should Nth QLD shires be changed so they can have a
extra shire in the southern half of this state.

If they want to add a shire in down south then why not change the size of the shires down
there, cause if they change the size of the shires up here is totally stupid, cause all they are
doing is causing headaches for the rest of the shires & everyone in them.

I reckon that if they want to change the shires then cut QLD in half & have a new state from
Mackay north as one state then that way we might get the funds which are needed up here
for our roads plus health might get fixed up instead of being destroyed by the Labour
Government like it is.

If they want to change anything then why not change the south & fix up the problems that they
have caused up north which they don't care about, except for when there is a major flood or
cyclones or what ever else happens up here then they give us the funds we need but I think
we don't totally get, only some of the funds.

They spend millions on the roads & everything else down in the southern half of this state but
forget about the northern half, where most of the profits from the mining & mines &
everything else that we have up here that they use for there own use instead of using it up
north where it should be used.

The politicians are only in for two things & that is to line their own pockets & make a name for
themselves instead of being in power for the people who they are suppose to represent,
which they never do, & use to do centuries ago.

They are only out to make problems for the north & keep all the health down south instead of
getting the health fixed up here in the northern half & the rest of the state plus get the Doctors
& Specialists up here also.

They went & spend all the funds from the health on the sports & take the funds from the
health which Beattie never did banned of where the funds really did come from for either
sports Oval & what ever else, so the health & everything else can go down hill like it is.

So why not change the state to a separate state instead of changing the shires like
the Premier wants too.

They should make the shires down there smaller instead of making the Tablelands a shire
with Mackay which have different problems & needs than what we have up on the Tablelands,
which the Labor Government wants.

I think that Labor should take a step back & look at what they are causing instead of what
they can do with the rest of the state.

Why change the shires for their own reasons & their own benefits when it is totally stupid for
them to do which will cause nothing but headaches for everyone up north & every where else
in this state.

So why not get them to change the state & out this state in half, from Mackay north as one
state, & the rest as another state for the south.

If they did this then I reckon they can do what they want with there half like change the shires
to suit them & leave the rest of the shires as is which have been going on well & truly well
before they got these stupid ideas to make changes to suit them.

They say that its for the benefit of everyone, when it will not benefit everyone only themselves
& make huge problems for everyone else, that is all they are doing & making for everyone.

This idea of making the Tableland Shire combined with Mackay Shire is ridiculous & totally
stupid so why are they trying to do it for, except to cause trouble for everyone in this state.

The south has just about run out of water so why not fix it themselves instead of getting a
pipeline from up north to down south, why not just get it from the ocean, & leave the states
shires as they have been for centuries.

They show & say how many millions it cost for their Freeways & bypasses & tunnels but they
never show or say how much they are spending up north on the roads or tunnels or what they
are doing to fix the roads & everything else that needs fixing.

The main thing that this government needs to fix is the HEALTH & leave the Shires as they
are & how they have been for centuries, not what a few of the politicians want or what they
...
want to change to suit a few of them but leave the shires as they are & have been for so long that they don’t need changing.
The only thing that needs changing is the politicians need to be taken out & fix the problems that they have caused for everyone in this state & fix the problems up instead of making more problems.
The more health problems started when Peter Beattie was in & tried to run this state which he caused more problems for the health & everything else, & now Anna Bligh is doing the same as what Beattie did & she is just keeping the causes of the problems going & is only causing more problem & not fixing anything at all.
So why change the shires to suit a few politicians when it doesn’t suit anyone else, & all it will do & is doing is causing problems for everyone including yourselves in the ecq, because they will try to make it be known that the ecq will change the shires when they don’t need too be changed for anybody.
Please listen to the public not the politicians when they are only making problems for everyone in this state, & the rest of the country & states are not doing it so why should Qld do it, or is it just to help a few politicians out so they can have a shire which doesn’t need to be made.
So please listen too the public & work for the public cause when you leave your job & go home you are & will always become the public like the rest of us in this state, & the only ones who are not public is the politicians.

Cheers Jeffrey Hartnett.
From: Elizabeth Boyd (mailto:betteboyd@gmail.com)
Sent: Tuesday, 27 May 2008 1:45 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Atherton is part of Far North Queensland - NOT north queensland

Being a person of normal intelligence it is obvious that this latest idiocy of trying to put part of the Atherton Tablelands in the Townsville/Mackay area in the electoral map, is the worst bungle yet.

We have been forced in the local government redistribution to amalgamate the whole of the north and south tablelands to work together as one, and now to be split in three again for state electoral boundaries. This would produce dissent and create major problems for the development of this unique and specialised area. Even on road maps it is obvious an enclosed area with special needs.

This makes no sense.

The Tablelands is a small geographical area that ends just south of Millaa Millaa and down to Innisfail. From there south there are no links.

There are no settlements, no links, not even roads that link the small southern section of the Tablelands to anywhere south being the Charteris Towers (515km away) area on the proposed map.

In all other government documents and plans (including the 2025 draft regional plan) The whole of the unique Tablelands is included as part of the Cairns and Hinterland area.

The Tablelands belong in the Hinterland behind Cairns in far north queensland. That is where it is positioned physically and mentally.

The Tablelands would be split over three electorates with none of them based there, this would be detrimental and a nightmare to any growth or planning both in the private and government sectors.

The Tablelands is also one of the fastest growing areas in the state, and should be kept intact so that planning and development can better be policed and the private sector has a clear path they can follow when it comes to investment and growth.

This really needs to be re-examined as an important unique area (not areas) to far north queensland belongs in its entirety to far north queensland.

Concerned

Elizabeth Boyd JP
Connie Aylett  
P.O. Box 659  
Herberton 4887  

27th May 2008

Dear Sir,

I am writing to express my displeasure at the proposed carving up of our Tablelands Electorate.

Only a few short months ago, the state government chose to amalgamate our successful shire council – Herberton – with several other shires. As a result of this I feel we as voters were robbed of much of our voice through our local councillors.

As member for the Tablelands, Ross Lee Long has been a vocal advocate for locals in the state parliament. Now the state government seems hell bent on taking that voice away as well.

If the proposed electoral boundaries are implemented, I believe this will further reduce the average Joe Public’s ability to be heard on a state level. In fact if this does go ahead, then we may as well abolish the State Parliaments of Australia altogether.

North Queensland is a vast area of this country and the representatives of the existing electorates must have a hard time servicing everyone within their electorates as things stand now. Reducing the number of electorates in the north can only make any representation of the public that much harder.

Regards

Connie Aylett
From: Ron Kane [mailto:jkane@qld.chariot.net.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 27 May 2006 12:04 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Redistribution

To Whom it may concern,

Over the last few years we have become used to all sorts of crap from politicians and bureaucrats, but this latest gets the "Gold Medal" by the length of the straight. I'm referring to the so-called redistribution of the seat of Tablelands.

Let's consider what has just recently taken place. At a cost of god knows how many millions of dollars we have had a government under the guise of "The Local Government Reform Commission" amalgamate four independent shires into one, informing everyone that objected (which could have been around eighty percent) how beneficial this amalgamation was for the shires concerned.

Now only months later we have the same government apparently this time under the guise of "The Queensland Electoral Commission" doing completely opposite to what had just taken place with their amalgamation, splitting the recently formed "Tableland Regional Council" far and wide and joining these fractured pieces with other areas that have nothing what so ever in common. With redistribution this amalgamated Council will not be in a position to have their representative present unified propositions. One could be forgiven for feeling that this is what the government is trying to achieve.

Even the village idiot (poor chap) can see that these are actions of a government that should not be allowed make decisions that effects anything outside the South East Corner, and going on recent events he has reservations about that as well.

Please accept this email as a definite objection to the seat of Tableland being part of a redistribution.

Yours Faithfully
Ron Kane
12 Lerra St
Mareeba 4880
Confirmation of email
QRC/O

P O Box 777
KURANDA QLD 4881

Telephone 07 4093 8827
Mobile 0421 170 599
Email voicesofkuranda@bigpond.com

Friday, May 23, 2008

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Sir,

Re: Submission in respect of Proposed Electoral Districts - Kuranda regional community.

I refer to your proposed boundary changes and make the following appeals in respect to the boundary between the electorates of Barron River and Cook – starting from easiest first.

1. Placement of McCorry Road from Cook to Barron River. This road has no access to the electorate of Cook and should be placed in Barron River. There are three enrolled voters in McCorry Road and they would need to drive over 20 kilometers to visit their nearest neighbour in the Cook electorate. They are Mick Roberts, Shanna-Jane Jans and Vince McKay.

2. Land bordered by Barron River, Armstrong Road, Oak Forest Road and Kuranda State Forest. This block (with several owners who live on the other side of the road) has been placed into Cook for no apparent reason. There are no residents on this land although there is one house that has been unoccupied since 2001 when Jerry Harrigan died. It is only still standing because the white ants are holding hands. All of the residents in Armstrong Road and Oak Forest Road in this area live in Barron River. If there were any residents, the same comments as item one would apply. I suggest you just make the Kuranda State Forest your boundary so that it makes some sense.

3. Land at the end of Mt. Haren Road. Whilst it appears from your map that Mt Haren Road reconnects with the Kennedy Highway, in reality it doesn’t. The block of land between the end of Mt. Haren Road and the Formartine State Forest has one residence and one enrolled voter, Jake Pelling. He has no access to the Cook electorate and this land should be included into Barron River making the state forest the boundary, unless you agree with item four.

4. Exclusion of Koah community from the rest of the Kuranda community. Whilst I appreciate you returning the residents of Top of the Range and Russet Park to the Kuranda community, I am saddened that the Kuranda regional community is still split...
with our Koah area residents still allocated out to another electorate. We are still being used as the grains to balance the scales with little credence given to the first three criteria in determining electoral boundaries.

The saddest thing about considering existing electoral boundaries in other tiers of government is that once a bad decision is made, redistributions involving the other two tiers of governance can be based on that previous bad boundary. It can become a self perpetuating error.

The boundary between Kuranda and Mareeba is Davies Creek where it crosses the highway and the forests on both sides of the highway in that area. Between the junction of Kanerco Road with the Kennedy Highway and Davies Creek bridge is 2.9 kilometers of Dinden State Forest which actually connects with the Bilwun State Forest north of the highway. This is a gazetted wildlife corridor, is very rugged, and is uninhabited. It used to be called Lamb Range National Park. Whilst it is possible that somebody may live there sometime, it is unlikely in the next five decades or so. You would have to be a mentally challenged hermit with extreme masochistic and antisocial tendencies. People like that tend not to vote anyway.

On the Koah / Kuranda side there is essentially rural residential development with only four families in Koah area making their primary income from farming. There are many “hobby” farmers with a few acres of lychees, etc. On the Mareeba side it becomes predominately a farming community where the primary income is directly derived from farming or pastoral activities.

The postcode changes at Davies Creek bridge. The local paper changes at Davies Creek bridge. The cultural ethos, in so far as such a thing can be generalised, changes at Davies Creek bridge. The nearest food store, post office, school, police station, ambulance, doctor, dentist, pub, sports field, etc. all divide at the Davies Creek bridge. People on one side tend to be buried in Kuranda, and on the other, in Mareeba. Now there is an interesting social thought. Maybe you could define community of interest by where they are interred.

When you are up close and living it – it is just so obvious.

There are approximately 236 voters in the Koah area of Kuranda regional community give or take ten or so. Moving Koah from Cook to Barron River would have the following effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Your proposal</th>
<th>My proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barron River</td>
<td>30340</td>
<td>30576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook (inc. National)</td>
<td>31421</td>
<td>31152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I am only an interested amateur, but it would seem to me that you will then be closer to the mark that you are trying to achieve.
Also in consideration of the FNQ 2025 proposal which probably hit the desks a bit too late for your considerations, future development in Barron River will be somewhat discouraged. However, some development will be encouraged in the Mareeba area which will go some way to overcoming the natural slow development rate of Cook. In consideration of FNQ 2025, I aver that the above proposal more closely matches the long term growth of the two electorates.

Synopsis. It seems a bit silly to me to determine electoral boundaries on the basis of the left / right side of a road when there are perfectly good natural boundaries formed by rugged mountainous ranges and hills covered with forest kilometers wide located only a few hundred yards away. These are physical boundaries that are a bit hard to ignore. When you are dealing with one, or one, or three voters; and use a roadway instead of a range, it is ridiculous. The same applies with the Koah area. It is part of Kuranda and is not part of Mareeba. When there is no need to fragment a community in order to “balance the scales” – why do it?

Now I would like to rewrite your boundary definitions for you to make it easy, but I do not have access to the RP maps. I suggest that the definitions of the boundary between Cook and Barron River west of the coastal ranges should reflect the following – World Heritage National Park, Kuranda Forest Reserve north of Mora Mora, Kuranda State Forest, Barron River between Kuranda State Forest and Bulwun State Forest, Bulwun State Forest, Davies Creek at the Kennedy Highway, Dindin State Forest, Davies Creek National Park, and World Heritage National Park. These are really big boundaries that are a bit hard consider ambiguous. You may need to put in an RP description or latitude on the land between Davies Creek where it crosses the highway and Bulwun State Forest. Kanervo Road should be Barron River. Speina Road should be Cook. There are no roads, or people, or fences in there so it won’t matter. There is a creek that runs out of Bulwun State Forest into Davies Creek that would make a good boundary if it had a name – but I don’t think it has. You could name it after you and nobody would be wiser, or care. An electoral memorial in perpetuity – the ECQ Creek!

I seek your consideration of these appeals.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Freeman.

Attachments – maps of areas discussed.
Dear Sir,

I must protest most strongly at this suggestion. We have just lost our Council here in Mareeba and that wasn't a good idea either.

I didn't protest at the time because I just didn't imagine that we would also lose our representative in State Parliament as well - it's a double blow for the people of Mareeba and Kuranda.

The loss of our Mayor and councillors was bad but to take our State Rep as well leaves us with very little representation, and that cannot be considered as good government.

Sincerely,
Kenneth D Ritchie
Queensland: Redistribution. Com.
Locked Bag, 3304 Brisbane

...no bloody crossin' indeed! Born in Ahterton
...mid twenties I have watched all the changes
...that followed different govenrments. However, this clever Gov has taken the cake.
...dissolution to voters will show their displeasure at the next poll.
...I can only think our present Gov has lost the plot.
...some changes are not for the best
...and this is one, I say NO

M. Hamutal
23 Rita Crt
Athol Park 4063

...oh yes - another proof that Qld. begins...and ends 100 km R-W of Brisbane. Also
...what a way to get rid of our outspoken
...Member Rosa -- you hop
From: R & J GUERNIER (mailto:beary@optusnet.com.au)
Sent: Wednesday, 28 May 2008 11:14 AM
To: ECO User
Subject: Redistribution

Concerning the boundary redistribution. We are horrified with the proposed plan. With the abolition of the Tablelands seat we would in effect be disenfranchised. (Out of sight out of mind). Someone in Charters Towers may not even know where Tolga is, let alone represent us. The priorities in the proposed seat as a whole are not compatible with our tourism, and unique agricultural area.

R & J Guernier
To whom it may concern,

We **STRONGLY** oppose to the idea of scrapping the Tableland seat with the plan of putting us into the seat of MACROSSAN, because it is too big of an area. Charters Towers is at least 5 hours drive from where we live. The Tableland needs its own representative who knows what is going on around the area. We are often called the FORGOTTEN NORTH and if this happens we will be FORGOTTEN.

Yours Faithfully

Peter Lynch

Janice Lynch

from Malanda on the southern tablelands
Hi Linda

Re the name of the electorate.

Suggest Pine Rivers be it's name.

Graham Goss
From: Glenda [mailto:glendab13@cpusnet.com.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 28 May 2008 3:59 PM
To: kurwongbah@queenslandaborteam.com; letters@pineriverspress.com.au; ECQ User
Subject: RE: ELECTORAL CHANGES PROPOSAL

Good afternoon

I am writing to state my support for changing the name of the Kurwonbah electorate to Pine Rivers. I have lived and worked in the district for 19 1/2 years. The meaning of the name "Strathpine" is Valley of the Pines. Although many of these pines have disappeared through development of the district, it would be a fitting tribute and a popular decision to rename the electorate to Pine Rivers.

Yours sincerely

GLENDA BROWN
2 Aster Street
Lawnton
3265 7177
From: Ross Martin [mailto:roscoe126@primusonline.com.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 28 May 2008 8:09 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Objection to the renaming of Kurwongbah electorate

My wife and I object to the renaming of the adjusted electorate of Kurwongbah to
"Samsonvale". We agree with Linda Lavarch that considering recent council amalgamations,
it would be more appropriate to rename the new electorate "Pine Rivers". This was the
original name of the electorate when we took up residence over thirty years ago.

Ross and Patrice Martin
Dear Sir,

I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed abolition of the State seat of Tablelands.

The vast majority of people here and elsewhere in Queensland rejected the forced amalgamations of local councils and now they are being divided along State electoral lines.

The Atherton Tablelands is increasing in population yearly and because of its climate and rainfall and minimal damage by cyclone, is becoming more of an attraction to retired people. It is a unique area and should not be brought up to be represented in State Parliament by someone who lives say in Cairns Town.

To my opinion the State Labor Government is again riding roughshod over the wishes of Country Queenslanders.

Yours Truly,

Ronald Kneubuhler
From: Terry Cullen [mailto:terry.cullen@goosegully.com]
Sent: Monday, 2 June 2008 10:05 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Submission to Queensland Redistribution Commission

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission

This submission to the Proposed Queensland Electoral District (May 2008) addresses the proposed boundaries of both Glass House and Caloundra electorates, mutually and separately.

I am now and have been (for over 15 years) a resident of Mooloolah and previously submitted an objection to the inclusion of this place in the Glass House electorate - excised from the Mooloolah (Division) when the Kawana (Division) was created - and of which the northern part of Caboolture was clearly the dominant centre on the basis of no evident community of interest. This appears, finally, to have been recognised or realised.

Fundamentally, the Mooloolah community of interest is and has always been with the Sunshine Coast and, in that context, the Caloundra electorate (as proposed) is the logical connection.

However, in respect of this belated correction, the proposed electorate isolates parts of Mooloolah in the northwestern quarter in an illogical manner. As any competent appreciation of the local mapping – cadastral, topographic, photogrammetric – would show, such nearby places as Diamond Valley (for example) are cul-de-sac settlements and are only accessible via the Mooloolah township. This was acknowledged in historical of the now-extinguished Maroochy Shire and Caloundra City local government boundaries recognised this and local roads were developed accordingly by those entities.

I submit it to be appropriate that the Mooloolah location is correctly included in the proposed Caloundra electorate. I further submit that residents on the following roads (not presently shown in the proposed electorate) should be included in the proposed Caloundra electorate, as their community of interest is with the Mooloolah location:

Andersen Road,
Diamond Valley Road,
Harris Road,
Ratcliffe Road,
Shady Lane,
Risso Road,
Eaton Street,
Jillian Road,
Nellill Road (section on the western side of the Railway),
Mooloolah Meadows Drive,
Mountaintale Court,
Riverview Court,
Rainforest Place,
Rain Tree Court,
Songbird Place,
Leafy Lane,
Clancy Street,
Curner Road,
Brooks Road,
Rambert Road (southern part only),
Johnsons Road,
Upper Rambert Road,
Brandenburg Road and
roads made off those roads which connect to Mooloolah.

Both the Landsborough/Melany (sic) and Howard Roads should not be divided as they have a shared local community of interest.

As the community of interest of Moneybank and Cogden Roads is mainly with Eudlo, that should be considered in respect of Eudlo. This brings me to the strange geography of the proposed Glass House electorate which parrotheaks Eudlo, excising it from the Nicklin electorate where it has been for at least the past 10 years. (I further submit that the use of the Railway as a boundary in the Mooloolah location is also inappropriate as it adversely divides the respective Eudlo and Mooloolah communities of interest between these places.)

It cannot be reasonably rationalised that those constituents have a community of interest with the population centre of northern Caboolture less so than with that of either Nambour (ie: Nicklin) or the southern Sunshine Coast (ie: Caloundra, Buderim or Kawana) to which their roads connect through the nearby more dominant locations of Palmwoods, Mooloolah, Nambour Forest Glen, Woombie or Buderim. I submit that, of these options, Eudlo be included with Mooloolah in the Caloundra electorate, but Nicklin (as it is presently) as the most reasonable alternative.

As a general comment, I am inclined to the opinion that the Glass House electorate as proposed is little better than a melange of what has been left over, scattered communities with all identifiable or obvious common interest. The most striking evidence of this is the basically bipolar differences which exist even within the Maleny location and, in turn, the potential of division which those residents have with the recent urbanisation of Beerwah. It was clear in the present/previous representation of Glass House, in my opinion, major issues for which the State was accountable, were not being adequately represented in deference to those matters in places such as Beerwah.

I submit that the proposed boundaries - as commented on above - fail to satisfactorily meet the “Redistribution Criteria” as legislated, particularly in respect of all five “matters” as published on the ECQ’s own website.

Yours respectfully

Terry Cullen
20 Mooloolah Connection Road
Mooloolah 4553
1 June 2008

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Level 6/160 Mary Street
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Queensland Farmers’ Federation is the peak agricultural body representing the interests of 14,000 primary producers in the intensive agricultural sector in Queensland. Ensuring rural Queensland is adequately represented in the State Parliament is vitally important. We are disappointed that this redistribution will see the loss of three rural seats and the creation of three urban seats, but acknowledge that this is a result of population growth.

QFF raises no comments in relation to the boundaries in the southern part of the State. However, we wish to object to the abolition of Tablelands and the creation of the seat of Macrossan. Tablelands encompasses some of the most productive intensive agricultural regions in the state and the towns that rely on that. Industries in Tablelands include fruit and vegetable growing, sugar, dairying, pork and maize. The ECQ’s proposed split places the Mareeba irrigation area into a seat that stretches to Cape York, and the Atherton dairying and fruit growing area in to a seat that stretches south to Mareeba. It goes without saying that Mareeba and Atherton have a stronger community of interest with each other than with either of the seats they have been placed in. The recent local government changes saw the shires of Mareeba, Atherton, Douglas and Herberton united into the Tablelands Regional Council. This redistribution fails to take that into account. While Tablelands is under quota, extending the seat further along the Paluma Highway corridor into the former Johnstone Shire links to a strong sugar and fruit growing area, emphasising the basis of the seat on its intensive agricultural industries.

QFF acknowledges that retaining the seat of Tablelands would result in changes to other seats, but argues that these would better meet the community of interest and other criteria in section 46. The proposed seat of Macrossan included three discrete sections which have stronger communities of interest to adjacent coastal communities than to each other. Our proposal would place Cloncurry in the Townsville hinterland seat of Hinchinbrook, and Moranbah into the Central Queensland seat of Gregory, which includes the rest of the former Blayney Shire, the key regional centre of Emerald and the coal mining towns of Tieri and Blackwater. Our proposals would also reduce the size of Mt Isa and Gregory but increase the size of Cook.
B. Objection to the creation of Macrossan:

The proposed seat of Macrossan fails the criteria in section 46 in each respect:

1. The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district:

The seat has three discrete economic and social zones around Atherton, Charters Towers and Mornabah, one centred on intensive agriculture, one on grazing and one on coal mining. Atherton looks to Cairns as its principal centre and region, Charters Towers to Townsville and Mornabah to Mackay and Emerald, with little in common.

2. The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district:

The means of travel within the proposed seat are ludicrous. The main roads connect to the major coastal centres. While there is a development road that heads north-south, it is impossible to drive from Atherton to Mornabah without twice leaving the proposed electorate. Communication on Government or business matters tends to be with the major coastal cities of Cairns, Townsville and Mackay, reflecting the three non-connected districts within the proposed seat.

3. The physical features of each proposed electoral district:

The seat falls across three distinct regions – the Atherton Tablelands (which includes the headwaters of the Barron, Johnstone and Herbert rivers), the Burdekin catchment in the centre and the Isaac/Fitzroy catchment in the south, and falls across three regional councils (Tablelands, Charters Towers, Isaacs.

4. The boundaries of existing electoral districts:

The new seat pays little regard to the former seat of Tablelands, but includes part of the boundaries of the former seat of Charters Towers. Mornabah has been separated from Clermont, both contained in the former Belyando and current Isaac councils.

4. Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that... the need for another electoral redistribution will not arise under section 46 before it does under section 38.

The seat does meet this criteria, but fails the other four. Other permutations of the seat would better meet this criteria without breaching the other three.

5. The Commission may also consider the boundaries of local government areas to the extent that it is satisfied that there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each local government area.

The proposed seat takes little regard to the recent review of local government boundaries, which placed Mareeba and Atherton into the Tablelands Region, Charters Towers and Dalrymple into the Charters Towers region, and the towns of Mornabah, Clermont, and Dysart into the Isaac region. The recent Commission on Local Government Boundaries gave careful consideration to communities of interest in establishing the new regional council boundaries.

6. Proposed name:

The name of Tablelands has a clear geographic understanding for the Atherton Tableland, and was recently used to name the new regional council. It also has a long historic association with state seats, there being a State Seat of Tablelands from 1950-72, and since 1986. The name of Macrossan has no geographic association with the region at all, and only a very distant historic one with one part of the region.
C. Proposed solution: retain Tablelands:

1. The seat of Tablelands be retained, with the addition of the coastal strip to the former Johnstone Shire boundary plus South Mission Beach. 60% of the proposed voters in Macrooun came from Tablelands. The new seat would include 95% of the residents of Tablelands Regional Council.

2. Charters Towers Shire be added to Hinchinbrook. Charters Towers has a stronger community of interest and better transport links to Townsville and its region than to Atherton or Moranbah.

3. Moranbah be added to Gregory which includes the rest of the former Belyando Shire. Moranbah has a stronger community of interest to Clermont and Emerald than to Charters Towers or Atherton.

4. Gregory loses Longreach Region and the former Aramac Shire to Mt Isa and extends north to include the rest of Belyando Shire (Moranbah). This places three coal mining towns (Moranbah, Tieri and Blackwater) in the one district.

5. Mt Isa to extend south to include the Longreach and Aramac and lose Carpentaria, Croydon and Etheridge Shires to Cook. Longreach is linked to Mt Isa by a sealed highway, unlike Georgetown and Normanton.

6. Etheridge, Carpentaria and Croydon shire be restored to Cook (they were part of the seat from its creation up to the 1999 redistribution). These centres have strong transportation, road and economic links to Cairns and similar economic and social structures to the remainder of the Cape York Peninsula.

7. Small transfers to meet quota requirements between Hinchinbrook, Mulgrave and Cairns, Barron River to retain its existing boundaries.

D. Alternative Solution:

If the Commission did not wish to make major changes to its proposals for Gregory, Mt Isa and Cook, a lesser set of changes could still substantially deliver improved communities of interest. This could be achieved by combining the southern part of Tablelands Region not included in Cook with the southern part of Cassowary Coast Region not included in Mulgrave. This seat could be called Tablelands or Palmerston. The seat of Hinchinbrook would then include Charters Towers Region and Moranbah, with no other changes to any other proposed districts required. This would recognise the strong community of interest between Atherton and coastal communities and their similar economic base, with Hinchinbrook comprised mostly of towns in close driving distance of Townsville, with a strong pastoral and mining industry base.

Yours sincerely,

John Cherry

Chief Executive Officer
DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS OF SUGGESTED CHANGES:

A. Cook, Tablelands, Hinchinbrook

It is proposed that Tablelands be retained, but that the area formerly in Johnstone Shire south of Henderson Road (Wangan) and north of the former Johnstone Shire boundary, plus the town of South Mission Beach be added. This follows the transport corridor of the Palmetton Highway and links two areas dominated by intensive agricultural industries (horticulture, sugar, dairy). There are strong transport links between Mareeba, Atherton and Innisfail. The main centres of Tablelands Regional Council would also now be included in a single seat which would retain the name of Tablelands.

Cook be extended south to include Carpentaria, Croydon and Etheridge shires. These shires were part of Cook from its creation in 1972 until the last redistribution (1999). The shires have a stronger community of interest to Cairns in the east (where the Cook electorate office is) rather than Mt Isa in the west along the Gulf Development road, and similar industries and social structures to the rest of the Cape York Peninsula communities included in Cook. To meet future quota requirements, Cook would need to also include Chillagoe and Mt Molloy from Tablelands (ecds 3030206, 3030211, 3030105, 3030106, 3030301, 3030302, 3030310, 3030318).

Hinchinbrook would lose the remainder of the former Johnstone Shire plus South Mission Beach (3040107, 3040112, 3040108, 3040111) to Tablelands, bringing it under quota. It would also lose Wangan to Mulgrave (ecds 3012504, 3012508, 3012509, part 3012502). It is suggested that this should be offset by the addition of Charters Towers Regional Council. Charters Towers, North Beaches and Ingham each look to Townsville as the key regional centre. There are also strong road links between the coastal strip and Charters Towers. The Federal Electorate of Kennedy also encompasses both areas.

Mt Isa would extend south to include the Longreach Region (Longreach, Isisford, Ilfracombe). While Longreach has a stronger association with Gregory than Mt Isa, Longreach is connected to Mt Isa by a sealed national highway (Landsborough Highway), and has a similar pastoral based economy to much of the extended Mt Isa electorate. The revised electorate would have the advantage of being a little bit smaller than the ECQ proposal (359,000 sq. km rather than 570,000 sq km) and have a slightly larger actual enrolment (19,700 compared to 19,370).

Gregory would be become a predominately Central Highlands seat, extending north to include the rest of the former Belyando Shire (including Moronbah), and losing the Longreach Region and the former Aruma Shire in the west.

Mulgrave would gain Wangan from Hinchinbrook, the area bound by Henderson Drive and the South Johnstone River (3012504, 3012508, 3012509, part 3012502), and lose part of Mt Sheridan to Cairns (ecds 3012715, 3012112, 3012117, 3012118, 3012211, 3012222) north of Trafalgar Road. Cairns would gain Mt Sheridan from Mulgrave, and Barron River would be unchanged.
## NORTH QUEENSLAND SEATS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>28/9/2007</th>
<th>28/9/2014</th>
<th>CCD transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tablelands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>24,959</td>
<td>27,321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSE</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>Chillagoe, Mt Molloy ((3030206, 3030211, 3030105-6, 3030301-2, 3030110, 3030315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Arish, Mission Beach (3012502, 3012506-7, 3012510, 3012601, 3012603-14, 3040107-8, 3640111-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td>5070</td>
<td>5578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinchinbrook</td>
<td>28015</td>
<td>31768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hinchinbrook</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>22,739</td>
<td>24,779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSE</td>
<td>5070</td>
<td>5578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablelands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malgrave</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuringowa</td>
<td>3370</td>
<td>7979</td>
<td>Northern Beaches (3040804, 3040809-10, 3040812, 3040816-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters</td>
<td>7129</td>
<td>7478</td>
<td>Charters Towers Regional Council (3031201-303141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>27,457</td>
<td>33,888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barren River</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>29,306</td>
<td>33,946</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>26,742</td>
<td>28,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>White Rock (north of Sawpit Ck &amp; White Hill SS) (3012706, 3012711, 3012714, 3012716, 3012117 (pt), 3012118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>29,172</td>
<td>31,467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mulgrave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>28,626</td>
<td>37,589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSE</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>White Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinchinbrook</td>
<td>26,907</td>
<td>34,252</td>
<td>White Rock (north of Henderson Drive, Sth Johnstone River) (3012502 (pt), 3012504, 3012508)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WESTERN SEATS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District name</th>
<th>Area (sq. kms)</th>
<th>% of Area (Notional Electors)</th>
<th>Current Enrolment</th>
<th>Current &amp; Notional Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>196,936</td>
<td>3.939</td>
<td>27,482</td>
<td>31,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>316,400</td>
<td>6.228</td>
<td>24,490</td>
<td>30,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>314,234</td>
<td>6.285</td>
<td>24,430</td>
<td>30,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>274,360</td>
<td>5.487</td>
<td>24,999</td>
<td>30,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Isa</td>
<td>570,482</td>
<td>11.410</td>
<td>19,373</td>
<td>30,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>493,900</td>
<td>9.878</td>
<td>19,931</td>
<td>29,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrego</td>
<td>279,499</td>
<td>5.900</td>
<td>25,883</td>
<td>31,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>279,499</td>
<td>5.900</td>
<td>25,883</td>
<td>31,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrossian</td>
<td>105,360</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>28,437</td>
<td>30,144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECQ proposal: notional voters: 29,731
Recommended: notional voters: 27,683
From: Berit Williams [mailto:beritwill@squline1.com.au]
Sent: Sunday, 1 June 2008 4:16 PM
To: EQU User
Subject: Proposed State seat: Samsonvale

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to put a submission to you that the former State seat of Kurwongbah not be re-named Samsonvale, but instead Pine Rivers.

I have lived in this district for several decades, and identify with the name Pine Rivers. I also feel that we have the natural and important rivers here, the South and North Pine Rivers, while Lake Samsonvale, although important, is a man-made lake, and I don't identify with the name of Samsonvale at all.

Yours faithfully,
Mrs Berit Williams,
17 Killara Crescent,
Petro, Q, 4502
From: evanandcarol@bigpond.com [mailto:evanandcarol@bigpond.com]
Sent: Sunday, 1 June 2008 10:30 AM
To: EOO User
Subject: Objection to redistribution proposal

I would like to lodge an objection to the redistribution of state seats. I live on the Atherton Tableland where we have just had council amalgamations forced upon us with no consultation. The one advantage I could see in the amalgamation of four councils into one was the fact that instead of four mayors talking to one state member, it would now be one mayor and one member working together for the Atherton Tablelands. Now the major parties want to abolish the Tableland seat and absorb it into three seats. If this happens the mayor will be the sole voice for the the Tablelands talking to three state members. My local member will be seated in Charters Towers, five hours drive away. That is not local in any definition or form. The rate of growth in the north of the state and the south east corner, I believe, should be reason enough to create more seats rather than abolishing them.
2 June 2008

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Electoral Commission of Queensland
By Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Cc: Peter Wellington MLA, State Member for Nicklin
Cc: Jenny McKay, Division 5 Councillor, Sunshine Coast Regional Council

Dear Secretary

Objection to proposed changes to the electorate of Nicklin

I am writing to object to the exclusion of the town of Palmwoods from the electorate of Nicklin, and the resulting electoral separation of Palmwoods from the adjacent town of Woombey.

My home is in Palmwoods and my practice is based in Woombey. I have a good knowledge of and interest in both towns.

I submit that Palmwoods should remain in the electorate of Nicklin, for the following reasons:

1. **Community of interest with Nicklin**

Palmwoods has a strong historical connection to Nicklin. (And in fact the electorate was originally given that name primarily because it contained Palmwoods.)

Sir Francis Nicklin moved to Palmwoods in 1919 after serving in France in World War One. He began as a pineapple farmer but by 1932 he was elected as the area's State representative. He remained in parliament for 35 years and served as Premier of Queensland from 1957 to 1967.

Palmwoods is extremely proud of this historical connection. We have a park named in his honour, and a Sir Francis Nicklin memorial clock in our Main Street. His original farmhouse in Palmwoods still stands, on a street named Nicklin Road.
These historical bonds are important to the town and should be respected. Breaking them will have an adverse effect on community spirit, particularly among the older members of the community (many of whom served the country themselves) who still fondly remember the man who, even after being knighted, always insisted on being called just "Frank".

Separating Palmwoods from the electorate will send a message to younger members of the community that such history is not valued by our political machinery.

2. **Community of interest with Woombye**

There is a strong community of social and economic interests between Palmwoods and Woombye, and so they should remain in the same State electorate.

These ‘twin’ railway townships are extremely close — less than 5 minutes by rail or road. There is a continuum of residential housing between Woombye and Palmwoods along the Woombye-Palmwoods Road, and so the towns together form a single community.

They are similar towns of a similar size facing similar challenges.

They are defined by their proximity to the railways and do not enjoy the same tourist popularity as the towns in the Blackall Range (like Montville, Maleny or Mapleton) or the beach towns on the coastal strip.

The community formed by these towns is growing fast, and share the challenges of rapid transition from rural uses to residential. For instance the community formed by these towns is currently debating a controversial development proposal to erect residential units on an ex-pineapple farm midway between the townships. Compliance with the State Governments SEQ Regional Plan will certainly be an issue in the debate. However the proposed new boundary for Nicklin will run alongside the development area (along the Palmwoods-Woombye Road and Taintons Road) and so in terms of State representation it will effectively split the residents who are directly affected by the proposal. This will significantly reduce the capacity of the affected residents to effectively lobby a State representative.

Also the community formed by these towns will soon face the prospect of a large grocery retailer wanting to enter their area, such as Woolworths or Coles. The towns currently each have an independent grocery store — both of which are owned by the same family — to which many people are loyal and so the arrival of a large external retailer will be a major issue for the community to resolve, as it was recently in Maleny.

Also the towns also have a clear community of interest in relation to State schooling. Many Palmwoods children attend the Woombye State School, and vice versa. However the proposed new boundary for Nicklin will run alongside the Woombye State School, effectively separating it electorally from many of the families that it serves.

Woombye and Palmwoods have also forged close social bonds. The peak community groups in each town (the Woombye Community & Business Association and the Palmwoods Progress Association) regularly run joint community events for Australia Day and Christmas. They recently co-hosted a “Bush Christmas” function at the Nambour Show Grounds attended by more than 1000 people and raising more than $10,000 for charity.
The strong social ties between the communities were further strengthened in the wake of the tragic unsolved abduction of Daniel Morcombe in 2003. He walked from his home in Palmwoods to a bus stop in Woombey and was never seen again. The communities of Woombey and Palmwoods have rallied to support his family through annual events such as the “Dance for Daniel” and the “Walk for Daniel” which begins in Palmwoods and finishes in Woombey. The proposed new boundary for Nicklin passes through the point of his abduction, and follows the route he walked, effectively dividing the community that this terrible incident has brought together.

Also, in 2006 when controversial changes to the Nambour Connection Road were announced by the Department of Main Roads, a joint taskforce was formed by concerned residents from Woombey, Palmwoods and Nambour. This taskforce was able to negotiate amendments to the proposal with the assistance of our State representative, Peter Wellington. Having a single state representative made this process far easier than it would have been. There will continue to be a community of interest surrounding the future of the Nambour Connection Road.

Similar challenges now face the towns in relation to the State government’s proposed upgrade of the Landsborough to Nambour Railway that will effect massive upheaval in the towns and is not expected to be completed until 2020. Many issues surrounding this upgrade will need to be resolved between the community and the State, and this process will only be further complicated if the joint community needed to consult multiple state government representatives.

3. Communication and travel

The townships of Woombey and Palmwoods are just minutes apart, directly linked by the railway, and by the Palmwoods-Woombey Road and the Old Palmwoods Road.

There is also a well-used bikeway between Woombey and Palmwoods along the Palmwoods-Woombey Road.

4. Physical features

Under the SEQ Regional Plan, the urban footprints of the two towns are already very close and may in time merge. There is already effective conurbation between the towns.

By contrast the nearest towns to Palmwoods in the Glasshouse electorate are Eudlo and Montville. There are separated from Palmwoods by extensive tracts of rural land and, as a result, the social and economic links between these towns and Palmwoods are not as strong.

5. The boundaries of existing electoral districts

Woombey and Palmwoods are in the same division of the Sunshine Coast Regional Council (Division 5). They are also in the same Federal electorate (Fairfax). They were also once in the same State electorate (Nicklin) prior to the proposed redistribution.
The proposed southern boundary of Nicklin should be moved to the south of Palmwoods, and should follow the existing line that demarcates the Federal electorates of Fisher and Fairfax.

This would allow the strong historical bond between Palmwoods and Nicklin to be preserved, while also recognizing the community of social and economic interest between Woombye and Palmwoods, and their physical proximity.

6. **Demographic trends**

Prior to the redistribution, Nicklin was the only Sunshine Coast electorate that remained within the allowed 10% tolerance of the quota, so the need to reduce its size was not as great as other electorates in the region.

After the proposed redistribution, Nicklin will be about 2% under the quota, with capacity to easily absorb Palmwoods without accelerating the need for a further redistribution before the stipulated time.

Can you please give these matters due consideration before finalising the redistribution.

Yours faithfully,

David Wise
From: Carol Petrie - Albert Riesler [mailto:casbert@petos.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 2 June 2008 4:18 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: re: redistribution of Tableland

Dear Sir, Madam,

I would like to raise my concern with you about the the cutting up of the Tableland seat which is held by the very capable member Rosa Lee Long who is treasured by everyone on the Tableland. To put Atherton with Charters Towers is ridiculous. The Tablelanders has completely different interests to the area of Charters Towers. This is another case of "Big Brother" coming in by stealth and to tell us what is "good" for us. Like the amalgamation of the shires and forcing us to have fluoride in our drinking water. It looks like that you just want to get rid of Rosa Lee Long, because she does such a good job for this area. The system has been working quiet well as it is, so why fix it? This area is growing more and more and we need every bit of representation we can get!

I hope you take notice of what I am saying and rethink your decision.

Yours sincerely
Albert Riesler
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

THIS ALL WRONG, WE WILL EFFECTIVELY, BE OUT OF REPRESENTATION
29th May, 2008

The Electoral Commission,
Locked Bag 2304,
BRISBANE. Q. 4001

To whom it may concern

Re: Proposed changes to electoral boundaries

I wish to make the following submission in relation to the proposed changes to the boundaries for Queensland in particular the abolition of the electoral of Fitzroy and how it affects the township of Duaringa.

1. The town of Duaringa has been included in the electorate of Callide along with the portion of the southeastern section of the old Duaringa Shire including the section which adjoins the town of Duaringa between Dunne's Road and the Capricorn Highway.
2. The balance of the rural area surrounding the town of Duaringa is proposed to be included in the electorate of Gregory.
3. The proposal would have the rural areas adjoining the town of Duaringa in 2 different State Electorates with two different representatives, thus disenfranchising one rural area adjoining Duaringa from the town. Section 1 of the redistribution criteria states that the Commission must consider the extent to which there is a community of economic, social. It is to be assumed that the whole of the rural area surrounding the town would have the same community of interest.
4. The town of Duaringa is part of the Central Highlands Regional Council with its headquarters in Emerald.
5. Why was more consideration not given to at least attempting to follow new Local Government boundaries.
6. The old Duaringa Shire area currently has no representation on the Central Highlands Regional Council partly I feel because of its geographic location in relation to the heavier populated areas of the regional council and now the electoral commission wishes to disenfranchise the Duaringa town further by incorporating it in a State Government Electorate that is different to the majority of the balance of the region.
7. If the quota system of defining boundaries leaves the state with communities that end up stuck in an area where they have no community of economic, social or other interests then perhaps the Commission should look at recommending to the State Government that the system of distribution of electoral boundaries should be changed to make it more relevant to the communities that are affected.

Yours sincerely,

Carol Finger
Hi I am a resident at Struck Oil which is 5km from Mount Morgan and 35km from Rockhampton. Which was in the Fitzroy Electoral Area.

I would think that the obvious thing to do with residents from the Fitzroy Electoral Boundary (if it has to be wiped out) is incorporate the existing boundary into the closest Electoral Boundary.

That would be Rockhampton or Keppel not Mirani as proposed.

I wish to voice my opinion against the proposed electoral changes to our electoral boundaries which was Fitzroy and now will be Mirani.

1. We have just had a council amalgamation which now means that the main office for our Regional Council is now Rockhampton. Would it not make sense to make our Electoral Boundary Rockhampton.

2. To change our electoral boundary to Mirani where the likely office will be Mackay is ridiculous when we are closer to Rockhampton or Keppel electoral boundary. Would it not make sense that we would have the same aspirations and problems with a closer electoral boundary.

3. With the price of petrol sky rocketing and telecommunications not that cheap, it seems irresponsible of a government department to make up a boundary which inconveniences the residents when a closer electoral boundary is within closer proximity. Would it not make sense that we would want to drive and phone a closer electoral office.

4. I hope that the electoral commission will reconsider these proposed changes to our area by keeping Fitzroy or incorporating our area with Rockhampton. Would it not make sense that this would make our area more uniform within the state.

Thanking you for your time to listen to a resident of Queensland.

Lorna Ressell
220 Struck Oil Road
Struck Oil Qld 4714
From: John & Pam Tendero [mailto:jpte@bigpond.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 3 June 2008 2:09 PM
To: [ECQ User]
Subject: Electorate Name

Good afternoon,

I wish to add my support to the suggestion by several people, including our current State Member for the new name of what has been the Kurwongbah electorate to become Pine Rivers instead of Samsonvale.

Until very recently, I was president of the Pine Rivers U3A. The name "Pine Rivers" has a long tradition and is well known as a community of interest. One only has to look in the telephone directory to see how many organisations and businesses have the name of "Pine Rivers" in their title.

There is a Pine Rivers school and a "Pine Rivers Press" newspaper.

Since the name was lost in the Council amalgamation, it would be very important to the community to once again have the name recognised in some way.

Even interstate, the name Pine Rivers is well known - by comparison, the name "Samsonvale" has no significance in the area, is not well known and does not represent any community or locality.

I am aware that "Kurwongbah" was the name of a lake in the area and that "Samsonvale" is also the name of a lake in the area. However we now have a unique opportunity to have a large electorate in the State represented by a well known and identifiable name that represents a community rather than a lake.

I do hope that consideration can be given to the suggestion.

Regards

John Tendero
From: Wilfred Herefield (mailto:wilfred@ozemail.net)
Sent: Tuesday, 3 June 2008 7:21 PM
To: EQ user
Subject: Change to State Electoral Boundaries

Once again we see this present state government hiding behind dark glasses in the changing of state seats in North Queensland. Right I remind all the politicians that the Tablelands electorate has always been remembered all over Australia as the place where the safety of the country depended on the 6th 7th and 9th Army Divisions and ancillary troops who were trained on the Tablelands for the defence of Australia. Let me also remind the politicians that each year in August many exservicemen and their families come to the VE Day celebrations at Rocky Creek from all parts of Australia and would be greatly disappointed that the Tablelands electorate would lost to posterity in the wilderness of Macrossan.

I lived on the Atherton Tablelands for 46 years until moving to Bundaberg 18 months ago and I still have very fond memories of the beautiful Tablelands and would hate to see it linked with Charters Towers and the wide open spaces of bushland further south towards Mackay.

Please let some of the staff of the Queensland Redistribution Commission get out of their offices and see first hand the areas that are involved and not look only at maps and talk so some of the locals.

Wilfred O Herefield Bundaberg
Fran Clayton

12 Theresa Close, Woree, 4868

Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Level 6, Forestry House
160 Mary Street,
Brisbane 4000

To whom it may concern.

I wish to protest against the redistribution of the seat of Tablelands. The proposed new seat of Macrossan which will incorporate the majority of the Tablelands residents runs all the way down to Mackay. Creating larger and larger electorates makes them harder for the elected representative to give real time to the residents due to the distance needed to cover them.

Surely there is a better way to give representation to people rather than the formula just being numbers based. I trust that the bureaucrats making these decisions have spent some time in the areas and looked at the practicalities of covering such vast areas rather than just doing the theory by punching numbers into a computer.

I reiterate that I object to the current plans for redistribution.

Yours sincerely,

Fran Clayton
From: Richard Hole [mailto:richard.hole@truesolutions.info]
Sent: Thursday, 5 June 2008 10:19 AM
To: ECU User
Subject: Electoral redistribution solution.

Richard Hole,
9 Leonard St.,
Toowoomba 4350.
Ph 4603447.
e-mail richard.hole@truesolutions.info
A reply by email is preferred.

Hi

I think the best way to solve the electoral redistribution problem would be to make seats smaller if they are over populated, as in the South East. It would be best if all of a new seat falls inside the boundaries of the overlapping older seat. New territory should not be added to any seat where possible. This would mean that the people would be adequately represented by their local member and live close to them. The members would also maintain their support base. This would also save members, and other people traveling great distances to cover the electorate, which would in turn save fuel and pollution.

The current proposal of increasing the size of some seats like Tablelands is ridiculous and will cause major problems. The seat of Tablelands is probably the worst affected with the redistribution, as not only will it’s size be greatly increased, but the redistribution will also divide the new local Tableland Regional Council and two main centres into two seats. Currently the local council is in the one seat.

Could you please confirm that you receive this email and let me know what you think.

Your help will be appreciated,

Regards Richard.
To whom it may concern

I wish to lodge a submission regarding the proposed change of electoral boundaries which will remove the seat of Tablelands and replace it with an entity better called the Electorate of Leftovers. My submission is based on the following grounds.

- Lack of community of interest
- Lack of meaningful representation
- Logistics of servicing such a vast area

Section 46 of the Electoral Act 1992 requires that the redistribution be based on defined criteria, and it is around those criteria that I base my submission.

The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district

The southern Tablelands has little economic community of interest with the central western mining towns included in Charters Towers. The southern tablelands area comprises intensive agriculture, (potatoes, corn, vegetables, tree crops, dairy). Likewise our regional interests lie with the Cairns area. We are included within the footprint of the new Cairns Regional Plan 2025 — not within any regional planning process based on Charters Towers, Mackay or Townsville.

The Tablelands has no social community of interest with the dry country mining towns of central Qld. We are not coal or gold towns; we are intensive, wet climate farming communities with connections to the wet tropics. The only community of interest we share with central Qld is that we are less densely settled leftovers located away from the coast.

The Commission may also consider the boundaries of local government areas to the extent that it is satisfied that there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each local government area

The Atherton Tablelands Shires have just gone through the local government amalgamation process where our 4 tableland local governments were amalgamated based on a perceived community of interest based around geographical and physical similarities, and service of the region by the same newspapers (Andrew Fraser pers. comm. Feb 2008). We are now being divided up again based on another quite contradictory perceived community of interest that has us lumped in with coal mining towns and dry savanna goldfields. Again, this criteria has been ignored by the need to increase electoral enrolments for Charters Towers. Instead there is an option to unite Kuranda and place it within the Tablelands electorate where it has remained after the local government amalgamations.
The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district

The proposed seat of Macrossan is so large and sprawling as to be unmanageable, both for the elected member and for the constituents. The elected member will need to advertise in at least 3 large regional papers to get messages out. The likelihood of regular, much less frequent, trips hundred of kilometres from the members home base of Charters Towers to the northern edges where Tablelands now sits, is remote. Even with the best intentions, there will be insufficient time and resources to provide a regular service to our part of the world. Thus the probability of adequate representation is diminished by the great distances involved and the logistics required.

We are currently a small voice in the country, but at least we have a voice. The south eastern corner will continue to dominate – but the Tablelands towns need real representation too.

The physical features of each proposed electoral district

There are very few if any geographical or physical similarities within the existing seats to satisfy this criterion. The western goldfields and southern coal mining towns within Charters Towers are totally dissimilar in terms of industry, landuse, geography and climate to the major populated parts of the Tablelands which are within the Wet Tropics bioregion. We have more in common with Mulgrave and Cairns than central Qld – even down to sharing a local paper.

The boundaries of existing electoral districts

The boundaries of the existing electoral districts define areas that share similar characteristics. Charters Towers comprises mainly mining towns and extensive cattle grazing interests in the dry savanna, while the Tablelands largely comprises the wet tropical rainforests and the intensively farmed agricultural uplands (corn, dairy, potatoes, tree crops) of the Atherton Tablelands along with a drier western area more similar to Cook. Amalgamating these two quite disparate areas together does not follow any logic other than uniting the leftovers after separating them out from all the faster growing coastal areas to the east. This criterion has been ignored in favour of increasing electoral enrolments for Charters Towers at the expense of meaningful representation.

This boundary change comes at a time of major local government disruption which has put pressure on representation at the local level. Locally our small farming communities are within a LGA the size of Tasmania; now we are lumped into a state government seat exceeding 100,000km² and divided between 3 seats. As we are at the margins of all three seats we will have little meaningful representation at this level either.
Instead of this redistribution model, there is an option to unite Kuranda and place it within the Tablelands electorate where it remained after the March local government amalgamations, and to retain the northern part of the Tablelands within the seat of Tablelands rather than moving it into Cook. Charters Towers has more in common with Townsville-Thuringowa area as that is their main supply base and port, and makes more community of interest sense to look at boundary changes between these areas. Cook has more in common with the western parts of the former Mareeba Shire and adding these Tablelands areas to Cook while including all of Kuranda within the Tablelands would make more community of interest sense than the proposed changes.

Dr Nicky Moore PIA

63 Woolleys Rd
Millaa Millaa
QLD 4886

5 June 2008
To Whom it may concern.

I would sincerely like to voice my objection to the proposed boundary changes that will wipe out Mount Morgan from the old Fitzyroy electorate to the new Mirani electorate.

Mr. Malone, who is based in Sarina is so far north that I believe we will be severely disadvantaged our needs at Mount Morgan are aligned to Rockhampton electorate of which we can have a chance in meeting with the local member, if and when any local problems arise. I sincerely believe that the distance of approximately 350 Kms is out of the question as being parsoners the time and costs, fuel, wear and tear and accommodation, to meet Mr. Malone for a variety of reasons which makes it and the citizens of Mount Morgan disadvantaged.

-6 JUN 2009

Sincerely,

Eric D. Barnes.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Lock and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, the five previous shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1900 Kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland, is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in the North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that...
Alice is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Moranbah in a particular.

There is no community interest between the wet tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

G. Prior.
From: Arne Bold (mailto:aildarm@hotmail.com)
Sent: Friday, 6 June 2008 1:07 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Queensland Redistribution Commission

To Whom it May Concern

Where do the people have a right? So far, in the ever-growing community of Ravenshoe and surrounds (Tablelands Region) everything has been "-stickily" done.

Firstly, with the amalgamations of council - the communities of the Tableland areas had a week to object to a proposal of the above, only those with post office boxes received this first letter, people in the town of Ravenshoe never had delivery of such a "have your say and an opinion on council amalgamations" letter. Those that did receive such a letter had no time to reply or object. Groups from the community set up "Shame" meetings - of course, we all become apathetic as next we had to go to the polls. The general consensus was "I'm not voting".

Secondly, we didn't know why we were voting or who we were supposed to vote for as far as a "Mayor" is concerned. Most people in Ravenshoe and surrounds didn't vote - or because of a "line" went along and marked "nothing" (donkey vote) just to get their name struck off the electoral roll. Then came along the "Rates Notice" which I am still paying off in installments as the "jump in rates" was ridiculously high - it was the only talk about town at the time. No time for any objection before voting. I am a full-time student (52 years old) on Austudy and feeling extremely threatened in all areas that a so-called government concerned. Not to mention pensioners, disability "New Start" people or people on low income, especially in an area where statistics show third highest per capita of unemployment in Australia. We are classified as Rural/Remote and all struggling, most still living in conveners. How do you "government-employed" people ever begin to understand?

For you to decide about our future and future generations by re-distribution will only isolate us all the more. We still have identity in the Tablelands Region, we are proud, we love Rosa Leo Long MP, she had a wonderful personal approach to our communities and the only government official whom the people can turn to and she listens and acts. How ridiculous including Marramba to Cape York and then down south to the hinterland of Mackay, such vast areas with no connection to the Tablelands whatsoever.

Rosa is doing us proud, leave her in her seat of the Tablelands Region please.

Yours sincerely,

Elisa Wright

Arne Plathé
From: Sharon Brooks [mailto:chookah1@bigpond.com.au]
Sent: Friday, 31 January 2003 11:31 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Tableland Electorate

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane, Qld. 4001.

Sir/Madam,
As a Tableland Electorate voter for 37 years, I wish to strongly object to the excising proposals that have been put forward to your members, none of whom have any idea of the difficulties we are already encountering through the forced amalgamation of our Shire. Our roads, rail and bus services, to say nothing of phone, health, police and education problems, are all a disgrace to a State that calls itself "SMART", and can not figure out where the majority of it's income is generated.

I have been in Brisbane recently, and it's obvious that every possible effort and resource is being directed into your area, while a large portion of the so-called Highway One (Bruce) up in the North is little better than a goat track, and the side roads degenerate into worse than goat tracks. Our population has already outgrown our so-called "SERVICES", and our only voice in a Government that is intent only on fostering the big businesses that pander to it, is Rose Lee Long. I am a cynic, and can see that the only REAL reason for doing this is to eliminate a lady who truly has the well-being of her electorate at heart, and NO hidden agenda.

I hope that you members will deny you masters wishes in this matter, and bring some sensibility and fair mindedness into your decision.

Yours Optimistically,

Zoe Brooks

Marcia Zoe Brooks
1D Kuradilla Street
Ravenshoe, Qld. 4888
From: Bill Marsh [mailto:wma53832@bigpond.net.au]
Sent: Saturday, 7 June 2008 5:47 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Opposition, Redistribution Tablelands

7th June 2008
16 Ceola Drive,
Mareeba 4880
FNQ.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Dept. of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there a strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

I believe the following have not been considered by the commission

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 - Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters

(1) The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.
(2) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district.

(3) The physical features of each proposed electoral district.

(4) The boundaries of existing electoral districts.

(5) Demographic trends in the state, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100,000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Dept. of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.

Yours Sincerely
W.M. Marsh
Percyvale Station  
Einasleigh Q 4871  
Phone: 07 40625506  
Email: percyvalestation@esat.net.au

7 June 2008

Electoral Commission of Queensland  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
BRISBANE QLD 4001  
email:ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Sir/ Madam,

We, Allyn and Natasha Zabel, am writing our objection to the proposed redistribution by the Queensland Electoral Commission. We, at the moment, have been getting a very good representation from Shane Knuth M.P. We are graziers who are getting more and more disadvantaged, in our opinion.

If the redistribution goes ahead in its current form then we will be put in the Mt Isa electorate, which no one in this entire shire has any affiliation. We generally do business within our shire, (Georgetown, Forsayth, Einasleigh, Mt Surprise) or our residents go to either the tablelands or more often Charter Towers. Personally we deal with Charters Towers mainly because our children attend the Charter Towers School of Distance Education. No one in our district has ever been to Mt Isa!

The redistribution is another shock for a very remote, rural community. We have 3 hours to travel to get to most of the towns in our shire, let alone going across country to attend a meeting with our new proposed representative in Mt Isa that has no idea how we live, what we have to endeavour, or any other issues we have. It is interesting to note that to get to Mt Isa, on a sealed road, we have to travel to Charters Towers because the Lynd Highway is unsealed and a national disgrace.

The proposed redistribution is not only affecting the constituents of this electorate but it is going to severely impact on the people representing this shire and our area. How is someone going to travel on our roads, or fly aeroplanes when there is no all weather airstrips in our particular area?

The proposed electorate is being said to be as big as France. Please reconsider this decision, it will impact and cause a lot more hardship on those in society that are getting hardest hit by global demands, i.e. increase in oil prices (diesel fuel record prices), cattle stump and all the day to day hardships faced by people living and working on the land. We hope you will reconsider the redistribution.

Yours Sincerely,

Allyn and Natasha Zable
9th June 2008

Barbara Jennings
P. O. Box 1572
MAREEBA QLD 4880

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001

I am writing to register my strong disagreement to the proposed split of the Tablelands Electorate.

- At the regional level we have just been amalgamated, with the majority of locals in disagreement with the move, and now you propose to carve us up on the state level. How absurd!
- How can such vast areas with geographical, climatic, agricultural and industrial differences be governed adequately and satisfactorily under your proposed changes? How can we have a united voice with these differences, or is this your strategy to gain more power and control in the South East? It seems the regional people do not matter a great deal to those in their "ivory towers".
- The Tablelands has been steadily growing in population and it is estimated that by 2025 there could be around 100,000 people. That is only four elections away. The unnecessary burdens and costs seem ludicrous.
- Parliament was instituted so that people could have their say in local, state and federal government. What has happened that this is no longer so?
- Do not remove an ancient boundary stone or encroach on the fields of the fatherless, for their Defender is strong; he will take up their case against you. (Proverbs 23:10,11)

Barbara Jennings

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane, QLD 4001

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to express my concern and objection to the recent announcement on the redistribution proposal for the removal of the Tablelands seat. The suggestion that by removing the Tablelands seat the constituents of that seat would be adequately represented by the seats of Mareeba and Cook is ludicrous. We own property in Kuranda (Barron River Electorate) and Ravenshoe (Tablelands Electorate).

The Tablelands region has recently undergone an amalgamation procedure of four shires that was not in the best interest of those concerned. All attempts to ascertain why Mareeba should have been included in a greater Tablelands Regional Council went completely unanswered in all correspondence received from various government offices. However, amalgamation has now taken place and we are beginning to adjust to new councillors and a new mayor only to find that the Queensland Redistribution Commission now feels it should shatter the cohesive integrity of an already fragile region.

To remove the Tablelands seat and place part into Mareeba (centred in Charters Towers - 5 hours south of Atherton) and part into Cook (centred in Cooktown) does not make sense at all. In order for the area to be adequately represented we should maintain the current boundaries. Our population is growing as is our economy. In order for the infrastructure of the area to be adequately pursued we need strong local input from a Tablelands based seat. The constituents of the Tablelands share common interests and with the new Tablelands Regional Council in place we will be able to better co-ordinate services and infrastructure to our region. By removing the Tablelands seat you will again be dividing a region that truly deserves to be better served.

This appears to be a politically motivated decision that neither benefits the citizens of our region or the region itself. Perhaps it is time to seriously consider a State representative North Queensland. The Southeast corner seems happy to usurp most of the assets that are generated throughout the state. Without reasonable representation we are certainly NOT going to be adequately represented in Queensland.

We beseech you to reconsider the decision to abolish the seat of Tablelands.

Yours truly

[Signature]
President: A.B. Fielding OAM
Secretary/Manager: Kevin Rouse

3 June, 2008

Electoral Commissioner,
Electoral Commission of Queensland,
Level 6 Forestry House,
160 Mary Street,
Brisbane, Qld. 4001

Dear Sir,

Re: Proposed boundary changes Stafford electorate

I write on behalf of the Burnie Brae community to voice our opposition to the proposed boundary changes for the Stafford electorate.

We believe that the proposed change of boundaries for Stafford would negatively impact on the continuity of services that we offer to the community. Burnie Brae has been a significant Seniors' Centre in Chermside for the past 25 years. Many of the issues and concerns that we seek to address are specific for this area because of the high population of Seniors residing in Chermside. Most of our members are residents of the suburbs of Chermside and Kedron. Under the proposed change these suburbs will be divided by the Gympie Road boundary, placing our Centre under the auspices of Nudgee with many of the Seniors that we are offering services to residing within the electorate of Stafford.

If the proposed change were to go ahead, our Centre along with a few streets in the suburbs of Chermside and Kedron will be represented by the member for Nudgee. Our specific concerns with this change is that as the Member for Nudgee is only representing a few streets within the region that we are servicing which we believe will disadvantage him in terms of his knowledge and understanding of the issues that exist for our members in the suburb of Chermside.
We have enjoyed a long and supportive relationship with our current Member for Stafford, Stirling Hinchliffe and from the perspective of Burnie Brae Centre, we do not believe that the changes that are being proposed will be beneficial to our members and clients.

Please consider our letter carefully before making changes that will detrimentally effect our service to the community.

Yours faithfully,

Kevin Rouse,
Secretary/Manager
Dear Commissioners: A mess of Mrs in non-metropolitan Qld.

The Electoral Redistrict is profoundly upset by too many electorates outside the metropolitan area, inadequately often, beginning with the letter "M", being either too big or too small. I prefer to Moree, Mackay and Mundaringbilla plus crops of the latter, and Mareeba, Mt. Isa, Mirani plus Cook, Barron River and Gregory being also badly affected. Nearby Electoral Districts are also affected.

For over half a century, the Education system effectively indoctrinated compulsive Californian coastal lifestyle — or be treated like Z-raters. This redistricting worsens this matters. From the Meriton Tablelands to Wallangarra inland intermediate Queenslander deserved less better.

This state is so vast that electorates over 800,000 km² need to be more frequent, but we need no Electoral Districts over 500,000 km² and non-crossing Highways inland from Rockhampton and Townsville. In this part particularly in the Cairns and Mackay areas, the tiny electorate badly ignores 2001 Regional Division. It is unnecessary exclusive part with Blocks Division into the Cairns Biarchy joining Cook to enable better franchising being denied to people in Mt. Morgan effectively. Mt. Isa, Mackay and Mirani are terrible. Electorates unnecessarily apprehended. The main alterations I suggest are to join the main of
Gregory and Mt Isa to Rockhampton and Burdekin elect

d District respectively as new neighbors. To enable
this: Add Diamantina, Stanwell, Westwood, Boulder-
combe and Mt. Maroon to Gregory, Lake Clifton, Jervi,
Cayalla and places north of the highway north and east
of Alpha to Miranui. Add places south of Charters
Towers in the proposed Macrossan mostly to Burdekin which
needs most of Whitsunday Division 4, may be also Division 6
but not the big Bowen Hinterland now proposed. It is
important for Whitsunday to go no closer to Mackay than the
Southern Board of Division of Whitsunday and Mackay
Subdivision groups are you could without breaking pham "DC">

Proposed Macrossan as much as possible former Del
penny and Charters Towers to join Mt. Isa ample electors
needed to join to the Woodstock area in Burdekin. Both
Goobung and Etheridge, plus Divisions 1 and 6 of Tablelands
Could be to link with the Tablelands Regional Division
except Mount, Ruedang and possibly Division 3.

To keep Edgehill Cairns in Dorrigo River will force
Cairns to be skipped by Tablelands and possibly Northern Divisions if
the other two are extensive likely. Tablelands Division 3
has long links with Mclevey which needs rejoining.
It seems better to keep to Marian and for Mackay
Divisions in Macrossan and to bring both closer to
Cairns Airport.

Mossman and Morayfield, it seems better to join Banbury
and to restructure add northern areas of that proposal to
Morayfield. Out northern parts of proposed Sam-
son Dale with Glass House mountains and so enable
Coastal to be in Morayfield. A couple of hundred
km south extra to Morayfield is inappropriate.

Hoping you can see and resolve in this.

Yours sincerely, Bruce Alexander.
Frank & Beryl Grepo
1 Ray Road
MAREEBA QLD 4880.
Ph (07) 40628003 or (07) 40621055

Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001.

RE: Protest to the proposed carve up of the Tablelands
A possible loss of our Local Member

Dear Sir/Madam,

We would like to take this opportunity to register our protest & strong disagreement against the proposed redistribution of the Tablelands area.

As voters and business owners in the Tablelands town of Mareeba, we are of the opinion that a split of the two major tableland towns of Mareeba and Atherton would greatly hinder progress in the region. We strongly feel that this area needs to be under the same umbrella as it has been for past years, to enable growth and progress of both towns to assist each in growth, business and tourism. This area needs to remain intact as one, not split as the current proposal.

Having a Tableland’s Member, means the Tablelands Community will progress to compliment both the north and southern Tablelands area. Our current Local Member, Ross Lee Long has been a very effective advocate and we would like to see this remain.

We did not get to vote, or have a referendum on the of the idea on the of the founding of the Tableland Shires to one Regional Council, to unite on Local government matters; as least we should be able to keep our State Government Local Member to ensure our issues from the whole community are heard by one voice, one focal point, who has the whole of the Tablelands progress and welfare at the fore, for all the right reasons.

We feel to see how Charters Towers can help the Southern Tablelands area move forward with the Northern Tablelands who will be under a completely different area to go forward together.

Should you need to contact us regarding our concerns, please do not hesitate to contact at the above address or phone numbers.

Yours faithfully,

Frank & Beryl Grepo
From: Jim Hooper [mailto:jim@hoopersengineering.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 June 2008 8:10 PM
To: ECO User
Subject: Boundary changes in Nicklin and Glasshouse.

Ref to your boundary changes in Nicklin and Glasshouse by putting Montville Fluxton etc in Glasshouse electorate.
This is an excellent move as many people from this area use Maleny as a shopping town.

Being on the same plateau it would make a Member of Parliament work easier as voters have a similar interest.
I would guess by the number of people I have spoken to, that this view would be the view of the silent majority of the voters.

Trusting that your decision will not be altered. J M Hooper  222 Main Rd Montville. 4560.
From: Chris & Wanda Townley [mailto:ChrisWanda.Townley@bigpond.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 June 2008 11:27 PM
To: EQU User
Subject: Comment upon the proposed redistribution 2007/08

I've attached my comments regarding the proposed redistribution. Could you please see that it gets to the appropriate party

Christopher Townley

57 valley View Drive

Meringandan West

Queensland  4352
Section 46 of the Act requires that, in proposing the proposed redistribution, the Commission must consider the following matters:

1. The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district;
2. The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district;
3. The physical features of any proposed electoral district;
4. The boundaries of existing electoral districts;
5. The boundaries of existing electoral districts;
6. The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district;

The Commission may also consider the boundaries of local government areas in the extent that it is satisfied that there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each local government area. It is interesting that, in the CCQ's draft bill, they have a list of all the regions in the state, yet no western regions are listed. The page identifiers also suggest removal of your council.

Criteria 1 Section 46

1. The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district;
2. The physical features of any proposed electoral district;
3. The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district;
4. The boundaries of existing electoral districts;
5. The boundaries of existing electoral districts;

The proposed boundary for Nanango did on some way accord with the previous config, however these boundaries clearly have no special application in relation to the previous criteria.

Chapter 5: Demographic trends in the state. With a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends, the need for another electoral redistribution will not arise under section 45 before it does under section 45.

The area of growth over the last 10 years will be in the Clarence/Wallaga area, with growth being likely to be in the dormitory town areas such as Nanango, Toowoomba, and Dalby.

As a result, I voted in the electorate of Darling Downs, and I voted independently at the last election, as did a number of people in the previous division who had been elected. Your policy in this case demonstrates the need for a review of the electoral boundaries, which not only ensures a fair and democratic process, but also respects the wishes of the people.
From: John Bams [mailto:percyriver@bigpond.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 June 2008 9:10 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Redistribution

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Please find attached our letter of objection.

Regards
Linda Bams
Secretary
Kedala & District Progress Assoc. Inc.
PO Ennalsleigh QLD 4971
8/6/08

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001

email:ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

RE: Charters Towers Electorate Redistribution

We herein wish to state our objection to the proposed redistribution of the present seat of Charters Towers with the present seat of Mt.Isa for the following reasons.

1. Distance to travel.
2. Time traveling (member and public)
3. Conditions of roads
4. Clash of public festivals/shows
5. Lack of all-weather air strips/safety
6. No air services
7. Price of fuel/travel costs
8. Unfair treatment i.e. human rights/working conditions
9. Low morale of constituents
10. Do not identify with Mt.Isa

1. As stated in the media, the new seat of Mt.Isa would be the size of the country of France. To fairly represent each person in this electorate, the elected member would be continually traveling by ear.

2. The member wouldn't have any time to meet specific groups if an urgent problem arose far from Mt.Isa and the time/distance traveling for the general public with the high price of fuel would lead to no representation for most remote people compared to the arrangements in an electorate in Brisbane with public transport readily available.

3. The road conditions over this vast area may be fair for the dry times of the year but are untrafficable for up to six months in some years. Unfortunately, not everyone lives beside a main road. Most large rivers and creeks still do not have bridges over them in 2008 and the majority of roads traveled are still unsealed.
4. Due to climatic conditions i.e. extreme heat/min in summer but pleasant, dry autumns/winters, a high percentage of large and small communities hold their respective annual shows or festivals in the cooler, drier season. At present, the local Charters Towers M.P. takes this opportunity to visit all social gathering to meet with his constituents in one convenient venue. How would this be possible in such a vast area as the proposed new Mt.Isa electorate as there aren’t enough available weekends in the dry season compared to the increased number of communities holding social events? Of course, as usual, the remote ones miss out!

5. Air travel could alleviate the distance problem but unfortunately, as with roads, the number of all-weather landing air-strips is small and most are remote and do not have reliable safety services near by.

6. As experienced now in Mt.Isa, there is not a regular, reliable air service so this mode of transport cannot seriously be contemplated.

7. With the price of fuel so high and going higher, travel costs are going to be a huge expense for the government. It actually would be more sensible to have more, smaller electorates due to increase costs in remote areas, than the present plan to make them bigger.

8. The long hours necessary to cover this new seat of Mt.Isa, reduces the time the elected representative has to spend with their family. This is inhumane, unfair and unjust and could possibly lead to the best candidates not wishing to take on this important position.

9. Regular visits from our local M.P. boosts morale for isolated citizens. If these visits are removed due to the increased size of the electorate, the feeling of low self esteem could become frequent with only selected larger towns being seen as important.

10. Most residents of this and many other shires have never been to Mt. Isa as most banking, business, schooling and health is done in towns to the east such as Charters Towers, Atherton and coastal destinations, not towards the western city of Mt.Isa.

We trust you will consider our reasons for this objection to the proposed redistribution as it will affect our everyday lives and we would like to see the said electorates stay as they currently are.

Yours faithfully,

Linda Burns
Secretary

C/- POST OFFICE • KENSALG • 4871
PHONE (PRESIDENT) • ALLYN ZABEL: 07 40625506 • FAX: 07 40625505
PHONE (SECRETARY) • LINDA BURNS: 07 40625307
PHONE (TREASURER) • NATASHA ZABEL: 07 40625506
Monday, June 2, 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Qld 4001

Dear Commissioner:

I would like to register a strong protest about your proposed elimination of the Tablelands seat.

This is a unique area which deserves to maintain its own identity, an identity which has already suffered a major blow with local shire amalgamations. The resultant evolution of the new Tablelands Regional Shire has yet to play itself out. At the very least, we would prefer to see discussion of a new disruption put off until amalgamation has been worked through and we have been able to assess, at least minimally, the real effects of establishing the new shire.

We, the voters, also need to have a full discussion of how and why these proposed boundary realignments emerged. The voters certainly should expect to have a full assessment of the financial, social and political implications before having to decide.

Changing the electoral boundaries not only splinters this cohesive region, but orients much of it away from the east, the coast and Cairns, a measure which defies the direction of the areas development over its entire history. The regional offices for every department or service are either in Atherton or Cairns, FAR NORTH Qld, NOT west or central Qld. or Cape York. This includes facilities such as Telstra, hospitals, DPI, EPA, Ergon to name a few.

There are many aspects to a change of this magnitude which need to be explored and taken through public consultation.

I hope that these far-reaching changes will not be made precipitously and without fully informing and consulting with the constituents who will be so drastically affected by inappropriate alterations. We, the voters, would find it particularly unfortunate if this hurried new initiative is, or even appears to be, driven by base political motivation.

Yours sincerely

Christine Doan
MW Zapala
PO Box 136
Malanda Qld 4865

June 1, 2008

Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Qld 4001

Dear Commissioner:

I would like to register a strong protest about your proposed elimination of the Tablelands seat, a suggestion which is just ludicrous.

This is a totally unique area that deserves to maintain its own identity, but that has already suffered a blow with local shire amalgamations. Apparently that decision was made because the previous 4 shires share such a "special connection", yet you are now denying this is the case? Your proposal to include this area into part of central/west/south Queensland is inconsistent at best, and totally lacks any sort of common sense or any remote practicality. Please explain the turn of events to me, so that I in turn can explain to other constituents? To date we have not received any sort of explanation about why this is even being considered. Aren't we the people who vote? Shouldn't we be informed?

How have you come to consider these proposed boundary realignments? It certainly will not help in any financial way to the region. Social and communication aspects of the area, built up over decades, will also be eliminated with your proposal.

You seem to have ignored the fact that Cairns is the main service centre for this region, and the 2025 plan clearly states the regions growth rate will continue to expand, more so than most other regions in the state. The regional offices for every department or service is either in Atherton or Cairns, FAR NORTH Qld, NOT West or Central Qld. This includes things like Telstra, hospitals, DPI, EPA, Ergon to name a few.

I would strongly suggest that you review your proposed elimination of the Tablelands seat, and restore this areas capacity to have some sort of voice.

Rosa Lee Long has been an excellent politician, available to the public for every scope and variety of issues, and does her best to help every single resident, and of which she has achieved a great deal. To try and depose of her and her position is similar to a communistic attitude, and is certainly not democratic, as were the amalgamation laws.

It seems obvious that yet again this decision has been made by people totally unfamiliar with any part of the state outside the city region in the south-east corner. I would suggest that if all of the facts presented still do not make sense, at least look on Google earth to clearly appreciate at least the physical differences between this area and the rest of the state.

I look forward to your earliest reply.

Yours truly,

M. W. ZAPALA
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Stamp]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304 
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ocq@ecq.qld.gov.au  

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

K. Muller
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of *economic, social, regional or other interests* within each proposed electoral district.
(b) The ways of *communication and travel* within each proposed electoral district
(c) The *physical features* of each proposed electoral district
(d) The boundaries of *existing* electoral districts;
(e) *Demographic trends* in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the *Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025* it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100 000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au  

28/05/2008  
Address  
35 CROFT RD  
Malahide 4865  

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

K. M. Casey
Queensland Redistributiton
Commission
Lockyer Bay 3304
Brisbane 400

Dear Commissioners,

I would like to express my strong opposition to the elimination of seat of Tablelands in the new Redistribution.

I have been a Tableland voter all my life and I am very upset at the decision. Our Tableland shire has been changed to include all the Tablelands and now you intend to break its shire in half to go to different seats.

We will have no representation at all. Please reconsider and leave us to make our own choice and have a voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

John Fry
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Date: 12 Jun 2008]
DEAR COMMISSIONERS,

WE WERE SHOCKED AT THE NEW BOUNDARIES OF THE LOGAN ELECTORATE NOT INCLUDING BORONIA HEIGHTS AND HILLCREST. THIS AREA IS ONE COMMUNITY LED BY A VERY CAPABLE MEMBER JOHN MCKEEL WHO HAS ACCOMPLISHED A LOT IN THIS AREA SUCH AS HEALTH CENTRES, RETIREMENT VILLAGE, NURSING HOMES, NOT TO MENTION NEW POLICE, AMBULANCE AND FIRE STATION, PLUS IS NOW WORKING ON A NEW TRANSPORT SYSTEM.

THIS ELECTORATE IS PROGRESSING IN LEAPS AND BOUNDS. I AM SURE THE SOUTHERN PART OF THIS ELECTORATE CAN BE TAKEN WHICH WOULD BE OF MORE INTEREST TO THE ELECTORATES DOWN THERE, LEAVING BORONIA HEIGHTS AND HILLCREST, WHICH CUTS OUT THE ACTUAL ELECTORAL OFFICE OF OUR SITTING MEMBER. IN LOGAN THE BORDER HAS BEEN EXTENDED AS FAR SOUTH AS JIMBOOMBA AND I AM SURE THESE RURAL PEOPLE HAVE NOTHING IN COMMON WITH OUR AREA.

WE WOULD LIKE TO OBJECT TO THE NEW BOUNDARIES WHILE IT WORKS WHY FIX IT.

YOURS FAITHFULLY,

DF & LJ SEVERNS
2nd June, 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

To Whom It May Concern

The Crestmead Community Centre is writing in regard to the invitation for submissions regarding the new proposed boundaries for the State electorate of Logan.

Crestmead Community Association Inc (CCAI) is a Community based and managed organization, established in 1993 and incorporated in May 1994. The Crestmead Community Association has since its inception, been pro-active in responding to the needs of the local community and maintains close links with its clients in the surrounding suburbs of Crestmead, Marsden, Logan Reserve, Park Ridge, Heritage Park, Regents Park and Browns Plains.

The Crestmead Community Centre proposes that the new boundary should keep to the existing boundary; that is, proceeding up Browns Plains Road to Trulson Drive and continuing down to Augusta Street into Julie Street. These are the main thoroughfares through these parts of Crestmead and are understood locally.

That will mean that the Logan electorate would be on the western side of Trulson Drive, Augusta Street, and Julie Street to Burnstead Road.

We believe that this realignment will facilitate and maintain the sense of community and strengthen the identity of these suburbs by uniting them in the one Logan electorate.

Yours sincerely,

George Thomas
President
C V Hill  
PO Box 569  
TOLGA  4882  

Qld Distribution Commission  

Dear Sir  
I am so saddened and discussed that you would even consider this blatant removal of our only real represented in Parliament for the Atherton Tableland. I have worked all my life and paid taxes to keep people like yourself in a position on high salaries to now have you turn on us with this now. (Gerrymander)  

This nonsense about numbers per MP is a lot of crap, No MP goes around and visits his or her constituents.  

If you are going to go ahead with this that will leave the Tablelands with a Party Hack in Charters Towers and we will never have our voice heard.  

I will never vote for a political party while the party comes first and the people come last.  

The only reason the people of the Tablelands always vote for Rosa Lee Long is because the three major parties are all puppets to a dictator from South East Qld.  

Disgruntled Voter  

Cecil V Hill.

Wednesday, 04 June 2008  

12 JUN 2009
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Qld 4001

Re: Retaining name, Mt Gravatt, for Electorate.

I wish to express keen disappointment on losing Judy Spence as our member.

She has been ever available, patient and understanding. Judy encompasses everybody, irrespective of race or social status. She is a capable representative, keenly involved in Mt Gravatt district. Her interest stems from her great grandfather, John Spence, who took up land in the 1880s and was among those responsible for the preservation of Mt Gravatt Mountain and construction of the first road to the summit.

Mt Gravatt residents are saddened by the disappearance of the name, Mt Gravatt, chosen by Government Surveyor Dixon in 1839 at a time of the Moreton Bay Penal Settlement.

We residents are fiercely dedicated to the district welfare, managing in 1977 to retain the showgrounds in a protracted legal battle with the Brisbane City Council, and to honour a 1964 election promise to provide the area with a library.

In view of the depth of community spirit, please, will you consider retaining the name, Mt Gravatt, for an electorate now incorporating part of our district.

Thank you

Yours faithfully

Clare Boulter  
(President)
The Proposed Redistribution Of Electorates

The Division is Fair enough now with new
local Government boundaries. The current new
Shire of Warwick Stanton is a bad idea I
live 78 K.M. from Warwick my so called
local member lives 75 K.M. from me, what
use is this. Now as ever higher a west of
Lawrence - Warwick Railroad has had no
local Govt Member for 12 years. Before the
stupid amalgamation of Shires by Government
my Tum as called member lived in Allora
Township. This member had no ties with my
area. I only had him once to look at a job.
He was (Dead loss) as if I needed to have a
job done on (Yalgai West Rd). I would go to
Warwick Council Office tell of a job that
needed doing the only thing I would have to
go back time time again) before I got any action
ever had to speak to treating Child then.
If a Kidney Transplant Patient had got sick
or infected on account of a poor job done by
Warwick Council on repairing the distance Rd.
the caught fast action by then. Then
What should be done is the Shire of Allora
a Clifton that was before amalgamation. These
2 Shires should be together. Not current
set up. Between Allora & Warwick that
came in 12 to 13 years back Fiji it was the
worst thing to even happen. My own
Example. My Rates jumped 40% in that
time a Big loss of services

P.T.O
The amalgamation drowned 927 acres of good land rates then to former Allora Shire Council was $12,000 - just before the amalgamation happened my father passed away he left my then mother and myself a $33,700 - 0 - debt unknown to me until reading of will. To fix up this huge cost I had to sell off over 500 acres of good land I was left with 37 acres my rates on this land is current $2,000 - 0 - if I still had 927 acres rates would be over $3,000 - 0 - what for (nothing) I want the 2 Shires of Allora Clifton to be made into 1 shire this would be a lot more sense (then is current) all land in these 2 Shires back onto each other all the way along. It would be much more sense then to have a Council 75 km away who have no idea of the area. The only time Warwick knew where you are is that time when they want money. Currently Southern Downs Shire Warwick Shanters have a debt between $12,000,000 to $23,000,000. Putting up rates is not the answer or creating costs to make money. I feel Warwick done over 3 years ago it now with the former State Government led by then Premier Peter Beattie going off to rockies acting under advice from some one at the age to enlarge Local Government areas all over Q to cut up Q into 4 pieces and is
Plain Radiculous Here we have a State Nr 54 Er W that covers 100000 acres Thousands of KM To look after off the area if Allora-Clifton are not put into area
1 The Surveying come into force, my member will be located at Hillmore and is simply Radiculous: As where off Allora-Clifton where together my Councilor would be 10 minutes away, Allora-Circled in Blue on map by re Backs onto Allora - Clifton Red Road in Circle, then Backs onto Blue line near Clifton Township It would be a lot more sense off the former Allora - Clifton Shire became (1)
 Instead of current (75 KM to Warwick) not paying good money to be wasted in a area that has no interest in us only Rat Time
If I need help for buy a fire to be put out, Clifton can get to job in 10 minutes or less where Allora some distance away as Clifton takes 1 hour to get to fire fire if needed
So let get out for put the old Shires of Allora-Clifton together 2 leave Warwick or Stanthorpe Become (1) on unboxed map out of paper the area Sandy Camp spotted inside circle is only a couple of miles from my property Circled on map So put Allora-Clifton together must more sense
Then Current Set Up:

Yours Truly

P.S. In War 764 Halsey West Rd PO Allora 4362 Q
Big change proposed for electorate

Changes proposed by the Queensland Redistribu-
tion Commission will see the state electorate of Cunningham and Burley Downs abolished.

The proposal is for the creation of a new electorate, to be called "Clifton".

With the two existing seats held by the Nationals at least one of the seats may be threatened by the election of a new seat.

Member for Cunningham, Stuart Copestake has represented the electorate for the Nationals since the 2006 election, while the Member for Burley Downs, Ray Hopper was elected as an independent candidate in 2006 but soon after was re-elected to the National party.

The decision of who will be put forward as candidate for the new seat will be made by the National party, which by then may not be a single organisation of the Nationals and Liberals, who are currently discussing a merger.

Clifton (the electoral division of which was created in 2006) is currently held by Individuals who are looking at options to keep the Liberals in the seat if the Liberals are losing their current hold on the seat.

The map in the right shows the current Electoral boundaries for the proposed electorate.

Queensland residents were first asked to offer comment on changes to electoral district bound-
daries at the end of last year.

The Queensland Government received 206 suggestions.

With the proposed new electoral boundaries now released, there is a further opportunity for public comment.

The Commission will consider any objections lodged prior to 31st July, 2006.

The Commission will make a decision in writing.

These can be sent to the Electoral Commissioner, Statewide Customer Service Centres, Level 6, 325 George Street, Brisbane 3001.

The Electoral Act requires that all objections be made available for public inspection.

The Commission is planning to release the final determination of new electoral boundaries in the Queensland Government Gazette on 23rd August.
1 June 2008

Po. Box 554
Kawungan 4678

Old Redistibution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane 4001

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my (our family's) strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tabland in your proposed Redistibution.

The Tablands has always boast close community identity. The isolation + rural remoteness creates a need for representation of a group of people who suffer higher costs of living because of remoteness. Our children suffer as they do not have employment opportunities without major hassles caused by travel + accommodation. Our phone + internet is sub standard + often non existant. Bus + transport services irregular. School + other study - choiceless.

We need a representative who understand - Rosa lives amongst us + we depend on her & her.

Without Rosa + Bob Katter I know my family's life would have been much worse. I depend on them - we rely on them regularly. I cannot imagine having our representative in Charters Towers. With HUGE petrol prices - Charters towers is now a place I would never go to unless an emergency occurred. Our fuel costs with 4 children now is $1000/mth. This is just Army cadets + music + school. You + goot just keep taking away + making
everything for families. More and more difficult.

We have 2 incomes and barely live anymore + taking just another of our facilities away adds to the slow death of family life.

Our hospital is never open at night anymore. Although we live 56 km away from it we can no longer ring up and ask for help. We have to call someone at the hospital in Brisbane to see if it warrants the hospital.

We have no swimming pool to teach our kids to swim. Our State High School is in a chronic state. Our food prices are huge compared to larger towns.

Our council members + workers are not our neighbours anymore. Things are just getting worse and worse.

This year last in every way I feel our govt has abandoned us. My 2 children struggling at uni are not allowed to be a part of our tax claims anymore because they live away in Townsville but they are not independent either.

Govt would like us to divorce our kids + our husbands to get the help needed. Govt pays our teenagers to leave home + have babies + get paid for it. Govt prefers to pay out dole rather to aide students to study harder.

You cannot even imagine the trouble + headache the decisions you have put in place have made to ours + others like us lives.
You may think this letter is strong & not entirely to the point but 1 and so so disappointed - at the end I caring about what happens next and since amalgamation (even though everyone voted against it) fuel, education, food, govt aside values promoted - what else is planned.

Yours Sincerely

Luella Tyler.

P.S. I did not mention that our land valuation rocketed this yr. I'll bet rates soar as well.

For your info. We have no town water; no dump collection; no bitumen road; no mail service. We have no mobile coverage; no sewerage; we are out of any Rural Fire brigades allocation. We pay nearly $800 rates per year already. I wonder what you think of that on top of the rest.

During the cyclone Larry episode we had no power for over 2 weeks and took 1 week to cut ourselves out of the driveway. We want our Council POC to - we want our tableland member.
From: Plains Wanderer [mailto:plainswanderer@powerup.com.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 11 June 2008 8:52 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: new boundary.

Flaxton, 4560
Dear Members of the Electoral review team,
I wish to let you know that I find the new boundary excluding me from the Nicklin Electorate, to be totally unsuitable. We use Nambour for our shopping and financial affairs. We do not go to Maleny or further south to Landsborough or Caloundra. We have nothing to do in our weekly lives with that country. It is therefore not suitable or relevant for us to be put in what is an unvisited area for us at Flaxton. Please reconsider this decision and put our area in with Nambour and Mapleton. That is the way our lives work. So should our political ties and representation!
Yours sincerely,
Dr Diana O'Connor.
From: Fred Cole [mailto:fred.cole@bigpond.com]
Sent: Thursday, 12 June 2008 10:28 AM
To: ECO User
Subject: Boundary changes.

As residents of PINE RIVERS Shire for the past 50 years we wish to register our support for Linda Lavarch in her campaign to retain PINE RIVERS as the name for the current electorate being considered. Surely such a historic name which aptly describes the area should not be overlooked as the Shire has already lost its identity.

Sincerely,
Eileen and Fred Cole.
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Marceba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely [Signature]
11th June, 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
BRISBANE 4001

Dear Commissioners

RE: PROPOSED LOGAN ELECTORATE

My name is John Patrick Shanehan. I live at 2 Poinclan Drive, Boronia Heights 4124. I have lived there for 23 years with my family. I am retired.

I came here to live with my family 23 years ago because of semi-rural living. I found this to be attractive in those days. I have seen the City of Logan change its character over the years. My dwelling is no longer in a semi-rural area. A 4-lane highway passes at one end of my allotment. Schools have been built to cater for the children of people who have moved into the Logan area. It is now predominantly a city area. It is no longer a rural or semi-rural area.

Logan is a close community. We have a local newspaper, the Logan West Leader which keeps me, and many others, abreast of what is happening in Logan. Under the proposal, Hillcrest and Boronia Heights (where I live) will be removed from the Logan electorate.

As the years have gone by I have been very impressed by the pride which people take because they live in the Logan electorate. We have many voluntary organisations which are staffed by many community-minded residents.

Over the years our local Member, Mr John Mickel, has worked very hard on behalf of many community organisations in the electorate. I understand that a new Medical Centre valued at $50M in Middle Road will be removed from the Logan electorate under these proposals.

Hillcrest, as it is now, contains the Police Station, Fire Station and Ambulance Station. It will disappear from the Logan electorate under the new proposal.

The Logan Nursing Home, St Paul's Charters Retirement Home and the Clive Burdett Aged Care Facility will be lost to the people who live in the Logan electorate. The Greenbank Garden Village will go, as will the Logan West Community Centre in Wingeal Drive.

It is no exaggeration to say that the Logan electorate under the new proposal will be left without schools and sporting fields. There will be no Police presence, and no emergency services in the proposed new electorate.

I propose that the old boundaries in Crestmead remain as they are. I propose that the old boundary remain, and Hillcrest and Boronia Heights remain in the Logan electorate.

I propose that Flagstone be deleted from the proposed electorate as it has absolutely no community of interest with the Logan electorate. It is a rural area. I also propose that Stockleigh be dropped from the proposed new electorate as it is a rural area and has no community of interest with Logan.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1,000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
From: John [mailto:providore@dodo.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 12 June 2008 3:41 PM
To: QCQ User
Subject: The Redistribution { The Loss Of Our Tableland Seat }

If you were to read your electoral act 1982, Part 3 you would find that there are at least (5) Five matters that you have not considered.

(1) The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed district.

(2) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district.

(3) The physical features of each proposed electoral district.

(4) The boundaries of existing electoral districts.

(5) Demographic trends in the state.

I understand that our present state government would like to remove our member as she is definitely a thorn in their side as she will not roll over for the party policies they want to implement, however we went to an election and voted her in as our member exactly for that reason. And if they have brought pressure to bear on your department to change the boundaries I would ask you to remember that we voted in good faith.

The people of the Tableland seat are not interested in party politics, however we are interested in honest government, of which we have not seen any evidence in the past few years.

The southern part of the Tablelands have nothing in common with Townsville or Mackay.

The northern part definitely has nothing in common with Cooktown or the Torres Strait.

With this in mind I would ask you to do the honorable thing and allow us [ as Australian Citizens ] to keep the Member that we voted for.

John T Hunter
1 Ethel St.
Ravenshoe
Qld 4888
68 Byrons Rd.
Mt Morgan 4714
9th June 2008

Dear Electoral Commissioners Chairman,

I write to protest the proposed abolition of the seat of Toogool in the electorate of Mirani. One look at the map shows this redistribution to encompass wildly dissimilar areas with Mt Morgan and nearby Boulderina "tacked on" at the end.

Representative government must be based on historical, economic, social and cultural factors that make up community life. Mt Morgan has strong historical links with Rockhampton (38Km away). Indeed it was Mt Morgan gold that made Rockhampton (and Australia) prosperous (we once had the richest gold mine in the world.) There are strong family links too and most Mt Morgan workers are employed in Rockhampton. While sometimes it's a love/hate relationship the two places are intricately linked and it makes no
sense for them to be electorally separated.

We have been extremely well represented by our member for Fitzroy, Jim Pearce, who many of us know personally. Our interests will be swamped by the very different needs of those in the Murrumbidgee electorate. Five years ago, our town for all of its former rides was designated officially the poorest non-Aboriginal town in Australia. While things are improving, many residents struggle to find the travel money to visit Jim Pearce in nearby Ginninderry. We will be effectively disenfranchised if our local member is hundreds of kilometres up the dangerous Bruce Highway.

Mr. Morgan has just lost his own local council through amalgamation. This redistribution will further damage the community spirit and sense of pride of this unique but vulnerable town.

Yours faithfully,

Leonie Lane

LEONIE LANE
Hans - Joachim Sachse,
3 Storer Street,
Atherton, 4883,
Far North Queensland.,
29 - 5 - 2008.

The
Commissioners of Redistribution
Queensland Commission
Locked Bag 3304 Brisbane, Qld. 4001.

Subject : Elimination of the Tableland Seat.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you to register my very strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of the Tableland in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a resident of the Tableland and believe your proposal to devide this seat between Cook and the new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objection, that the previous four shire Councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a large part of the Tableland into Macrossan is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Your statement that our population is falling is also wrong. See your own growth identification in your FNQ 2025 Report.

You also forget the Cairns is the hub of our Health, Transport and Communication which will be very far away from the new Redistribution. We have no connection with Mackay or another otherside with Cook. Also we have nothing in common with the area outside the Wet Tropic.

I request that you review the elimination of the Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and restore this region with its own seat in the Queensland Government.

I lived under one Dictator in my home country and I do not like to live under a Anna Blight - Beattie Dictorship. I lost my Shirecouncil and now I am landed with this mess.

Your sincerely

[Signature]

( Hans-Joachim Sachse)
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Max Farquharson

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
Brisbane. Q 4001.

Dear Commissioners,

Re: Elimination of the seat of Tablelands.

I am writing to complain about the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in the new distribution of seats in the Queensland Parliament.

I have been a tableland resident for the past 20 years, and believe this change is definitely a backward step. The new seat of Mackay is just too large and people of the Tablelands have nothing in common with people from Charters Towers and beyond.

If our seat has to change, it would be far better added to the seat of Mulgrave, as we have to pass through this electorate when driving to Cairns for business and health reasons, and we have more in common with the people and the area of this electorate, than the Charters Towers area.

Please review the elimination of the Tableland seat in your redistribution, so that we can have our own voice in State Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

(P.S) Patricia Sachie

13 Jun 2008
Clem Wright
Box 686
Kuranda NQ 4881

Dear Bean Counters,

I submit the following objection to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands. If you can't vote her out, take away her seat!! Given your abhorrent treatment of Pauline Hanson & jailing as a consequence, it begs the question if this seat was held by any other party would it be torn asunder?

Putting Atherton & the southern Tablelands in with Charters Towers and the backblocks of Mackay makes as much sense as putting Mareeba in with Aruakun, Kowanyama, Saibi & Duan. Really, your integrity & impartiality is very questionable!!

Couldn't find a seat in the southeast to eliminate eh?

Sincerely,
Clem
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands Into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep Into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
TIMBERCLADES
Box 111
MILLAA MILLAA 4866

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and failing elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Calms is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

13 JUN 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

13 Jun 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

G. Racanelli
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Calrns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

QRC/08075
28/05/2008
Address
EM WEST
8 MAZLIN ST.
RAVENSHOE
4888

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecco@ecq.qld.gov.au

1 of 2
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.
(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district
(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district
(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;
(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100,000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
3/5/08

PO Box 724
Toogoo
QLD 4882

QRC/0BJ/76

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing this letter to voice my objection to the redistribution proposal for Atherton to be put in a southern seat of Macrossan, hence cutting the Tablelands in half. It is my opinion that the tablelands as a whole be integrated into the seat of Cook. I feel very strongly on this as I see the needs of this area, being a wet tropical area totally different from further south, which is a more temperate area, which therefore has a flow on effect to the way the two areas are managed and financed within the agricultural sector as well as the domestic arena. I find it totally misguided to have Atherton and southern Tablelands put into an electorate more than four hours drive from the next major city being Charters Towers.

I also have to say that I feel that this is a Political decision by the labour party to abolish the seat that Ms Lee Long has held for the last number of years. Ms Long has been a great advocate for our area and has done more for our area than any past member of any party. I feel she has been a thorn in the labour party for some time and I feel this is the only way that the party can get around this problem. I am not a labour basher as I have supported labour for all my working years.

I also have to say with the past election for the super councils now over and the tablelands now all under one council including Mareeba and Atherton and surrounding areas, it makes more sense to keep these areas as one under the same seat, to me this is only common sense.

As for tourism with Cairns and the tablelands and Cape York working as one to promote our pristine areas it is also common sense to keep all these areas as one with a minister who is local to this area and understands the specifics needs of this area.

In the event of a natural disaster it is also common sense to have this area as one to work as a whole and not have two ministers of totally different areas trying to do the same job.

I feel there has to be more public meetings on this subject for all to be able to voice their opinion.

Regards Colin Watson

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission.
Locked Bag 3504, Brisbane, Qld, 4001.

I, amongst so many an angry that we are faced with yet another erosion of accepted and working Tablelands Electorate. And MOST STRONGLY protest that we lose our elected representative. I look forward to voting for a new Qld Government when the next opportunity occurs. We have seen a continual erosion of democratic choice and the happy working status quo. One only example is fluoridation; - with no nutritionists vote even in the equation. Plus a carve up of Councils, etc.
Is it the purpose of this Qld Labor Gov't to continually upset the apple cart as much as it can while in office.? ?? Then good riddance hopefully at the next election.

Tony Ford, P.O. Box 507, Kallanda, Qld, 4665.
The Commissioners,
Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
Brisbane, Q 4001

Dear Commissioners,

Re: Redistribution of the Tablelands Electorate.

With regard to your intention to eliminate the seat of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution, I wish to register my strong opposition to this as a Tablelands constituent.

I believe your proposal to divide the seat of Tablelands between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is terribly wrong. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this District had such a strong connection and identity.

The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right and cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025, it cites the population is expected to increase in Far North Queensland by around 100,000 people by 2025. Far North Queensland will need more electorate seats, not less, in the near future.

I request that the elimination of the Seat of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution be reviewed. Please restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament, so that the constituents in Far North Queensland may continue to have their say in the future, as they have had in the past.

Thank you for your attention in regard to my opposition to your proposed redistribution. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this District had such a strong connection and identity.

Yours sincerely,

Kathleen N. Russell.
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecco@ecq.qld.gov.au  

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

13 Jun 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
28/05/2008
Address
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands Into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[signature]

ELIZABETH WARMUL
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

H. Wurzel
From: David Innes [mailto:mdasii@optusnet.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 12 June 2008 7:48 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Proposed New Boundaries For Electorate Of Stafford.

Attention: The Secretary

I wish to hereby register my dissatisfaction with the proposed new boundary of the Stafford electorate.
In recent times the Brisbane City Council has expended considerable time, effort and funds on the Chermside Neighbourhood Planning initiative. This has resulted in a growing sense of community and involvement among the residents in Chermside.
Your proposal to remove the portion of Chermside east of Gympie Road from the Stafford electorate has the potential to negate a lot of the good work done by the council. At a time when there is a paucity of community spirit throughout this and other cities I believe that any action that would detract from the efforts of the council is to be deplored. I therefore urge the QRC to review these proposed boundary changes and make the necessary alterations to ensure that Chermside is not divided in the manner now proposed. Whether Chermside in its entirety remains within Stafford or a neighbouring electorate is immaterial.

Yours truly,

David Innes
58 Myine Street
Chermside 4032
Dear Sir,

Re: OBJECTION TO THE REDISTRIBUTION PROPOSAL FOR THE ELECTORATE OF TABLELANDS

We have read the redistribution proposal for Queensland, in particular that part relating to the Electorate of Tablelands, and lodge an OBJECTION to the proposal that eliminates the Electorate of Tablelands and redistributes its electors to the Electorates of Cook and Macrossan.

The grounds for this objection are:

1. No competent or reasonable administrative body could make such a recommendation after having considered all the facts and principles relating to the creation of a representative electorate. In particular, it is apparent that the provisions of Section 46(1) and (2) have been completely ignored.

2. The principles of Natural Justice have been disregarded. Who would create Macrossan with a length from north to south of over 1,000km and a width of up to 250km that includes widely separated small communities that have absolutely NO community of interest, NO recreation or commercial interaction, NO economic interaction or similarity and which are linked by long lengths of poor quality roads.
3. The Commission has not given reasonable or adequate consideration to the fact that there will be NO community of interest in the proposed new Electorate of Macrossan. The proposed electorate stretches from the Tablelands, just west of Cairns to Moramba in the south; that is just west of Mackay. There are at least four major settled districts in this vast area each of which has NO relationship with another BUT each has a distinct and close relationship with the major coastal settlements of Cairns, Townsville, Bowen and Mackay. The Commission solution seems to create a balancing void with no heart that effectively disenfranchises all who may be thrown into this new electorate.

4. The Commission has not given due consideration to the previous submissions that strongly opposed the abolition of the Electorate of Tablelands.

5. The Commission has given a disproportionate and incorrect weighting to the political submissions which opposed the retention of the Electorate of Tablelands.

6. The Commission has ignored or largely disregarded the basic tenant that an Electorate wherever possible should comprise an area with a common community of interest. The State Government has recently created the Tablelands Regional Council which has an area almost the size of the State of Tasmania and a population of over 40,000. The majority of residents live in towns located on the Tablelands: Mareeba, Atherton, Tolga, Kairi, Tinaroo, Walkamin, Malanda, Herberton, Ravenshoe, Millaa Millaa, Kuranda, Biboohra, Mt Molloy, Julatten, Dimbulah, Chillagoe, Mutchilba and Irvinebank. This major recent State Government decision should be weighted heavily and should ensure that the area of the Tablelands Regional Council forms the core of the Tablelands Electorate.
If this area does not have sufficient voters to sustain it as an Electorate then it would be appropriate to add electors to it from the Gulf and Peninsular areas as residents from these areas have many common interests with the Tablelands. It should be noted that residents of the Gulf and Peninsular travel to and from Cairns via the Tablelands and many shop and holiday on the Tablelands. Indeed the Tablelands are seen as a retirement centre for the Gulf and Peninsular. The development and population growth of the Tablelands is high by Queensland standards and it is considered that the rate of growth will continue at an increasing rate.

Critical factors which must be considered are:

- These residents form a vibrant social, recreational and economic community who live close together and share common interests on a daily basis.
- A short integrated road system links the communities and extends to Cairns, the major City in Far North Queensland, which is located only a short distance from the Tablelands. Cairns is our Regional Centre. It provides our port and our International Airport; about one to one and a half hour trip by road.
- Cairns is the Regional shopping and recreational centre for FNQ. Our Regional Sporting, Social and Community Clubs form a Region based on Cairns.
- State Government Departments based in Cairns have responsibility for the area of the Tablelands Regional Council.
- Regional Medical services are based in Cairns.
- Television, Radio and newspapers for the Tablelands are all based in Cairns.
- The Prison system for the FNQ Region is focused on the major prison located on the Tablelands.
- The Regional waste System has final waste disposal areas located on the Tablelands, and waste from the Tablelands goes to a central plant in Cairns for sorting, separation and treatment prior to final disposition.
- The Tablelands is an integral part of the FNQ Regional Planning System.

From the foregoing it is abundantly clear that the Tablelands has NO affiliation or connection with Charters Towers or Moranbah. We have different economies, different environments and we have absolutely NO community of interest with Charters Towers or Moranbah.
7. The proposal to abolish the electorate of Tablelands would inflict hardship on all who presently reside in this electorate. The community would be separated into two other electorates with which they have little in common and which are located substantial distances from them. For example; Atherton and other tableland towns are at least 5 hours by road away from Charters Towers and much further from other areas in the proposed Macrossan electorate. What has Atherton in common with Charters Towers? Absolutely nothing!!! The relationship between Mareeba and Cooktown is almost the same.

This proposal is divisive and non productive. It creates great problems for the Tablelands and does not make any meaningful contribution to either Charters Towers or Moranbah or Cooktown areas.

8. The proposal, if successful, will add significant costs to the operation of the two proposed electorates. Both members would have to travel much further to service their electorates and in all probability their level of service would significantly decrease merely due to the tyranny of distance.

9. The proposal, if successful, will make it more difficult and expensive for electors to contact and meet their member. This is a very significant and critical factor that surely must be given a heavy weighting factor.

10. The commission needs to carefully study a large scale map of Far North Queensland to clearly understand how:
   - Charters Towers relates to Townsville.
   - Moranbah relates to Mackay.
   - Grazing properties west of Bowen and Proserpine relate to Bowen.
   - Atherton, Mareeba and the Tablelands relate to Cairns.
   - There is no relationship between the Charters Towers/Moranbah areas and the Tablelands which are separated by a very long length of narrow poor quality bitumen road.
   - There is little relationship between the Tablelands and the Cooktown area.
   - The Tablelands Regional Council clearly comprises a homogenous closely settled district with common interests and which forms a part of the Cairns Region.
11. The Commission should give serious consideration to the many reasons used by
the State Government when it decided to create the Tablelands Regional Council.
These reasons were sufficient and substantial enough for the Government to
amalgamate four shires and create a strong vibrant and financially independent
local government based on Community of Interest, Financial Viability, Similar
Economies, similar problems such as roads, water supplies; waste water
treatment; rubbish collection, treatment and disposal; town planning, including
the FNQ Regional Plan; Tourism development and promotion...etc.

We respectfully request the Commission not to proceed with its
recommendation to create the new Electorate of Macrossan and to give the full
and correct weighting to the provisions of Section 46(1) and (2) of the Electoral
Act and to retain the Tablelands Electorate.

Yours faithfully,

Colin C McDowall - B. Comm., FCPA, FIMM, Dip of Local Gov Management
For Colin and Robyn McDowall
11 June, 2008

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: SUBMISSION ON RENAMING THE SAMSONVALE ELECTORATE

I have been a resident of Somers Street, Cashmere since 1982. I have been a local Councillor firstly with Pine Rivers Shire Council from 1994 to 2008 and was recently elected to the new Moreton Bay Regional Council. I now submit two proposals for your consideration. The first will be for a name change and the second for possible boundary relocations (see attached Map and Appendices).

When my wife and I bought our land and built our house this was part of the old Pine Rivers Shire. My children were born and brought up in the area and our family has seen the shire flourish in the last 26 years to go from 88,000 people to nearly 150,000 people. We were proud of our shire and we love living out here.

With the forced amalgamation of local governments this year, Pine Rivers as a name ceased to exist as it was subsumed into the new Moreton Bay Regional Council, along with the old Caboolture Shire and Redcliffe City. Our identity was lost. The residents of Caboolture and Redcliffe still have some link to their pasts as Redcliffe and Caboolture are still place names as suburbs in the new Regional Council. Pine Rivers, however, had no suburb called Pine Rivers and the name has now officially disappeared although it is still used unofficially by residents and businesses.

I support the preservation of our district name by way of inclusion in the new State Electorate names by substituting "Pine Rivers" for the new electorate of Samsonvale. As Samsonvale has never been an electorate name before there is little attachment to it in this area whereas Pine Rivers has large sentimental value to a great number of residents. The new electorate also fits neatly between the North and South Pine Rivers. Many of the local businesses are also called Pine Rivers........ so they would appreciate the name being retained as well.
I would also like the Commission to consider the possibility of changing the boundaries of the new electorate by including the area of Strathpine (See Appendix 1 highlighted on the Map in yellow) which is in the new Kallangur seat into the new “Samsonvale” electorate and exchanging them for the Petrie CCDs (See Appendix 2 and highlighted on the Map in pink) that were included in “Samsonvale”. This would provide a much cleaner and clearer division between the two electorates as the river would be the boundary. This would also allow for the whole of the Strathpine Business District to be in the one State electorate rather than being split in two down the middle of Gympie Road. The people of Strathpine for years now have been split into two State electorates and this is the perfect opportunity for the whole suburb to become a part of one electorate. Apart from Gympie Road, there is also no connection between the Strathpine area and the rest of the Kallangur seat.

I understand there will be a difference in the numbers mentioned above of some 1,593 electors. May I suggest that this could be made up by adjusting the boundaries and moving the Upper Caboolture area (highlighted on the Map in orange) which has no community of interest at all to Samsonvale, and only accessible by driving through two other electorates, into the new Morayfield electorate and moving a small portion of the Morayfield seat into Kallangur. This would make both the Morayfield and new Pine Rivers seat much more compact and easily administered.

I have spoken with a large number of residents at the various community groups and meetings that I attend and we hope you look upon this submission favourably.

Regards,

Mick Gillam
Councillor for Division 8
MORETON BAY REGIONAL COUNCIL
APPENDIX 1 – HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW

STRATHPINE CCDs IN KALLANGUR ELECTORATE

3180605 - 125
3180607 - 13
3180802 - 758
3180803 - 455
3180804 - 430
3180805 - 301
3180806 - 338
3180807 - 368
3180808 - 37
3180809 - 362

Total 3187

Appendix 2 – HIGHLIGHTED IN PINK

PETRIE CCDs IN SAMSONVALE ELECTORATE

3181112 - 552
3181106 - 1042

Total - 1594
Mary Lewendon
PO Box 822
Kuranda, Queensland
AUSTRALIA 4881

10th June 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane, QLD 4881

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to express my concern and objection to the recent announcement on the redistribution proposal for the Tablelands seat. The suggestion that by removing the Tablelands seat the constituents of that seat would be adequately represented by the seats of Macrossan and Cook is beyond comprehension.

The Tablelands region has recently undergone an amalgamation procedure of four shires that was not in the best interest of those concerned. However, we have now been amalgamated and are beginning to adjust to this amalgamation only to find that the Queensland Redistribution Commission now feels it should shatter the cohesive integrity of an already fragile region.

To remove the Tablelands seat and place part into Macrossan and part into Cook does not make sense at all. In order for the area to be adequately represented we should maintain the current boundaries. Our population and our economy are growing. In order for the infrastructure of the area to be adequately pursued we need strong local input from a Tablelands based seat. The constituents of the Tablelands seat share common interests and with the new Tablelands Regional Council in place we will be able to better coordinate services and infrastructure to our region. By removing the Tablelands seat you will again be dividing a region that truly deserves to be better served.

This appears to be a politically motivated decision that benefits neither the citizens of our region or the region itself. Perhaps it really is time to seriously consider a State representing North Queensland. The southeast corner seems to be happy to usurp most of the assets that are made throughout the state, without reasonable representation we are certainly NOT going to be adequately represented in Queensland.

We beseech you to reconsider the decision to abolish the seat of Tablelands.

Yours truly,

Mary Lewendon
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong “community of interest”, but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility/ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]

Name: [Name]

Address: [Address]

June 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecg@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

d0 Sample
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;

(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100,000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304 Brisbane Qld 4001

6.6.2008

Proposed Qld. Electoral Boundaries April 2008
Electorate of Albert.

Dear Sir/Madam

The present Member has worked for Beenleigh and the immediate surrounds for many years before standing for the Seat of Albert. She has been always available when help was needed.
In appreciation we voted for her and now she can not be looking after us anymore, the people of Eagleby, if the proposal goes through.
Please find enclosed an enlargement of the map supplied by the Commission.
I do know that my proposal could off-balance the figures temporarily. But as the Premier has promised more houses by Christmas in the South-East, the Coomera Electorate should be compensated.

Thanking you,
Yours
Joachim Torgau
Villa 46 Sapphire Gardens
196 Logan St. Eagleby 4207
Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
BRISBANE  4001

Dear Commissioners,

I wish to submit an objection to the proposed new boundaries for the State electorate of Logan.

I have studied the proposal and think that by cutting out the suburbs of Hillcrest and Boronia Heights really breaks up our community of interest with suburbs like Regents Park, Heritage Park and Park Ridge etc.

By doing this, I notice that all the facilities won by our State Member Mr John Mickel over the years have been for nothing.

The Police, Fire and Ambulance Stations are all in the suburb of Boronia Heights as is the new Health Centre being built, the retirement village and nursing homes like the Logan Nursing Home and St Paul de Chartres, not to mention that the new park and ride that is being built will also be taken away.

Surely the southern part of the electorate can be taken off to balance this up. That area down there has no interest in us, not like Boronia Heights and Hillcrest – we all belong together up this part.

Hoping you will take my letter into consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Marnette Sally
3511 Mt Lindesay Highway
Hillcrest  4118

16 JUN 2003
June 10, 2008

Electoral Commission Queensland
GPO Box 1393
Brisbane 4001

Dear Sir:

Re: Consideration re objection on final boundary determination, Noosa Electorate
Pursuant to the Electoral Boundaries Act

I am writing to you on behalf of the Cooroy-Doonan District Branch of the Labor Party.

Our committee objects to our area of Doonan being placed into the ‘NICKLIN’ electorate.

We share common community of interest with Noosa electorate. Our emergency services, library facilities, council business centre and medical and hospital facilities are all located in the Noosa electorate.

Our district also has the added relevant point we also use the Noosa retail centres for shopping and our school children are attending the local Noosa area schools.

We believe there is latitude to vary the boundaries by + or - 25% and it makes good sense that our district is included in the Noosa electorate not Nicklin, where many population areas of growth are planned and identified, particularly around Yandina.

Our Federal boundary (Wide Bay / Fairfax) runs along the Verrierrdale road and to the south skirts off the Doonan Bridge road, to Peregian Springs Village. This boundary makes common sense as it already a federal boundary, it establishes a more unified community and meets the criteria in accommodating such communities as ours in the Noosa area.

We urge the Commission to consider carefully our objection, and allow DOONAN to remain part of the State seat of NOOSA.

Yours faithfully,

Judith Grieve

[Stamp] 16 Jun 2008
AUSTRALIAN PENSIONERS' & SUPERANNUANTS' LEAGUE
Gracemere Branch

Post Office Box 228,
Gracemere, 4702.

12/06/08

The Secretary,
Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
BRISBANE, QLD, 4001

Dear Sir,

At a recent meeting of the above league, discussion centred on the recent suggested redistribution and the loss of the Fitzroy seat.

While there had been speculation in the media for quite some time, that Jim Pearce’s seat of Fitzroy would go, our group believes that the redistribution has done a disservice to our region. While we are not here to praise any Political representative, we believe that the Fitzroy electorate was well served by Mr. Pearce and should have remained.

With the Rockhampton Electorate expanding to take in Gracemere and its surrounds, members believe that this area will not be represented as well. Many of the local non-profit groups looked to the local M.P. for photocopying and the like, and with the town being consumed by the Rockhampton electorate, representatives of these clubs will find it difficult to access that member’s office as it is situated right in the middle of the City with the subject of a nearby parking being an absolute nightmare.

Members of our group reside in areas affected by the redistribution and these include – Bouldercombe – Marmor – Stanwell – Westwood – Kabra and other centres, which now have a Sarina office for their State politician. Our fellow group in Mount Morgan and many other groups relied on close contact with the Gracemere office of the Fitzroy representative and got it, now all of the residents, frankly find it “laughable” that their representative
will be situated so far away. Members feel that they have suffered another blow with a decrease in representation following on from the recent amalgamation of Local Government Shires. The loss of the name Fitzroy is also a matter which was discussed as we have just lost the Fitzroy Shire name.

Members are argued that why cannot the State boundaries be redesigned to fit in with the recent Local Government redistribution boundaries? We are well aware of the guidelines and reasons put out for the redistribution, but our members feel that there should more flexibility when it comes to the “actual” boundaries. The boundaries and in particular, the Mirani electorate appears on paper to have absurd features when all the towns from the former Fitzroy Electorate are set to have their representative in Sarina.

It could be said that at the next election someone in our area may stand and the whole picture may change, but it could also remain the same.

Therefore, this group which represents many of the people affected by the proposed redistribution opposes all of the suggested changes to the current Fitzroy Boundaries.

Yours sincerely,

Cheikh Weiis

........................
Honorary Secretary

* Hard copy in mail
Dear Sir/Madam,

*Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate*

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

*The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.*

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the mostly typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which
membership of the active and effective community representative group Montville Village Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through gymnasia to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially, culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Name  Jane Gibbs
Address  15 Allara St
          Flaxton Q 4560
Hon. Alan Demack A.O.
Chairperson
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Level 6
Forestry House
160 Mary Street
Brisbane 4001

*PROPOSED NAME CHANGE from CHARTERS TOWERS to MACROSSAN.*

I am lodging an objection to the Commission’s determination that Macrossan would be an appropriate name for the redistributed electorate.

The justification on page 9 of the Commission’s proposal is historically erroneous and ill-conceived. I have presented contrary views in the attached formal submission for the Commission’s re-assessment.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Kett Kennedy
Former Chair of History and Head of the Department of History and Politics,
SUBMISSION to the QUEENSLAND REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSION on the PROPOSED NAME CHANGE for the ELECTORATE of CHARTERS TOWERS to MACROSSAN.

K. H. Kennedy
12 June 2008

(1) Rationale for Objection

(2) Appendix 1: John Murtagh MACROSSAN

(3) Appendix 2: George Augustus Frederick Elphinstone DALRYMPLE

Recommendation:

That the Queensland Redistribution Commission revise its determination that the proposed electorate be named Macrossan, and instead adopt the name Dalrymple.
RATIONALE FOR OBJECTION

Naming of Electorates:

Historically Queensland electorates have been named after localities or pastoral districts. Even from the 1860 elections members were returned to the Legislative Assembly as representatives of distinct geographical entities, although many of them carried the names of past governors or explorers. For example, Leichhardt was named after the pastoral district even though it embraced the famous explorer’s name. When the first North Queensland electorate was provided for in 1864, it was named Kennedy, again after the pastoral district, even though it took in the ports of Mackay and Bowen: towns named after an explorer and the first colonial governor.

And while there was a trend over the following decades to name many towns or geographical features after explorers or prominent public men – e.g. Burketown, Cooktown, Cairns, Charters Towers and so on – the naming of subsequent electorates created afterwards – e.g. Burke, Cook Cairns, Charters Towers, Bowen, Mackay and so on – was specifically geographical.

This pattern was broken in 1949 when the Redistribution Commission named a new electorate based on Gympie – NASH, after the discoverer of gold in that locality. The name was abolished in 1958, and Gympie restored. In 1986 a redistribution created the seat of Nicklin from sections of Landsborough and Coorooma: the seat was named after Francis Nicklin, Premier from 1937 to 1958, who held the seat of Landsborough.

In the 1999 redistribution, two electorates appear which could be conceived as honouring individuals: Eric John Gaven was MLA Southport 1950–1960, then South Coast 1960 – 1966, with a distinguished career in local government to add to his reputation. A suburb was named after him in 1979, and suggests a geographical determination in the naming of the electorate. Similarly the electorate of Streton derives its name from a suburb gazetted in the 1970’s after the pioneer of the Eight Mile Plains area, George Streton.

2008 Commission’s Electoral Names:

There are several changes of names and the Commission advances its rationale. For example, its report states that Samsonvale, Buderim, Mermaid Beach, Morayfield are based on geographical features; Dalby on the principal town which can also be designated geographical. This leaves Maccrossan; the rationale for the re-naming of the new seat is clearly spelt out on page 9 of the documentation as “appropriate”:
John Murtagh Macrossan (1833 – 1891) was elected as Member of the Legislative Assembly for Townsville and Kennedy electorates between 1873 and 1891.

(To be pedantic, he was MLA Kennedy 25 November 1873 – 28 November 1878; Defeated 1878; MLA Townsville 4 March 1879 – 30 March 1891, Secretary for Public Works & Mines 21 January 1879 – 13 March 1883, 13 June 1888 – 4 January 1890; Colonial Secretary & Secretary for Mines 4 January 1890 – 12 August 1890.)

As well as being a fervent advocate for North Queensland, he attended the conference on Federation called by Sir Henry Parkes in Melbourne and was subsequently chosen to attend the Australian National Convention in Sydney 1891.

(To place Macrossan’s career within correct perspective, a brief biographical note has been attached as Appendix 1 for the Commission’s survey.)

Macrossan in terms of localities has few testimonials. Macrossan Street in Ravenswood, Macrossan Street in south Townsville, Macrossan Street in Ingham and a former railway siding named Macrossan on the eastern bank of the Burdekin River, about 30 kilometres from Charters Towers. This township never exceeded 100 people at its height in the early 1880’s. Indeed, it is ironical that it was named in his honour as Macrossan had voted against the Townsville to Charters Towers Railway Bill in 1877. And there is the nearby bridge.

The Alternative Proposal:

It is submitted to the Commission that a more appropriate name would be DALRYMPLE, after George Augustus Frederick Elphinstone Dalrymple, renowned North Queensland explorer and pastoralist. (See Appendix 2 for a summary of his career.)

In terms of recognition bestowed upon Dalrymple, the first inland town in North Queensland was Dalrymple on the Burdekin River at the junction with Kidston's Creek. By 1864 it was a pivotal stopover. Initially drays and later reachas travelled from Bowen to Salisbury Plains and north-west to Ingham, then west to Clare Crossing onwards to Cardington Station on the Haughton River and to Dalrymple. Here were located two pubs, a Lands Commissioner's Office and a Native Police barracks. When gold was found on the Star River and soon afterwards at the Cape River, Dalrymple was a hive of activity. A passage through Hervey Range at Thornton's Gap provided alternative access to Cleveland Dam and the new port of Townsville. Floods in 1870 destroyed its potential although it was a stopover for miners rushing the Etheridge and for teamsters taking supplies out to the Flinders pastoral district. Ironically, Dalrymple himself detracted from the settlement’s growth by cutting the track from Valley of Lagoons to Cardwell.
There are streets named after him in Charters Towers, Townsville, Ingham and Bowen. There is Dalrymple National Park near the Basil Wall and Lake Dalrymple, the huge reservoir at Burdekin Falls, with a peak capacity at the present day almost five times the volume of Sydney Harbour. Other geographical sites outside the proposed electorate, but indicative of his contribution to opening the North, include Point Dalrymple near Bowen, Mount Dalrymple near Mackay and Dalrymple Bay near Sarina.

Most pertinent, however, was the creation of the Dalrymple Board for local government administration in 1879, only three years after his death. Dalrymple became a Shire under the 1902 Act and continued as an entity until the amalgamations of 2007. In this instance the Shire of almost 68,300 square kilometres joined the city of Charters Towers (some 42 square kilometres) to form the Charters Towers Regional Council, equivalent in area to the state of Tasmania.

Expunging the Dalrymple name from local government maps has caused considerable angst among hundreds upon hundreds of people who can trace their ancestry to the “Kennedy men”, five and six generations back. The loss of the name Charters Towers from the state electoral map is not felt so deeply. Charters Towers as a state electorate did not gain an identity until 1887; this was lost in the 1958 redistribution and not restored until 1991 – now to be erased in 2008.

With the proposed electorate at 105,359 square kilometres in area, the former Dalrymple Shire will imprint of 65% on its land mass.

**Excised Tablelands' Considerations:**

The population of the northern segment of the proposed new electorate, which takes in the southern portion of Tablelands, no doubt resent loss of identity to the same extent as Charters Towers residents. The many towns of the Atherton and Evelyn Tablelands have, however, only been recognized since the 1931 redistribution as an entity. And yet by 1958, the Tablelands embraced a huge area from Atherton in the east, the towns of Georgetown, Chillagoe, Crydton and Normanton, way over to the Gulf of Carpentaria. It was abolished in 1971, and not re-created to its recent format until 1991. Like Charters Towers it will lose the Tablelands’ nomenclature under the proposed name changes.

History however suggests that there should be little objection to the compromise name DALRYMPLE. Tablelands was first traversed by Hann and Mulligan. It was then settled by Atherton, the pastoralist, and numerous timber-cutters, then base metal miners from 1877 onwards. In fact, settlement on the Tablelands lagged behind even the creation of the Dalrymple local authority.

That there is not much community interaction between the towns of the southern portion of Tablelands and the old northern goldfields based on Charters Towers, aside from
pastoralism, is understandable. Equally there is little in common community activities between Charters Towers and the coal-fields of the south-east portion of the new electorate.

This should not detract from urging that the new electorate should have an identity of a neutral and common denominator. Dalrymple rather than Macrossan is the solution. The northern tablelands developed as a consequence of his path-finding exploration activities. The pastoral districts and goldfields radiating in every direction from the centre of the new electorate, and the areas in the south-eastern portion of the seat, all have Dalrymple the explorer at the forefront, not John Muiragh Macrossan, a Lilliputian in the broader perspective of North Queensland history and geography.
APPENDIX 1

MACROSSAN, John Mortagh [1833 – 1891]

Few Queensland politicians present as perplexing a challenge to portray as the man known as “Jack the Hatter” Macrossan, the intellectually introverted and socially reticent miner-parliamentarian, of whom legend is larger than life.

His biographer, Harrison Bryan, came close to capturing his public persona, but failed to delve beyond the penetrating eyes, which guarded his troubled mind.

Born in County Donegal, Ireland, with a rural heritage and Catholic education, Macrossan arrived in Victoria in 1853. For twelve years he wandered the goldfields: Otaga (N.Z.) and Peak Downs in Queensland can be verified. Some writers suggest that he rushed the Cape River diggings, Sturt River and, maybe, Gilberton but there is no surviving evidence. What is certain is that by 1870 he was at Ravenswood, and it was here that his reputation, the myths and the nonsense began, culminating in the “infamous episode” of Macrossan “horse-whipping” the local warden, Thomas Hackett, in the mudy bed of Elphinestone Creek.

For too long the exaggerated anecdotes of W.R.O. Hill’s Forty-Five Years’ Experiences in North Queensland: 1891 – 1905 have been repeated by amateur historians as an account of Ravenswood’s early period, viz., 1868 – 1873. Hill was a cadet with the Native Police through to June 1868 when, at age 24, he was appointed Assistant Warden at Cape River, and subsequently transferred to Ravenswood as Clerk of Petty Sessions. He wrote of his adventures in 1905, first as a series of newspaper articles, and then compiled into a volume in order to supplement his retirement income. His account of events involving Macrossan verge on pure fiction; they partly drew on the reports in the Ravenswood Miner filed by George Reid, younger brother of the proprietor of the newspaper, and Macrossan’s closest friend. Both were County Donegal men.

From careful scrutiny of the above-mentioned sources and official papers in the Queensland State Archives, John Josephski has pieced together, convincingly, the Hackett versus Macrossan event. Briefly, Hackett was transferred to Ravenswood in July 1870 and six months later favoured a leasing system rather than individual claims. Recently-arrived John Macrossan, who was working a claim on the Saratoga reef, turned up at a public meeting in March 1871 to protest the suggested changes to mining regulations. Three months later, he addressed another roll-up. As Josephski wrote: “It is the first instance in which his name (Macrossan) appears as taking a prominent part in public affairs.” Subsequently, in July 1871, a petition with 1102 signatures was forwarded to the incumbent member for Kennedy, John McDevitt, a Brisbane-based barrister. The Mines Minister, Walsh, rejected the petition, so Macrossan called another public meeting at which he demanded Hackett’s removal. A Miners’ Protection Association had recently been formed with Macrossan as Secretary.

When matters become personal, and there is no spirit for compromise, tempers always erupt. Macrossan told an official inquiry that Hackett “...was guilty of an offence against public morality by openly accompanying, and bringing to a public hall, a woman of bad repute.” He further suggested that one miner had been deprived of a sixteenth share in a lease; and finally,
that Hackett had denied miners an opportunity to have ore crushed by a new machine owned by John Deane, which was offering 25% cheaper rates than other privately-owned plants.

To deal with the issues, seriatim: The morality matter was clearly aimed at Hackett’s standing as Magistrate and Goldfields’ Commissioner, and it troubled him greatly; on the other hand, it was an instance of stones thrown at glass houses. Macrossan was very close to Annie Smith, the notorious sly-grog supplier and brothel keeper. She was known to contribute to the Miners’ Protection Association, and later to have supported Macrossan in litigation.

The matter of miner Burrows’ one-sixteenth share was trivial to all. However, Deane’s crushing machine was of concern to many miners. There were already six on the field, and Hackett said that there should be no more at the present time. It was a stand-off: miners wanted cheaper rates; machine owners wanted to retain their profit margins. The Government backed Hackett’s decision.

Had Hackett kept his patience, while Macrossan and the Ravenswood Miner continued provocative rantings, the matter may have blown away – after-all, it was that very month in which Charters Towers was discovered – but no! A very peeved Hackett announced publicly that Macrossan was no saint:

That he was a broken and disreputable Catholic priest, that he was a married man and had deserted his wife and children; that he was the editor of a newspaper and that he had got embroiled in a swindle and had to fly; that he was a Fenian and a leader of Fenians; that his shanty was a den of sedition; that he had said that Annie Smith, of the Northern Star Hotel, had given twenty pounds to the Roman Catholic Church for seats as a bribe.

Ravenswood Miner, 13 January 1872

Macrossan was furious. When Hackett crossed Elphinstone Creek, just after noon on 29 December for lunch at Hishon’s Hotel, Macrossan was waitng for him, feet-astride, in the creek sludge. He produced a horse-whip, but there is no evidence that he cut the Warden, contrary to folklore. Short men both, hardly of muscular stature, they grappled and fell into the mud. Hackett’s mates from the Hishon rescued him; Macrossan stood and acknowledged the cheers of anti-authoritarian miners. The incident should have satisfied both parties: a paddle in the puddle. Yet enmity remained intense. Macrossan was arrested and arraigned before the local Justices of the Peace, and was committed to trial at the Townsville District Court.

The colonial press revelled in the fracas. The Queenslander (17 February 1872) wrote:

On Ravenswood, at least, the reign of the ‘strong arm’ seems to have already commenced... We wonder the editor of the [Ravenswood] Miner does not offer Mr. Macrossan the dictatorship of North Queensland in the future.

The Brisbane Courier opined:

I should like to reside in Ravenswood. The residents of that town are supremely blessed by the public-spirited digger, store-keeper, publican, or something of the kind, named Macrossan. It seems from the local thunderer that this Macrossan has taken Ravenswood
under his protection, and devotes himself with an energy and self-denial touching to
witness.

Macrossan stood trial on 27 March 1872; his surety was £1000, rumoured to be provided by
himself (£500); machine owner, Edward Plant (£250) and a man named Parker (£250). Without a
doubt Macrossan’s contribution was guaranteed by Annie Smith, retrieved when Macrossan
pleaded guilty to assault and was fined just £20. Ravenswood miners cheered the verdict; they
raised a purse of 100 guineas to cover legal costs. Macrossan then decided on a political career.
Hackett was ignominiously transferred later in the week.

If Hackett versus Macrossan was a one-off episode, supposedly, of pious and dedicated
public duty and self-sacrifice, supporters of both would be disillusioned. In mid-1872, Macrossan
applied for at least two leases, as opposed to claims, in Ravenswood. He also extended his
investments north to Star River and areas around the almost deserted Dalrymple township. Was it
decision on his part? Certainly on other counts this question arises. First, Macrossan’s decision
to run for the seat of Kennedy in 1873, second, his betrothal and marriage to Bridget Queely, at St
Joseph’s Church Townsville on 1 October 1874. Only the first is of concern; private lives and
motives should remain private, if there is no conflict of public interest.

There was a redistribution of electorates in 1872 to accommodate expanding northern
settlement and gold-seekers. The electorate of Kennedy, which ran from south of Mackay to
Cardwell in the north and took in the pastoral district west to about Pentland was divided into
three constituencies: first was Bowen, which included Mackay and Bowen; second was
Ravenswood, the epicentre being Ravenswood township, and including the goldfields of Cape
River and little Charters Towers; third was Kennedy which was based on Townsville and
geographically ran west to today’s Lynd Junction and north to the tip of Cape York, including all
of Cape York Peninsula. McDevitt, the sitting member for Kennedy, demanded Ravenswood;
Macrossan settled for the redrawn Kennedy. (Bowen, it was no longer relevant to the region.)
McDevitt won Ravenswood, soon to turn it over to King, the MLA who had presented
Macrossan’s 1871 petition of miners’ signatures. Macrossan won Kennedy, only because of
support from ‘gougers’ north of the Burdekin and the backing of John Deane, the machine owner
who was Townsville-based and into pastoralism. Effectively, Macrossan had cut ties with
Ravenswood and the mining areas in which his “reputation” was made.

Another redistribution of electorates occurred in 1878. There were drastic changes:
Mackay, with sugar prospering, became self-contained; Bowen took in what is today the
Whitsunday Regional Council; Townsville extended north to Cardwell and west to around
Dorothy. The Kennedy seat was drastically altered. It lost the entire Peninsula area in 1875
when Cook was gazetted, following the rush to the Palmer River. By 1878, Cook took in all land
south of the Mitchell and Walsh Rivers down to present-day Tully, and was afforded two
members. Kennedy was based, almost exclusively, on the Northern Goldfields, centred on
Charters Towers. It was also a dual-constituency.

Somewhat arrogantly, Macrossan ran for Kennedy in 1878. There were three
nominations: Macrossan, who had gone from an Independent to support McDevitt; H.W.
Palmer, brother of former Premier, Sir Arthur Palmer; and Francis Stubley, mine-owner with
conservative leanings. The Kennedy contest was notable for two features: newspaper rivalry and 'plumping' of votes. Macrossan held a financial interest in the Northern Advocate & Miners' Journal for some time, but this newspaper had changed name to the Towers Herald & Mining Record in 1877. Palmer was a part-proprietor. Stubley was a friend of Thaddeus O'Kane, owner of The Northern Miner, who threw his weight behind the anti-Macrossan groupings. In today's litigious society there would have been a score upon score of grounds for libel in the inventive of the respective editors. As for "plumping", this entailed voting for only one candidate, even though there were two vacancies. The end result reflected the tactic: from a turn-out of 1478 voters, Stubley received 868, Palmer 649, and Macrossan 581, only one vote more than the 580 sovereigns presented to him for his campaign.

Macrossan's defeat was attributed to his opposition in the parliament to the Townsville to Charters Towers railway, and his joining forces with McIlwraith. There was also strong suspicion among Liberals that his virulent anti-Chinese stance was opportunism, to win back miners' votes.

Most politicians would have accepted such a heavy defeat with grace. Not Macrossan, who together with McIlwraith, orchestrated a career resurrection. On 21 January 1879, McIlwraith named Macrossan his Secretary for Public Works and Mines, even though he was no longer an MLA. He then pressured John Deane — yes, the same John Deane of the Ravenswood mining dispute, but now one of the North's wealthiest men — to surrender his seat of Townsville, which he had won only eight weeks beforehand. Deane complied, resigning on 3 February, and Macrossan was re-instated at a by-election on 4 March 1879. Thereafter, Macrossan had no connection whatsoever with North Queensland, north from Mission Beach or west of Reid River. In fact, in the 1887 redistribution, Townsville was given two seats for an area less than today's Townsville Regional Council boundaries. He was essentially a Townsville politician who spent his time in Brisbane.

To examine Macrossan in depth, post 1878, is superfluous to this exercise, except for three significant contradictions to the rationale of the Commission's recommendation and justification for naming the proposed new electorate "Macrossan".

First is the matter of being "a fervent advocate for Northern Queensland", an ambiguous statement. Macrossan prevailed on the popular sentiment of separation. He initially supported the concept of financial separation, wherein revenue and expenditure would be committed to the districts in which taxes were raised. When Griffith, the Liberal, became Premier in 1883, Macrossan became exasperated, and demanded territorial separation. He was now in Opposition and, as nominal leader of the "Northern Nine", rationalised that this was the way ahead. Silently he harboured a grander vision of becoming Premier of a new state of North Queensland, based on Townsville. When Whitehall in London rejected the new state proposal in 1887, Macrossan dumped the movement within a year after he had been returned at the 1888 elections. [See Christian Duras, Separatism in Townsville (1981) for a full treatment of Macrossan's role.]

Second is the inference that Macrossan was an ardent Federationist. In reality, he was responding to Liberal and Labour dissatisfaction with the George Street parliament: the mining constituencies were pro-federation, anti-Brisbane, and now Macrossan identified with a future...
‘White Australia’ policy. (When the Federation referendum was held eight years after his death it was the Northern vote which propelled Queensland into the Commonwealth.) When Macrossan attended the Melbourne (1890) and Sydney (1891) conferences, along with Griffith, who he formerly considered the ‘Devil’s sibling’, he was still playing politics, trying to balance an almost unresolvable dilemma. It has been recorded in various sources that his contribution at Sydney was significant and masterful oratory. If the truth be known, he was in bed for the entire conference, struck down by influenza, and rose only on 29 March to make an impassioned and carefully calculated plea for a national system and Commonwealth, a speech at the last supper. He died the next morning.

And third, there is redemption of Macrossan’s reputation. Much of his prestige was retrieved by the legal standing of his sons, all Brisbane educated. Hugh Macrossan, who held the state seat of Windsor 1912 – 15, became a Supreme Court Judge in 1926 and Chief Justice fourteen years later. Neil Macrossan, who led the defence in the famous Mangana Case, instructed by brother, Vince Macrossan, also became Chief Justice in 1946. The combination of two Catholic Labor Premiers (Theodore and McCormack) and three Catholic Macrossan sons was irresistible in refuelling the saga of John Murtagh Macrossan’s life as champion of the “underdogs”.

Harrison Bryan, his biographer, is more critical of the man, even though biographers are invariably empathetic. He suggests even by the sub-title of his study, “Jack the Hatter”, that Lewis Carroll’s “Mad Hatter” may have come to mind. He describes Macrossan as “...not to have made friends easily”, a depressive personality, a racist, and occasional “fiery demagogue”.

This difficulty must have been enhanced by his intense vigour in party politics, the bitterness and passion of his speeches, in and outside the House, the strength of insistence on his Catholic religion and a clear determination not to conciliate or to suffer fools gladly.

And this is why Macrossan will always remain a shadowy, suspect and controversial careerist. Perhaps, the absence of obituaries in Charters Towers’ newspapers was telling.

REFERENCES:

APPENDIX 2

DALRYMPE, George Augustus Frederick Elphinstone [1826 – 1876]

In his seminal work, _A Thousand Miles Away_ (1963), Professor Geoffrey Bolton wrote: "If anyone deserved to be called the father of North Queensland, it was Dalrymple."

Dalrymple was the tenth son of Lieutenant Colonel Robert Dalrymple, an Aberdeenshire Baronet. He arrived in Queensland circa 1857, following an unsuccessful attempt to prosper in Ceylon with coffee plantations.

For two years he managed a pastoral holding on the Darling Downs, earning the respect of the Leslie brothers, pioneer settlers of the locality. Patrick Leslie was one of the few representatives of Queensland’s interests in the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly prior to Separation.

Having read the journals of the 1845 Leichhardt expedition and the report of Augustus Gregory’s party of 1856, both expeditions remarkable for endurance but “fairly restricted in scope”, the thirty-three year-old Dalrymple drafted _Proposals for the Establishment of a New Pastoral Settlement in North Australia_. He subsequently set about forming a syndicate to finance an expedition overland to the Burdekin and Cape Rivers, where Leichhardt had marked campsites.

Nineteen subscribers were forthcoming; among their number were Robert Towns (shipping magnate), Alex Stuart (director of the Bank of New South Wales), Christopher Rolleston (N.S.W. Registrar-General and former private secretary to Governor Denison), John Wickham (Royal Navy), and two of Dalrymple’s expedition party, Philip Sellheim and Ernest Henry, who became notable North Queensland pioneers.

Departing for the North in July 1859, Dalrymple reached Princhester, the limit of settlement in central Queensland in mid-August. The party did not return to Brisbane until April 1860. One of the first actions of the new Queensland Government was to rescind the opening of the Kennedy district, which the N.S.W. Executive Council had determined would be 1 January 1860; the revised date would be 1 January 1861.

In the interval, Dalrymple embarked on a second expedition, this time by sea, to locate the mouth of the Burdekin and a suitable site for a port. In short, the Burdekin was inaccessible; they turned south and investigated Port Denison, which Captain Sinclair in the _Santa Barbara_ had located in the previous year. Dalrymple named the proposed settlement site, Bowen, in honour of the colony’s first Governor. In recognition of Dalrymple’s contribution to the opening of the North to pastoralism, he was appointed Crown Commissioner, based at Bowen.

Dalrymple’s major task was processing lease applications, but this activity did not gather momentum until April 1861, after Dalrymple, again, overlanded to Port Denison and surveyed the settlement; thereafter, the rush began. Some of the names and stations which appeared before
year's end were: Sellheim (Strathmore), Cunningham (Burdekin Downs), Stenhouse (Niall), Allingham (Hillgrove), Miles (Fanning River).

By the close of 1861, four hundred and fifty-four applications for a combined 31,504 square miles of country had been lodged. Over the following twelve months, properties such as Natal Downs, Lotworth, Reedy Springs, Craigie and Wyandone pushed the limits of settlement further west and north.

One application, duly processed, was for Valley of Lagoons which Leichhardt had extolled in his journal. The lease was in the name of Dalrymple, who subsequently sought financial backing to develop the extensive run. This he found in the Scott brothers and, as a sleeping partner, Robert Herbert, the Premier of Queensland. In 1863, the owners were registered as Scott Bros., Dalrymple & Co. Much of the initial work was undertaken by the Scotts as Dalrymple was in Brisbane on sick leave.

Complaints had been lodged with Augustus Gregory, Dalrymple's superior, that processing of applications was tardy; that the Bowen Crown Commissioner was a poor administrator, in some cases favouring acquaintances' applications over others. In his defence, Dalrymple argued that other duties, such as being local Magistrate and numerous clerical tasks, as the Government's principal officer in the settlement, were excessively demanding. When Gregory appointed surveyors to the various districts, Dalrymple considered his action an affront and resigned. He retreated to Valley of Lagoons soon afterwards, to assist with its management.

Dalrymple missed the acclaim of exploration. In 1863, with Arthur Scott, he decided to cut a track from Valley of Lagoons across the Seaview Range to Rockingham Bay, which would service the property. They failed; but, after gaining Herbert and Bowen's support, subsequently headed a settlement party aboard the schooner, Policeoman. He succeeded where Edmund Kennedy had failed. Not only was a steep access track cut through the range from the coast, but he was to return with cattle by April 1864, within 100 days. The settlement was named Cardwell, after the Secretary of State for Colonies.

In March 1865, Dalrymple sold out to the Scott brothers. He had been prevailed upon to contest the recently created parliamentary seat of Kennedy, and was elected. Dalrymple sat in the Parliament for just over two years, serving as Colonial Secretary in Herbert's short-lived second ministry in July-August 1866. He declined to re-contest the seat on the grounds of ill-health, and returned "home".

Dalrymple was back in Queensland by 1869, in partnership with A.J. Bogle on Oxford Downs. Biographers Austin and Lack attribute the failure of their venture, in part, to extravagance. Dalrymple had imported a steam traction engine, "which proved impracticable on northern roads". He was insolvent, only to be rescued by a Government appointment to the Gilbert goldfield in October 1871. By 1872, with the Gilbert fading, his Gold Commissioner duties extended further west and north. He was then called upon to cut a telegraph line through to Cardwell. It was easy going and the urge to mount yet another expedition was irresistible.
William Hans of Maryvale was invited in 1872 to lead a party to explore unknown territory to the north. He named the Tate, Daintree and Palmer Rivers before retreating south, reporting some fair pastoral country and traces of gold. It was left to Dalrymple to follow up Hann's cursory observations; this time on the seaward-side of the coastal ranges to reach the Endeavour River, which Hann had failed to do.

Bolton wrote that it was "the most successful expedition of his career":

Middle-age and the heavy fevers, which would shortly end his life, could not quench his enterprise and optimism, and he found in the country between Cardwell and the Endeavour River several fertile valleys, which in his view could not be bettered for tropical cultivation. Carrying out his inspections he brought back to Brisbane specimens of minerals, plants, timber and soil.

In time, Dalrymple's discoveries would propel the development of coastal agriculture from Tully to Port Douglas: the Tablelands would open up to settlement after the Palmer gold-rush during the 1880's. Indeed, Dalrymple's 1873 expedition achieved for the Far North similar outcomes to those which his excursion to the Burdekin fifteen years beforehand had facilitated.

To round off Dalrymple's contribution to the North, upon which Bolton based his assertion that he "deserved to be called the Father of Northern Queensland":

Dalrymple returned to Cardwell stricken with fever. He retired to Brisbane and in time proposed further exploration north of Cooktown, the infant port servicing the Palmer goldfield. The new Macalister administration, however, offered him the Superintendent's position at Somerset on the eastern tip of Cape York, which had been touted in official circles as "another Singapore". He accepted the post, no doubt deluding himself that he would lead expeditions south to Cooktown and across the broad expanse of Cape York, south-west as far as the Etheridge. After three months in residence, however, he was repatriated to Brisbane following a cerebral haemorrhage. Granted leave, Dalrymple returned to Great Britain. He died at St. Leonards, Sussex on 22 January 1876, unmarried, aged 49.

In an assessment of Dalrymple as a person and 'Frontiersman', historians have to tread cautiously if relying on the expansive biography by Dr. Jean Farnfield published in 1968. While her research is commendable, her portrayal, interpretation and conclusions betray hagiography – a Cromwell without wars, a Cardigan of tactical genius, a Livingstone who was never really lost, a Victorian protégé who contributed to the expansion and wealth of the Empire. Dalrymple, however, had several short-comings of character.

As tenth son in line to the Barony, he stood little chance of gaining the financial and social status which the first or second son would inherit. The Ceylon coffee venture was an opportunity to make his mark early in life, and return to Great Britain to acclaim as one who had prospered on the Sub-continent or in Ceylon, as so many had done. Instead, he went further afield as several others did in Malaya, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand.

The company Dalrymple kept in Queensland was always well-connected in Britain, commencing with the Leslie brothers, and extending to Robert Herbert and Governor Bowen.
Even in the North in the early 1860’s, as Ann Allingham has pointed out, there was a social unity prevailing among pastoralists of a ’squire-o-cracy’ class, “gentlemen of birth and education”. According to Governor Bowen: “They included Dalrymple, Ernest Healy, and the Scott brothers, Robert Gray and Robert Stewart, and to a lesser extent Biddulph Hervey…."

On his first New Year’s Eve at Bowen, Dalrymple hosted a Hogmanay. He was also often hailed as he drove his carriage, four-in-hand, around the settlement, although this assertion is apocryphal—it was probably only two, more likely one. That Dalrymple enjoyed social functions is certain, whether in Brisbane or at Rockhampton, where he almost came to grief.

In 1863, Dalrymple became involved in a fracas on his way north to Valley of Lagoons: at Rockhampton, he stayed some weeks with Albrecht Feez and his wife, long-standing friends, if six years acquaintance was a measure in colonial times. Dalrymple was observed alone with Mrs Feez at a ball held at tea-parties, while Albrecht was busily making money as one of Rockhampton’s leading merchants. The local “grandies” suggested impropriety; the police were alleged to be part of a plot, for reasons unknown. Feez, the aggrieved husband, defending his wife’s honour, confronted a local J.P. who had endorsed the statutory declaration of the resident police chief, who had an interest in “the scandal”. He horse-whipped him. When Dalrymple heard of the incident, he then confronted the Police Magistrate, John Jardine, and demanded an inquiry. Jardine demurred; Dalrymple, later that afternoon accosted him in Boltsover Lane, from horseback; he dashed him once on the head with his whip handle while uttering expletives in defence of Mrs Feez’s reputation. No such excitement had occurred in Rockhampton since the crocodile attack some months beforehand. Feez was charged and fined £20. Dalrymple was committed to the next Assize Court, not to meet until the following April. Premier Herbert wrote to Walter Scott:

…I feel more sorry for poor Dalrymple than anything else; he has been indiscreet, but by all accounts he is expected to see the inside of goal, which is a hard thing and I shall be very glad to hear that he escapes this fate.

Dalrymple did not front the court in April; he was high on the Seaview Range. The verdict went against him; the court determined that respect for the law must be observed. He was found guilty and fined the enormous sum of £500 for ‘slander and assault’. Jardine, Bucklay (who testified that Dalrymple and Mrs Feez had been observed together), and Sub-Inspector Foran, who drove the charge, were all transferred within three months.

Clearly, Dalrymple was pompous, sometimes arrogant, but made few enemies because of his flamboyance and eccentricity. That he was at home in the North was reflected in his maiden speech to the Parliament when he briefly represented the vast Kennedy electorate:

…Kennedy men have generously given me credit for my humble exertions. They well understand the sufferings and hardships of the pioneers, and the difficulties attending the formation of a new settlement… Many of these gentlemen can criticise us, but dare not follow our footsteps into the wilderness.
REFERENCES:

LAST Friday's announcement that the electorate of Charters Towers is in for major changes to its boundaries would have come as no surprise to keen students of electoral boundaries and associated representative quotas.

What would have surprised virtually everyone would be the proposed name change for the electorate – from Charters Towers to Macrossan. Proposing the new name, the Queensland Redistribution Commission has put forward that John Murtagh Macrossan (1833-1891) was an elected member of the Legislative Assembly for Townsville and Kennedy electorates between 1877 and 1891.

A fair historical connection with the region? Well no. In fact history reveals that Macrossan did little to promote the Charters Towers region and in fact was much more interested in furthering his interests with the port of Townsville. He was also an opponent of the establishment of the State of Queensland.

This newspaper does not accept that the commission has made a wise choice in the renaming of the electorate currently represented by the National Party's Shane Knuth. If we are looking for historical connections with accuracy, let the commission reconsider, and instead change the name of the electorate to Dalrymple – a name that has much closer links to much of this electorate.

Not only is the name Dalrymple associated with government in the state of Queensland through the former Dalrymple Shire but George Dalrymple (1829-1876) was not only the first elected representative for this region but was largely responsible for the exploration of large areas surrounding the Burdekin River, including further north into what is now the Atherton Tablelands.

George Dalrymple has been described by noted historian Professor Geoff Boulton in his book A Thousand Miles Away in this way: “...arguably the father of North Queensland is was Dalrymple”.

Boundary changes we can understand and accept, but the electorate name change to Macrossan we cannot accept.
PROPOSED ELECTORATE BOUNDARY CHANGES

The draft boundary changes proposed by the Electoral Commission of Queensland in May 2015, have been released by Shane Knuth MP for the electorate of Charters Towers. The proposed changes will significantly affect the electoral boundaries of the electorate.

The new electorate will be named Charters Towers Regional Council and the interface between the new electorate and the existing electorate will be maintained.

On May 21, 2015, the Commission released a draft of the proposed changes for public consultation. The public is invited to provide feedback on the proposed changes.

The proposed changes will come into effect on July 1, 2015. Shane Knuth MP encourages all residents of the electorate to provide their feedback on the proposed changes.

Phone: 4777 3155
Fax: 4777 3159
Email: Shane.Knuth@parliament.qld.gov.au

Page 2 The Northern Miner, Friday, June 5, 2015
To the Queensland State Distribution Commission

Dear Sir,

Is this the only way you can throw the One Nation Candidate out? It seems to be the only one who can see what Queensland is going. I object to changes you are doing as you are throwing out a great full Labour State. Labour is not the old Labour Party any more worse luck.

God help us now.

M. King.
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

We in Dimbulah will be another forgotten part of Queensland
Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and main typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far
more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring
the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to
Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of
the active and effective community representative group Montville Village
Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which
the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn
would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and
community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed
redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from
the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those
residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to pay major roles in its
continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place
as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic
community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present.
Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising
the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived
community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through
gymnasiums to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as
well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based
associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly
cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly
valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if
not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with
two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be
grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east
and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of
historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and
transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically
deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially,
culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The
topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being
practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin
electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging,
contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of
interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to
strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully

Name .......................................................
Address .......................................................

53 Alice Dixon Drive,
FLAXTON, 4560
From: Michael [mailto:m.mort@bigpond.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 17 June 2008 1:05 PM
To: EQC User
Subject: Redistribution Tablelands District

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

17th June 2008

Dear Hon. Alan Demack AO, Mr David Kerslake, Ms Rachel Hunter,

I am writing to you because of the concern I have with the decision of deleting the Tablelands Electoral District at present apart of north Queensland.

Your suggestion to split the Tablelands and add to three Electoral Districts; Cook with the Northern Tablelands, Hinchinbrook with a small portion of South/East and The new Macrossan with the Central/West/Southern region. (Macrossan all right it would take a mug to try and go across the length to get people to vote you into the seat). Is Charters Towers all ready a Labor seat? I know that Cook is Labor and you have just increased his votes close to 50k.

My concern is in the redistribution is:

A. The extent to which these communities have in common in economic, social, regional and what interests in each electoral districts are maybe Charters Towers wants some of the Tablelands water this is fine if the infrastructure is put in place to catch some of the wet season, but as is we only have enough to see our farmers through the dry season.

B. The way of communication which is very bad and worse since CDMA was removed. The only thing in common is bad reception. The travel within the new Macrossan district will be very interesting due to lack of well built roads and the new seat distance in area will be around 277,986 sq km. (make sure you pack water bottles and a cut lunch).

C. The physical features well nothing alike.

D. The boundaries of existing may require adjusting as for Hinchinbrook getting their small portion of the Tablelands district bring both districts population to a more even number of voters. Also if there is smaller numbers in Charters Towers then it would be of better understanding to divide charters Towers within their coastal boundaries.

E. The demographic of Macrossan seat is so way out there I believe that you cannot work a seat going South to North, and the government reelect that each region is unique to its own needs and requirements of services, at present we have the S/E corner, central, S/W, north and Far North Regions.

I am submitting to the Commission to please think hard and long about this decision.
The distance 277,986 sq km approx for our members office and the mileage that you would have to reimburse for the member to get around their seat is ridiculous, time wasted on the road would be outrageous. The government allocates funds per region where does this leave Macrossen seat covering 3 regions.

Yours truly,

Doreen Mortimore
PO Box 252 Ravenshoe Qld 4888
From: Lisa Devlin [mailto:lisa.devil@bigpond.com]
Sent: Monday, 16 June 2008 3:03 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Fw: Queensland Redistribution Commission 16 June

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane, Qld 4001
1422
4873
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

We are writing to register our strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution. We are Tablelands constituents (Woora Station, Ravenshoe) and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macossan is terribly flawed.

This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland, is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

We request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Glen Doyle and Lisa Devlin
17th June 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Commissioners,

I wish to submit an objection to the proposed new boundaries for the State electorate of Logan.

I have studied the proposal and think that by cutting out the suburbs of Hillcrest and Boronia Heights really breaks up our community of interest with suburbs like Regents Park, Heritage Park and Park Ridge etc.

By doing this, I notice that all facilities won by our State Member Mr John Mickel over the years have been for nothing.

The Police, Fire and Ambulance Stations are all in the suburb of Boronia Heights as is the new Health Centre being built, the retirement village and nursing homes like the Logan Nursing Home and St Paul de Charters, not to mention that the new park and ride that is being built will also be taken away.

Surely the southern part of the electorate can be taken off to balance this up. That area down there has no interest in us, not like Boronia Heights and Hillcrest – we all belong together up this part.

Hoping you will take my letter into consideration.

Yours truly,

Michael Franxmamn
Queensland Manager
From: Charlotte Golding [mailto:charlottegolding@bigpond.com]
Sent: Monday, 16 June 2008 6:04 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Electoral Commission Review

Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:–

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of
the active and effective community representative group Montville Village Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic community “self-help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through gymnasia to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Niekin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially, culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Niekin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully

Name      Charlotte Golding
Address    101 Flaxton Mill Road
           Flaxton, Q4560
From: Plains Wanderer [mailto:plainswanderer@powerup.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 16 June 2008 3:30 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Electoral boundary very unsatisfactory.

QRC/0
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane, 4001

Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far
more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of the active and effective community representative group Montville Village Association is drawn into each rebound electorate. Similarly the area from which the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through gymnasia to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially, culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to strongly held community wishes.

Yours faithfully,

Diana O’Connor
Address 1 Alice Dixon Drive,
          Flaxton 4560
From: Robyn Wing [mailto:robwing@bigpond.com]
Sent: Monday, 16 June 2008 8:18 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Queensland Redistribution Commission 16 June

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane, Qld 4001
1523
4880
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

We are writing to register our strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.
We are Tablelands constituents and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is terribly flawed.
This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland, is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

We request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Robyn and Rob Wing
Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my strong objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of
the active and effective community representative group Montville Village
Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which
the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn
would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and
community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed
redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from
the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those
residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its
continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place
as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic
community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present.
Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising
the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived
community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through
gymnasio to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as
well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based
associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly
cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly
valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if
not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with
two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be
gruesomely inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east
and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of
historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and
transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically
deply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially,
culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The
topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being
practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin
electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging;
contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of
interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to
strongly help community wishes.

The fact that this is a document which has been circulated and is therefore not my
own words should not diminish its meaning or impact. It encapsulates everything I
wish to be made known on this issue, wholeheartedly.

Yours faithfully

Name .................................................... Edward H Burke
Address ..............................................
...52 Flaxton Mill Road
    Flaxton 4560......................
........07 5445 7041......................
From: EDV Action Group [mailto:edvactiongroup@bigpond.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 17 June 2008 11:09 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Submission re. Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries.

---

EDV ACTION

GROUP
INCORPORATED
PO BOX 2020 NOOSA HEADS 4567
Ph (07) 5471 0868 Fax (07) 5471 0870
Email edvactiongroup@bigpond.com

The Electoral Commission of Queensland,
GPO Box 1393
Brisbane Queensland 4001

17th June, 2008

Dear Sirs,

EDV Submission to the Electoral Commission of Queensland re. Proposed amendments to the Noosa Electorate.

The Eumundi, Doonan, Verribee and Weyba Downs (West Peregian), would like to make the following submission regarding the redistribution of boundaries of state electorates in our area.

Prior to amalgamation in March, 2008, these areas were divided by the Noosa and Maroochy Shires northern border. Since the inception of the EDV in February, 2004 our mission, on behalf of our members and supporters, has been to become part of the Noosa Shire via a boundary change, and we have always based our argument on the fact that the Noosa area is our Community of Interest. A door-knock survey carried


out in 2006 showed that 81% of residents in these areas wished to become part of the then Noosa shire.

We believe it imperative that the areas of Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs remain as one community area and should not be divided by electoral boundaries, as would be the case if the Eumundi-Noosa Road became the southern boundary for the Noosa electorate. The EDV suggests that the boundary be taken further south into Verrierdale, say east from Seib Road, along Verrierdale Forest Road, Venning Road, Verrierdale Road and Doonan Bridge Road East to the Sunshine Coast Motorway. Our members and supporters believe that our communities should form part of the larger Noosa area, as this is our Community of interest.

We have been consistent in our efforts to bring about a boundary change in order to a) keep the areas of Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs undivided, and b) make these areas part of a greater Noosa Shire. I refer you to our various submissions supporting our argument as attached:

EDV Submission to Maroochy and Noosa Councils
EDV Submission to Electoral Commission of Queensland regarding internal divisional boundaries for the proposed Sunshine Coast Council
EDV Submission Regarding the Commonwealth Electoral Amendment (Democratic Plebiscites) Bill 2007
EDV Submission to the Local Government Reform Commission

We would once again ask you to reconsider the proposed amendments to the Noosa electorate which if instigated, would divide our community unnecessarily.

Yours truly,
EDV Action Group (Inc.)

Johanne Wright,
President
EDV Action Group Incorporated
EDV ACTION GROUP
INCORPORATED
PO BOX 2020 NOOSA HEADS 4567
Ph (07) 5471 0868 Fax (07) 5471 0870
Email edvactiongroup@bigpond.com

24th August 2007

Committee Secretary
Finance and Public Administration Committee
Department of the Senate
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Dear Sir/Madam,

Submission Regarding the Commonwealth Electoral Amendment (Democratic Plebiscites) Bill 2007

The Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale (EDV) Action Group is a community based incorporated organisation that represents 3,000 electors in the areas of Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and West Peregrin (formerly Weyba Downs). These areas are situated at the far northern end of the Maroochy Shire adjoining and adjacent to the boundary with Noosa Shire.

Since 2004 (prior to the last local government elections) our group has been campaigning to have the above named areas removed from Division Six of Maroochy Shire and a boundary change implemented in order for these areas to become part of Noosa Shire. To support our case, an extensive and detailed submission was prepared by us, for both Noosa and Maroochy Councils and presented to them in January 2006 (Executive Summary enclosed). This submission clearly showed that more than 80% of local residents and 67% of businesses in these areas were in favour of this move on strong community of interest grounds. (It is of interest to note that the issue of boundary change in this area has a history dating back to the 1920’s).

Noosa Council supported our proposal and in a recent submission to the Local Government Reform Commission (LGRC) of Queensland, recommended that the above named areas as well as Peregin Springs be part of an expanded stand-alone Noosa Shire. Our own submission to the LGRC also argued for this outcome. Additionally, we understand that the electors of Peregin Springs and Coolum (presently part of Maroochy Shire and adjacent to Noosa) also supported this move.

Terms of Reference

In reference to the proposed amendment to the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918, we fully support the Bill. We believe that it is essential for local authorities to be able to call for a plebiscite on this issue, or any other issue which profoundly affects their constituents. We are outraged that the Queensland Government is not acting in accordance with the will of the people by forcing amalgamation upon them and denying them their democratic right.
It is also outrageous that democratically elected Local authorities should be faced with
demissals and/or fines if they fail to act in accordance with the Queensland
Government's edict by allowing their constituents to express their will via a plebiscite.
Should a plebiscite be conducted by Noosa Council we firmly believe that it would yield
an overwhelming result opposing amalgamation and supporting an expanded stand-
one Noosa Shire. Approximately 32,000 submissions to this effect were sent to the
Local Government Reform Commission of Queensland in May of this year and were
ignored. Under the Terms of Reference of that Commission Noosa Council should have
been exempt as it is financially strong, viable and sustainable and hugely supportive of
its community of interest.

Our Dilemma

The areas that we represent wish to be part of an expanded stand-alone Noosa Shire
and Noosa Council wishes to include our areas within its boundaries. Should Noosa
Council conduct a plebiscite we would not be included as we are presently, not in that
shire. If Maroochy Council conducted its own plebiscite, we would be swamped as
Maroochy has a population of more than 149,000 (2006 figures) and our supporters total
3,000. We would be totally disenfranchised as Maroochy Council will not give us any
power and has not been in favour of a boundary change.

We propose that there are two ways of overcoming this dilemma.

The ambit of the terms of reference be extended to allow:

1. the above named areas to be included in a Noosa Council plebiscite owing to their
   strong links and their shared community of interest.

2. the above named areas be allowed to conduct a plebiscite of their own funded by the
   Australian Electoral Commission.


Johanne Wright
President

c.c. Australian Electoral Commission

Encl. Executive Summary – EDV Report on Doorknock Campaign
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OVERVIEW

Who we are

The Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale (EDV) Action Group Incorporated was established in February 2004. The group represents over 80% of local residents and has a support base of over 2,000 individuals.

What we stand for

The primary objective of the EDV Action Group is to lobby actively for a boundary change between Maroochy and Noosa Shires so that four defined areas (namely Doonan, Eumundi, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs) become part of Noosa not Maroochy Shire.

History to date

In mid to late 2005 the EDV committee undertook an extensive survey of all residents and businesses in the areas of interest to establish the extent of support for a boundary change. There was overwhelming community support for this with 80.5% of residents and 87% of businesses signing letters to Maroochy and Noosa Councils.

In January 2006 the EDV Action Group submitted an excellent case for a boundary realignment between Noosa and Maroochy Shires to both Noosa and Maroochy Councils.

During 2006, the EDV Action Group was approached by other community groups and individuals who live in the northern part of Maroochy Shire (namely Coolum and Peregian Springs) expressing their desire to be part of Noosa.

In January 2007, in the initial review phase of the SSS Process, Maroochy and Noosa Councils identified these areas as communities of interest for potential boundary realignment, based on their analysis using the SSS sustainability indicators.

In April 2007, with the announcement of the new Local Government Reform Commission and its terms of reference, the EDV Action Group committee were inundated by supporters expressing significant concern about the potential negative impacts of proposed amalgamation scenarios and asking the committee to put a submission to the Commission.
PURPOSE OF THIS SUBMISSION

This submission to the Local Government Reform Commission by the Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale (EDV) Action Group sets out the arguments for a boundary change between Maroochy and Noosa Shires so that Noosa Shire is expanded but not amalgamated with Maroochy.

The submission places the following recommendations to the Commission for its consideration and endorsement:

Recommendation One: The EDV Action Group strongly recommends that the northern areas of Maroochy Shire (Doonan, Eumundi, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs) become part of an expanded and stand alone Noosa Shire.

Recommendation Two: The EDV Action Group recommends the proposed boundary changes that are set out in the map in Attachment One to this submission be the basis of a new and expanded Noosa Shire.

Recommendation Three: The EDV Action Group strongly recommends against Noosa Shire being amalgamated with any other shire in the Sunshine Coast/ Coolum region.
EDV'S PREFERRED OPTION FOR THE FUTURE – AN EXPANDED NOOSA SHIRE

Our preferred position to ensure the best outcomes for our communities is to create an expanded Noosa local government area by extending the existing boundaries.

The boundaries of Noosa Shire should be expanded to incorporate adjacent areas which have close linkages to Noosa in terms of economy, community of interest and environment (i.e. Eumundi, Verierdale, Doonan, Weyba Downs).

We would also support Noosa Council's inclusion of Peregian Springs. The majority of the residents of this community, according to a recent survey, also want to be part of Noosa and not Maroochy.

This new expanded Noosa Shire would then retain the values and aspects that the Noosa community has worked hard to develop over the past 30 years, and that we strongly support.

The primary basis for our submission relates to the Commission's first terms of reference, namely:

*The reform commission must consider the grouping of like communities of interest to maintain the social fabric and character of communities and areas of the State, and in particular, must consider review areas established under SSS review processes*

**Groupings of Like Communities of Interest**

An important focus of the EDV submission to the SSS Review process (January 2006) was our community of interest and links with Noosa Shire. The arguments for a boundary change outlined in that submission were as follows:

1. There is extensive cross border use of services in Noosa Shire by the residents of Doonan, Eumundi, Verierdale and Weyba Downs. These residents use Noosa shire's libraries, its sporting venues, its rubbish tip and its community halls and other like facilities. Evidence of this was provided.

2. There is extensive use of a wide range of community facilities in Noosa by the residents of Doonan, Eumundi, Verierdale and Weyba Downs. We shop there, conduct business there, use the hospitals and schools, obtain medical and other health services as well as use a range of local professional services.

3. The strong Community of Interest between Noosa and the suburbs of Doonan, Eumundi, Verierdale and Weyba Downs is also evidenced by the extensive
commuting between one area and another, and the ease of access to
information from local Noosa newspapers. Residents receive free local Noosa
papers but no equivalent papers from Maroochydore. We are totally
disenfranchised in terms of information.

4. There is a range of boundary anomalies that create senseless divisions where
none should exist. The suburb of Doonan is bisected, with one half in one
shire and the other half in another. Weyba Downs is in an isolated
pocket surrounded by Noosa Shire and some streets in three of the suburbs
are bisected by the shire boundaries.

5. The culture, character and identity of the four areas have more in common
with Noosa Shire than Maroochydore by virtue of greater alignment with
Noosa’s approach to planning, by historical linkages, by the extent of branding
which makes the areas appear to be part of Noosa, and by geographic
proximity.

6. There would be more effective water catchment management for the
environmentally sensitive area of Lake Weyba if all surrounding development
is controlled by one shire.

The fifth point, namely strong cultural and identity linkages is particularly relevant
when potential options are being considered.

**Maintenance of the Social Fabric and Character of Communities**

Maroochy Council has demonstrated over and over again its lack of understanding of
the values, culture and identity of people who live in its northern area. A classic
illustration of this was the recent approval of a tender for Eumundi market car parking
from a non-local, non-Queensland company. Prior to this, local community groups, in
particular the local fire brigades, benefited from the extensive visitor commuting to
the markets. This decision is illustrative of the insensitivity of Maroochy Council’s
policy processes when dealing with local communities.

There is a lengthy history of local communities living in the northern part of the
Maroochy Shire desiring to become part of Noosa Shire. People who live in the
Northern part of Division Six in Maroochy Shire have been agitating for a boundary
development from as long ago as 1929. South Perigian achieved this boundary change
prior to the last local government election and the residents have been very satisfied
with the outcome.

The primary reason expressed at all times by these residents is the close alignment
with the values that underpin the Noosa community as distinct from the values that
underpin the southern part of the Sunshine Coast.

Analysis of media coverage shows the extent of interest by all the communities in the
northern part of the Sunshine Coast to preserve a “village atmosphere” and ensure
environmentally sensitive development. The long term impacts of over development and loss of amenity are very much in the forefront of community consideration. Far from being an elitist attempt to keep people out, it is a thoughtful, considered response to the creation of a sustainable environment that meets the needs of current and future generations.

We argue that this community of shared interests would be best served through the creation of a stand alone but expanded Noosa Shire that brings together those communities who share common values under one local authority.

Consideration of the SSS Review Areas

Maroochy and Noosa were part of the Sunshine Coast Council review area and Noosa and Coolum had also formed another review area, although no substantive work had been undertaken at the point of disbanding the SSS process.

In the reports that were undertaken by the Sunshine Coast Council Review Group, a clear picture emerged about communities of interest. Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs were listed by both Maroochy and Noosa as a potential for a boundary change (as was Peregian Springs and Coolum Heights).

This is further evidence for a boundary change.

We believe that an expanded Noosa Shire will be able to give our local communities:

- A single local government area that shares a common identity
- A Council that will best manage the growth and planning within the community
- A Council that will be able to meet the infrastructure and community services needs of its communities
- An opportunity for local residents to participate in local government decisions that affect their communities of interest
- A Council that will be even stronger financially with long-term sustainability
EDV'S CONCERN ABOUT AMALGAMATION

Although Caloundra and Maroochy Councils have already indicated their support for amalgamation, Noosa Council is totally opposed to amalgamation with any of its neighbouring shires including Coolum. Coolum Council have also indicated its opposition to being amalgamated with its southern neighbours. The position of no amalgamation is supported by the EDV Action Group.

The Noosa community has continued to voice its position that Noosa should not be amalgamated. This was made very clear when over 18,000 people signed a petition in 2004 and presented this to Parliament.

The primary reason the Noosa community is opposed to being forcibly amalgamated into a super Sunshine Coast Council or a Noosa/Coolum Council, is the knowledge that their gains over the last 30 years in becoming a unique community with an international reputation will be severely diluted or destroyed.

It is the EDV's position that amalgamation will have negative impacts on our lifestyle. We therefore strongly support the points raised by the Noosa community with respect to the negative impacts of amalgamation (particularly with Caloundra and Maroochy).

The Key Points raised by the Noosa Community are:

- The values held by the Noosa community are enormously different to its southern (and northern) neighbours, particularly in respect to growth management, scale, amenity and the environment.
- Noosa's town planning scheme is based on sustainability taking into account the capacity of its natural environment. This would be overturned under an amalgamated Council and replaced with the planning schemes currently being applied across the southern Sunshine Coast which would be detrimental to the Noosa lifestyle, economy and environment.
- Noosa's autonomy would be lost in a combined Sunshine Coast Council. The Council would represent only 1/6 of the population therefore Noosa would have limited ability to influence decisions.
- 'The "Noosa" brand is well established, very successful and worth a significant amount to the local and Queensland economy. The Noosa tourism industry alone generates over $800 million per annum. This would be at great risk under an amalgamation.
- Noosa has a very different look and feel to its southern neighbours with no high rise, minimal signage pollution, minimal traffic lights and significant green spaces protected through National Parks and reserves. This would change significantly under the management of a remote Super Council.
• The Noosa environment is pristine and is fiercely protected by the community. The community does not want to see this destroyed by a Council which is more influenced by developers.

• The Noosa community is mainly made up of small business, owned and operated by local people. They do not want the impersonal mega-marts to take over Noosa as seen in Maroochy and Caloundra.

• A pristine river ecosystem and no high rise buildings casting shadows on the beach are icons that identify Noosa as being a unique location, Noosa would no longer be unique if these were to change under pressure from a development focused Council.

• Noosa does not have signs polluting the landscape and has only three sets of pedestrian traffic lights. The community does not want to turn into a highly metropolitan area with city symbols.

• The Noosa hinterland is made up of small towns with character, natural bushland and agricultural farms. The community does not want to see this destroyed by suburban sprawl.

• The Sunshine Coast is highly urbanised and meets a mass market, whereas Noosa is of village scale and is in the niche market. Its economy is very different and needs to be managed differently.

• At the northern end of a combined Sunshine Coast Council, Noosa will end up the poor cousin for service. Services will be centred at Maroochy, just as is the case with existing State Government services.

In addition, we would add the following:

• In an amalgamated situation with the Sunshine Coast Councils, the sheer weight of numbers would see the planning philosophies of the Southern Sunshine Coast Councils being predominant in Council decision making. If we as a community suffer at present from a lack of understanding of our needs, this would be exacerbated in a larger, urban focussed Council.

• At present we have experienced poor levels of representation by our local Councillor of local issues and local needs. Effective representation would be even harder to achieve in an amalgamated Council when the majority of Councillors would be elected from the more highly populated areas.

• If the Commission determined that amalgamation was to be based on current borders, and was prepared to leave Noosa as a stand alone Council, then the interests of our communities would still not be met and the Commission would have failed to take into consideration the principles outlined in its first terms of reference.
Meeting the Commission’s Terms of Reference

The EDV Action Group does not believe that an amalgamation is justified with regard to the Commission's terms of reference for the following reasons:

- Maroochy and Noosa already operate effectively in an autonomous capacity
- Maroochy and Noosa participate in regional planning with neighbours through SunROC and Noosa in particular is still able to maintain its independent stance
- Maroochy and Noosa are financially strong
- Maroochy and Noosa already have populations of critical or sufficient size and are not one of the 88 Queensland Councils identified as having a population less than 5,000

However, the EDV Action Group believes that the Commission's Terms of Reference provide the opportunity to redraw the boundaries to create the most appropriate local authority structure for the present and the future. For such an important part of the State, taking a simplistic approach which just applies the current boundaries, without considering the implications of strong differences in communities of interest is a less than effective outcome.

SUMMARY

The EDV Action Group argues that a greater Noosa Council with expanded borders including our communities of interest (Doonan, Eumundi, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs) is the best outcome for those residents who live in the northern part of Maroochy Shire, and the best outcome for future generations.

The EDV Action Group considers that the worst outcome for the residents would be any amalgamation scenario viz:

- A large "Super Council" on the Sunshine Coast (Caloundra/Maroochy/Noosa or even worse Caloundra/Maroochy/Noosa/Cooloola) where our voice would be significantly diminished
  OR
- Two large councils on the Sunshine Coast (Caloundra/Maroochy and Noosa/Cooloola) where we would remain on the edges of two very different local authorities with potentially very different values that are inconsistent with our community values

The EDV Action Group further argues that to leave Noosa as a stand alone Council using the current boundaries, without including the communities adjacent to its...
southern borders would be a less than optimal outcome for those communities and for the Shire.

We therefore submit to the Commission that a boundary change between Noosa and Maroochy Shires to include the communities of Doonan, Eumundi, Varierdale and Weyba Downs is the preferred outcome.
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SUBMISSION TO MAROOCHY AND NOOSA SHIRE COUNCILS

A PROPOSAL FOR A BOUNDARY CHANGE

FROM

EUMUNDI, DOONAN AND VERRIERDALE ACTION GROUP INCORPORATED (EDV ACTION GROUP)

JANUARY 2006
Acknowledgements

The EDV Action Group would like to acknowledge many individuals for their support and assistance leading up to the development of this submission.

We are particularly indebted to the dedication of the door knockers for the amount of time they devoted to walking the streets of this large rural area and braving the rigours of long steep driveways, fierce dogs and inclement weather. Two individuals in particular are singled out for mention - Adrienne Prentice who coordinated the process and devoted many hours and weeks of her time to the process and Sonia Macdonald who was always on hand to help out others.

In addition to Adrienne and Sonia, the band of doorknockers included the following dedicated people: Peter and June Black, Ed and Sher Boyd, Jennifer Chapman, Jim Herde, Penny Johnson, Carol Metherall, Robin Morris, Robin and Rich Russell, Jeremy Sargent, Sarah Thomsen, Peter and Inger Vinogradov, Rhonda White and Ian and Johanne Wright

The Group is also indebted to a previous Vice President, Dr Peter Hartley, who established our constitution and set up the robust data base to enable us to undertake our survey of residents.

We have received both moral and financial support from our members who have been prepared to give their time, their advice, donations and membership fees to enable us to continue our work.

We would also like to acknowledge our local Councillor, Cr Greg Fairby who advised us on the format for the letter of support and what was required to include in our submission.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Purpose of Submission ............................................. 1
Arguments for a Boundary Change ............................... 3
Influence of Community Support for a Boundary Change .... 4
Addressing Issues of Concern .................................... 6
Conclusion ............................................................ 9

**INTRODUCTION**

Background .................................................................. 10
Current Situation ...................................................... 12
Purpose of the Submission .......................................... 13
Recommendations ...................................................... 14

**ARGUMENTS FOR A BOUNDARY CHANGE**

Cross Decker Service Use ............................................ 15
Community of Interest ................................................. 16
Extensive Commuting Between Areas ......................... 17
Community Linkages .................................................. 18

Culture, Character and Identity ................................. 20
Affordability with Noosa's Planning Approach ............. 21
Historical Linkages .................................................... 22

Branding and Identity ................................................ 23
Changing Settlement Patterns ..................................... 24
Geographical Closeness .............................................. 25

Lake Waya Catchment Area Management .................... 26
Indigenous Issues ...................................................... 27

**EVIDENCE OF THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR A BOUNDARY CHANGE**

Target Area ............................................................. 28
Household .................................................................. 29
Household Sample ................................................... 30
Household Results .................................................... 31
Reasons for Decision ................................................. 32

Businesses ............................................................... 33
Business Sample ..................................................... 34
Business Results ...................................................... 35
Reasons for Decision ................................................. 36

**CONCLUSION** ......................................................... 37

**ATTACHMENT ONE: RESULTS OF NOOSA SHIRE COUNCIL'S NEIGHBOURS' SURVEY** 38

**ATTACHMENT TWO: STREETS IN AREA OF INTEREST** 39

**ATTACHMENT THREE: MAP OF AREA OF INTEREST** 40

**ATTACHMENT FOUR: METHODOLOGY FOR DOOR KNOCK CAMPAIGN** 41

Organization .......................................................... 42
Information ............................................................. 43
Audit of Data ........................................................... 44

**ATTACHMENT FIVE: FORMS AND INFORMATION SHEETS USED BY EDV GROUP** 45

Letter of Support ...................................................... 46
Instructions for Door Knockers .................................... 47
EDV Information Sheets ............................................. 48
Survey of Community Activity (Undertaken prior to door knock campaign) 49
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of Submission

This is a submission to both Noosa and Maroochy Councils by the Eumundi, Doonan, Verribee (EDV) Action Group setting out the arguments for a boundary change, presenting evidence of the level of resident support for such a change and requesting that both Councils investigate the issue of a boundary change as part of the Size, Shape and Sustainability Review Project currently being supported by the Local Government of Queensland (LGAQ). To enable this to occur, the submission places the following recommendations to both Councils:

Recommendation One: The EDV Action Group recommends that both Maroochy Council and Noosa Council consider this request for a boundary change as part of their overall review of their future sustainability.

Recommendation Two: The EDV Action Group recommends that both Councils include this submission for a boundary change in the specific terms of reference for the Review of Size, Shape and Sustainability of the Sunshine Coast Councils.

The submission to the two Mayors also includes copies of the individual Letters of Support from residents.

Arguments for a Boundary Change

The arguments for a boundary change outlined in this submission are as follows:

1. There is extensive cross border use of services in Noosa Shire by the residents of Doonan, Eumundi, Verribee and Weyba Downs.
2. There is a definite Community of Interest between Noosa and the suburbs of Doonan, Eumundi, Verribee and Weyba Downs as evidenced by the extensive commuting between one area and another, and the ease of access to information from local Noosa newspapers. In addition, there is a range of boundary anomalies that create senseless divisions where none should exist. The suburb of Doonan is bisected, with one half in one shire and the other half in another shire. Weyba Downs is in an isolated pocket surrounded by Noosa Shire and some streets in three of the suburbs are bisected by the shire boundaries.
3. The culture, character and identity of the four suburbs has more in common with Noosa Shire than Maroochy Shire by virtue of greater alignment with Noosa's approach to planning, by historical linkages, by the extent of branding which makes the suburbs appear to be part of Noosa, and by geographic proximity.
4. There would be more effective water catchment management for the environmentally sensitive area of Lake Weyba if all surrounding development is controlled by one shire.

Evidence of Community Support for a Boundary Change

Evidence of resident and business support is provided based on extensive and exhaustive surveying of the local population and business community. This submission provides detail of the methodology used including the auditing of the data and analysis by an independent statistical expert to stress the validity and reliability of the results.

The results show an overwhelming support for a boundary change (80.5% of households and 87% of businesses). Such a response cannot be ignored.

Copies of the Letters of Support from individual residents and business owners are provided as supporting documentation to this submission.

Addressing Issues of Concern

This submission also acknowledges the concerns of Maroochy Council regarding potential loss of revenue and issues of asset transfer. It is suggested that the most appropriate way for these to be addressed is through a review process involving both Councils.

Conclusion

The EDV Action Group requests that both Councils, in line with their strong commitment to community engagement, consider this submission carefully and engage in a review process to examine all aspects of a boundary change.
INTRODUCTION

Background

The Eumundi Doonan Verrierdale (EDV) Action Group Incorporated was formed following a community meeting held in Eumundi in February 2004. It is a community based organisation comprised entirely of volunteers who have given their time and resources for a cause to which they are committed.

The Group started with an initial membership of less than 40 people and a committee of seven. The primary interest of the members was to develop a case for a boundary change between Division Six in Maroochy Shire and Noosa Shire so that the northern part of Division Six would become part of the Noosa Shire.

The rationale for this boundary change proposal was a community of interest argument.

In the first eight months of formation the group concentrated on the following:

- Establishing the policy position of candidates for the Mayor and the Division Six Councillor position prior to the April 2004 elections with respect to a request for a boundary change;
- Researching the legislative and policy requirements to have a boundary change considered;
- Establishing a basis for a community of interest argument; and
- Becoming incorporated as a not for profit organisation.

Current Situation

The Group became incorporated on the 22nd April 2005\(^1\) and has a current support base of over 2000 residents. The geographic area of interest was extended to include Weyba Downs after representation by a number of individuals who live in that area.

The group has made informal contact with both Noosa and Maroochy Shires and has been advised that although Noosa Shire would be amenable to consider the merits of a boundary change, Maroochy Shire would need hard evidence that the majority of residents (of Doonan,

---

\(^1\) The objects of the Group are as follows:
(a) to bring about the transfer of all or part of the localities of Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs to Noosa Shire by way of a boundary change; and
(b) to bring about the transfer of additional areas to Noosa Shire by way of a boundary change as may be decided from time to time by a General Meeting of the Association.
(c) in the event of amalgamation, or other local government boundary changes on the Sunshine Coast, to endeavour to ensure that the localities of Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs are in the same Shire as Noosa Heads.
(d) to oppose any amalgamation of Noosa Shire and Maroochy Shire.
Eumundi, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs) are in favour of such a change before agreeing to consider the issue.2

Accordingly, the majority of effort during 2005 was devoted to gathering evidence about the local residents’ views on a boundary change by undertaking a letter box and door knock campaign to gather letters of support.

The Group is aware that all local authorities in Queensland are participating in a Local Government Sustainability Reform Project initiated by the Local Government Association of Queensland (LGAQ) and due to commence in 2006 (Size, Shape and Sustainability Review). This is designed to examine structural reform options for future sustainability. Boundary changes are one such structural option that is to be considered.

The EDV Action Group considers that the question of a boundary change is very pertinent to the review process and wishes to have their arguments for a boundary change included in the review process of both Councils.

Maroochy Council has also raised concerns about the financial implications of any boundary change, in particular the potential loss of revenue from rates and the appropriate compensation for capital expenditure on fixed assets. The EDV Group that these can best be addressed by both Councils undertaking a careful analysis of the impacts of a boundary change as part of the review process.

**Purpose of the Submission**

The purpose of this submission is to present to both Shire Councils the arguments for a boundary change and the supporting evidence of the level of resident support for such a change.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendation One:** The EDV Action Group recommends that both Maroochy Council and Noosa Council consider this request for a boundary change as part of their overall review of their future sustainability.

**Recommendation Two:** The EDV Action Group recommends that both Councils include this submission for a boundary change in the specific terms of reference for the Review of Size, Shape and Sustainability of the Sunshine Coast Councils.

---

2 Advice received from the Division Six Councillor, Cr Greg Fahey following a meeting in 2004 with the President of the EDV Group.
ARGUMENTS FOR A BOUNDARY CHANGE

The arguments that the EDV Action Group believes support a boundary change are as follows:

1. Cross Border Service Use
2. Community of Interest
   a. Extensive commuting between one shire and another
   b. Community linkages
      i. Access to Information
      ii. Boundary Anomalies
   c. Culture, character and identity
      i. Affinity with Noosa’s Planning Approach
      ii. Historical Linkages
      iii. Branding and Identity
      iv. Geographical Closeness
3. Lake Weyba Catchment Area Management

Cross Border Service Use

In 2004 the Group undertook a Community Activity Survey of a small sample of local residents (that is residents of Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs living in the Maroochy Shire) to assess their level of community activity in each Shire. (A copy of the Community Activity Survey form is appended at the end of the document). These results showed that a significant majority of those sampled usually carried out the following activities in Noosa Shire (as compared with Maroochy Shire):

- Shopping for food and drink, clothes and fashion and home and hardware;
- Entertainment (cinema, dining, music);
- Services (Doctors, dentists, banking, hairdressing, library, use of refuse tip, car);
- Sport (particularly swimming); and
- Education (ranging from preschool to U3A)

These survey results were supported by “pulse surveys” carried out by committee members when interfacing with residents in a range of settings, including during the door knock campaign. A consistent pattern emerged of regular cross border use by residents of the area.

The data was further confirmed by a study recently undertaken by McNaught Anderson for Noosa Shire Council as part of the research for the development of the Noosa Shire’s social plan. A statistically valid sample of residents in Doonan, Eumundi, Verrierdale, Peregrine Springs and Coolum were asked about their use of services in the Noosa Shire. The results are in Attachment One.
The data from this survey shows a very high use of Noosa Shire facilities by residents of Doonan and Eumundi for all services, and Verrierdale for certain services. (Weyba Downs was not included in the survey). The facilities canvassed in this study included the library, the swimming pool, the rubbish tip, employment and volunteer work, church/charity/clubs; beach/boating/fishing, concerts/movies/theatre/dining, childcare/compulsory schooling; university/other, sport, general services and shopping.

The primary reason for this cross shire use of facilities is the proximity of facilities. For residents of this area the following Noosa based services are much closer than their equivalents in Maroochy Shire:

- The library
- Child care
- Waste disposal
- Sports grounds
- Shopping centres
- RSL and Surf Clubs

_The extent of cross border use is significant and warrants investigation as a boundary issue._

**Community of Interest**

**Extensive Commuting between Areas**

The survey data mentioned above also provides evidence of the extent of commuting that occurs between the areas in question and the Noosa Shire. Doonan in particular is a dormitory suburb for residents who work or own businesses in Noosa Shire. Indicative of this in the extent of use of the Eumundi Noosa Road. Day trips up and down the Eumundi Noosa Road between the hours of 7.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday in early 2005 averaged 1520 per hour.²

² Source: MetroCount Traffic Executive 5th September 2005
Eumundi, Doonan and Verrierdale are linked to the coastal areas of Noosa Shire by the Eumundi Noosa road and to the hinterland (e.g. Cooroy) by a number of roads*. To access other parts of Maroochy Shire residents of these suburbs travel along either Limu Mountain Road or the Bruce Highway. Recent road works on Eumundi Mountain Road also enable a connection to Verrierdale through Doonan Bridge Road.

Weyba Downs is linked to both Noosa and Maroochy Shires by Emu Mountain Road. This access to Noosa Shire will be enhanced when Walter Hay Drive is completed in the first quarter of 2006. When Walter Hay Drive opens it will reduce the traffic on Eumundi Noosa road and enhance the ease of access to Noosa Shire for residents of Doonan, Verrierdale and Eumundi.

There is one bus service along Eumundi Noosa road (number 630 – hail and ride) that operates six times a day. Enhanced local bus services are proposed under the Transit Plan. If these proposals are adopted, then it is anticipated that access to Noosa Shire will be made easier for residents of Doonan, Verrierdale and Eumundi.

When the Noosa Shire Business Centre is completed, it is anticipated to be a major attractor for the residents of Noosa Shire, and will provide further incentive for Doonan, Eumundi, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs residents to commute into Noosa Shire.

---

**The extent of cross border commuting warrants investigation as a boundary issue.**

---

**Community Linkages**

**Access to Information**

In addition to the extent of interface with the facilities of Noosa Shire, an important additional linkage is the access to and information about what is happening in each shire.

Our sample survey established that the residents received local newspapers that are Noosa based (the Noosa News and the Noosa Journal), but no residents in the area received any local Maroochy papers. Thus residents are kept well informed about Noosa Shire issues but unless they purchase the Sunshine Coast Daily, they are not kept in touch with local Maroochy Shire issues. This was verified by examining the circulation data for relevant papers.

* One route for Doonan and Verrierdale residents to the Noosa hinterland is via Sunrise Road to the Cooroy Noosa Road. Another route is down the Eumundi Noosa Road and along Beekmans Road. A route to Cooroy particularly for Eumundi residents is via the Bruce Highway and Myall Street.
The Nambour News covers the following areas: Nambour, Blackall Range, Bli Bli, Eudlo, Kell Mountain, Kureelpa, Mapleton, Montville, Palmwoods, Rosmeu, Woombye and Yandina/Ninderry.

The Noosa News covers the following areas: Noosa Heads, Noosa North, Tewantin, Boreen Point, Cooroy, Cooroy, Doonan, Eumundi, Kin Kin, Marcus Beach, Noosaville, Pomona, Sunrise Beach, Sunshine Beach, Verribee and parts of Weyba Downs.

The Noosa Journal covers the following areas: Noosa Heads, Noosa North, Tewantin, Boreen Point, Cooroy, Cooroy, Doonan, Eumundi, Kin Kin, Marcus Beach, Noosaville, Pomona, Sunrise Beach, Sunshine Beach, Verribee and parts of Weyba Downs.

Thus residents of Eumundi, Doonan, Verribee and Weyba Downs have no direct weekly information about what is happening in their Shire. This is a very key aspect of community linkages and strengthens the perception of many residents that they should rightfully belong in Noosa Shire.

**Access to Information is a key aspect of Community of Interest. The residents of Doonan, Eumundi, Verribee and Weyba Downs have regular access to local Noosa newspapers—another argument for change.**

**Boundary Anomalies**

The current boundary is still largely based on boundaries established a century ago at a time when the area comprised a small number of private land holdings (farms). Since that time settlement patterns have changed significantly and many new roads and subdivisions have been created.

The current boundary cuts suburbs and streets and isolates Weyba Downs. It is no longer a relevant boundary for today’s environment.

There are different implications for each of the suburbs with respect to the current boundaries.

**Doonan:** Half of Doonan is in Noosa Shire and half is in Maroochy Shire. Within Doonan, a number of streets are bisected by the electoral boundary as follows:

- Sunrise Road, half way between the intersection with Wust Road and Brushtail Lane

---

1. The oldest map which outlines the current boundary between the two Shires that the Group have been able to identify was drawn in 1910. This showed the northern boundary between the two shires was based on farm boundaries. Perusal of later maps in 1924, and 1947 did not appear to show changes but a map in 1984 showed that there were some minor variations made to the boundary. The boundary therefore was slightly altered between 1947 and 1984 and apparently no further changes have been made since that time.
- Beddington Road, near Pheasant Lane
- Pheasant Lane
- Eumundi Noosa Road at the roundabout with Emu Mountain Road

Other roads such as Fellowship Drive and parts of Eumarella Road have one side of the road in Noosa Shire and the other in Maroochy Shire.

Local Government boundaries should not divide communities. Doonan is a suburb divided - another argument for a boundary change.

Weyba Downs: Weyba Downs is in an isolated pocket surrounded by Noosa Shire and by Lake Weyba. There are two distinct residential areas, one accessed from Eumarella Road and the other by Murdering Creek Road. They are separated by a segment of Noosa National Park. In the southern section, three of the roads have the electoral boundary passing down the centre of the road (Mary Anne Drive, Win Road and part of Clarendon Road). See Figure One.
Figure One: Weyba Downs

Local Government boundaries should not divide communities. Weyba Downs is isolated and is totally surrounded by Noosa Shire – another argument for a boundary change.

Eumundi: There are two streets that are bisected by the electoral boundary:

- Solar Road (a small dog leg at the end of Solar Road is in Noosa Shire)
- Mount Cooroy Road at the point where it becomes Kings Road

The boundary crosses Eumundi Range Road at the intersection with Martins Road, so that part of Eumundi Range Road is in Noosa Shire and the remainder in Maroochy Shire.
Verrinderdale: This suburb is the most southern section of the area of interest and all streets are in Maroochy Shire. It has no adjoining boundaries with Noosa Shire.

Related Boundaries: The State Electoral boundary for Noosa encompasses the suburbs of Doonan, Eumundi, Verrinderdale and Weyba Downs, providing yet another argument to consider adjustment to the current boundary.

New Boundaries are required for the New Millennium.
Boundaries are arbitrary lines on a map and are not sacrosanct.

Culture, Character and Identity

Affinity With Noosa’s Planning Approach

A major consideration for the residents of the suburbs of Doonan, Eumundi, Verrinderdale and Weyba Downs is the strong affinity they have with a rural and village lifestyle. This is a very critical part of their sense of identity.

Residents of the area consistently identified the following attributes as being of high value to them:

- Lower levels of development
- No high rise and no high density development in the villages
- Preservation of cultural heritages
- Protection of the environment
- No evidence of muggings of big city style living (e.g. traffic lights, large regulated parking signs)

Noosa Council has a plan that limits high rise development. Maroochy’s plan allows for high rise development. Noosa has a long standing reputation as a "green" oriented Council with environmental values high on their agenda and a strong emphasis on low key built environment. This is reflected in part by the extent of the geographic area of each shire covered by national parks. Noosa Shire has approximately 14% of its area (including the lakes) designated as national parks whereas Maroochy has only 2% designated as national parks. Maroochy has a reputation as a strong regional centre with an emphasis on growth and being the economic centre of the Sunshine Coast.

* In Doonan, Maroochy Shire has placed large regulated parking signs much to the annoyance of many residents surveyed as they are seen to be anomalous in the rural residential setting

[6] In Noosaville, 1993 report on the approach that Noosa Council takes to development applications

SUBMISSION TO NOOSA AND MAROOCHY COUNCILS
Both Maroochy Shire and Noosa Shire have clear values and cultures that are expressed in their corporate plans and in their approach to planning. These are compared below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Noosa Shire** | Noosa Shire is an inclusive community renowned for its creativity, innovation, vision and entrepreneurship where sustainability underpins excellence. | Noosa Council - Innovative and effective leadership that facilitates preferred community outcomes. | Respect for the Environment
Inclusiveness
Individuality
Supporting and Valuing Staff Equity
Ethical Conduct | The Noosa Plan seeks to protect the local lifestyle by managing growth and development in an ecologically sustainable manner. It seeks to achieve a high quality of growth and development, rather than a high quantity.

| **Maroochy Shire** | Daring, dynamic, determined. | Dynamic leadership, planning for the future, delivering today – creating a cohesive, vibrant and enterprising Maroochy Shire | Pursuit of excellence
Integrity and openness
Teamwork
Enjoying work | Planning for anticipated growth of 3% per annum average with emphasis on integrated planning and infrastructure provision |

Both Councils have clear visions and there are clear differences between them. The Group does not believe that one is superior to the other, just that the residents of the area relate strongly to Noosa’s vision, more than to Maroochy’s vision.

**Historical Linkages**

Although the areas in question have been part of Maroochy Shire for over a century, there is a documented history of issues raised by local residents who have wished to become part of Noosa rather than Maroochy Shire. To illustrate, an article appeared in the local Coomoy paper in 1929, outlining reasons why residents of Doonan and Eumundi felt that they should be part of Noosa Shire. The current local Councillor, Cr Greg Fairley has also indicated to the press and to the Group that this has been a long standing issue for local residents.

That this issue continues to be raised by residents over such a long time period, suggests that there is a very long standing historical sense of identity with Noosa that should be taken into consideration.
Branding and Identity

There are many aspects of the local environment that link the areas in question more closely to the identity of Noosa Shire than to Maroochy Shire. These include:

- **Signs from the highway and motor way.** At the Bruce highway, the turn off to Noosa is through Eumundi and many visitors believe that they have entered the shire at that point, similarly from the motor way at Peregian the signage to Noosa gives the impression of entry to the Shire at a point further south than is actually the case.
- **Marketing of residential developments.** In the 90’s the development around Valley Drive in Doonan was marketed as Noosa Valley, with its key focus the Noosa Valley Golf Club. Similarly in the 90’s and in the new millennium, a number of new developments were given names that included Noosa in the title (e.g. Noosa Summit) or were marketed in terms of their distance from Hastings Street.
- **Marketing of tourism activity.** The most recent marketing initiative of Noosa tourism, the Noosa Food Trail, is a map listing local attractions including businesses in Doonan and Eumundi.
- **Use of roundabouts.** The virtual absence of traffic lights is a key feature of Noosa Shire and is also reflected in the road system in the northern part of Maroochy Shire, giving a strong visual link with Noosa Shire and instilling a sense that we are in Noosa rather than Maroochy.
- **Road linkages.** As mentioned earlier in this submission, the major roads tend to make it easier for residents to relate to Noosa rather than Maroochy.

Because of these factors, many new residents believe that they are purchasing in Noosa Shire and are very surprised when they see that the property is actually part of Maroochy.

Similarly, many travelers to the area believe that Eumundi is part of Noosa and are unaware that it is part of Maroochy.  

Changing Settlement Patterns

Early last century, the areas in question were farming communities. Overtime, the bulk of the lands in the areas have been developed into rural residential, with some farming activity around Eumundi, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs.

As residents have moved to the area, they have developed linkages with Noosa Shire for recreation, work, culture and education. The Group has established that newer residents (i.e. those residents who have moved to the area in the last 15 to 20 years) are far more likely to have established a community of interest with Noosa than residents who have been born in the area.

---

8 This was a common anecdote from residents in the door knock, referring to their own experiences and those of their visitors and friends.
Therefore, as future development occurs, it is probable that a higher and higher percentage of the population will wish for a change in boundary, rather than the reverse.

Geographical Closeness

The links and identity with Noosa are also further reinforced by the geographic proximity to the rest of Noosa Shire.

It is sensible for most residents to seek services and support close to home, rather than to link to places that are harder to get to. There is a general sense by residents that is just logical to belong to Noosa as Maroochy seems so remote.

Lake Weyba Catchment Area Management

An additional argument that was raised by residents when they were contacted during the door knock included Lake Weyba catchment area management. If Weyba Downs was part of Noosa Shire this would enable better management of Lake Weyba, an important water resource. The Lake itself is in Noosa Shire and the land in the north and east are in Noosa Shire. The western and southern areas of the lake are in Maroochy Shire. If all of the surrounding lands were within one shire, decisions on land usage that could affect water management could be more effectively managed.

Irrelevant Issues

When the EDV Action Group embarked on the campaign to gather evidence of resident support for a boundary change, the local press raised the following arguments as reasons why residents were pursuing this matter:

- Local residents wanted to have their properties in Noosa Shire so as to raise their property values and status (an argument stated by Maroochy Councillors)
- Individuals were interested in lower rates (i.e. a self interest argument)

The information gathered during the door knock campaign soundly refuted these arguments. Only two individuals (out of over 2,000 spoken to) raised the possibility that their property values might increase, and one of these was repeating a statement made by the local Councillor in a televised interview. Most of the area is already perceived by many to be part
of Noosa and a formal change of Shire is seen to be correcting an anomaly, rather than creating a new image for the area. 9

As the evidence from the door knock campaign as set out in the next chapter reveals, self interest in terms of reduced rates was not a major consideration for respondents. Indeed, reports were provided of situations where door knockers advised individuals that they would have lower rates if the boundary remained and they stayed in Maroochy Shire, yet the residents still signed a letter of support.

The evidence for the level of support for a boundary change is set out in the next section of this submission.

---

9 In Doonan and Verrierdale in particular, many of the residential developments already have a Noosa brand (e.g. Noosa Valley) or are heavily marketed as Noosa. According to local real estate agents, people purchase because they like the area and its proximity to Noosa.
EVIDENCE OF THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR A BOUNDARY CHANGE

Target Area

The target area of the four suburbs of Doonan, Eumundi, Verriherdale and Weyba Downs were chosen because residents of those areas nominated to explore the issue of a boundary change at community meetings held in Eumundi.

The extent to which residents in the northern part of Division Six believe that their community of interest is with Noosa Shire rather than Maroochy Shire was tested by undertaking a survey of households in the four suburbs. Households rather than individuals were chosen as the survey target as this could be more reliably measured.

The areas covered are mapped out in Attachment Two. The streets visited are also set out in Attachment Three.

A total of 147 streets were targeted as follows:

- Doonan: 63
- Eumundi: 50
- Verriherdale: 18
- Weyba Downs: 16

This household survey was supplemented by a survey of businesses that operate in the same geographic area.

Described below are the samples and how these were derived and the results obtained. Full detail of the methodology used is in Attachment Four and detailed analysis of the data is in Attachment Five.

Households

In May 2005 the EDV Action Group commenced a letter box campaign to determine the level of interest in a boundary change by mailing out a letter about our Group and its aims to approximately 1,500 households in Eumundi, Doonan, Verriherdale and Weyba Downs. The return rate was positive (far above the standard rate of response for such mail outs according to market analysts) and this encouraged the Group to undertake a full scale door knock campaign. The door knock campaign commenced in June 2005 and was wound up by early December 2005.
Household Sample

Total Number of Households

The EDV identified a total of 1904 households based on door knocker documentation of residences in the streets covered. This was cross checked with data from Maroochy Council. According to Maroochy Council, there are a total of 1847 households receiving domestic rubbish collection services in the suburbs of Doonan, Verrieree, Eumundi and Weyba Downs as at November 2005. A comparison of the data is set out in Table One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Number receiving rubbish collection</th>
<th>Number identified in the door knock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrieree</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some small differences in the data that can be explained by the following:

- The door knock campaign counted residences which were unoccupied at the time as well as occupied houses (this would explain the higher total for the door knock).
- There are potentially some differences in which streets are included in which suburbs as in 2004 there were some adjustments to the suburb boundaries – hence the fact that the actual streets canvassed are included in our report.

Sample Size

The total number of households able to be contacted either through the letter box drop or the door knock was 1536. When compared to the total number of households receiving a rubbish collection (indicating ongoing residency), this represents a total sample size of 83%. When compared with the total number of residences listed by the door knockers, the sample size is 81%. According to an independent statistician, who undertook a probability analysis of the sampling, this sample size provides a high level of confidence in the data (at the 95% confidence interval).

---

10 As set out in the methodology, every effort was made to contact householders and each residence was visited on at least 2 occasions.
The data was analysed progressively in October, November and December and the overall results did not deviate, providing additional support for a highly valid and reliable result from the sample size.

This is one of the most comprehensive surveys ever taken out in the community and demonstrates the commitment of the members and supporters of EIV Action Group to support a boundary change

Householder Results

The overall results showed that a significant majority of households supported a boundary change. The total number of households supporting a boundary change was 1238 (80.5% of those contacted). The total number of households opposed to a boundary change was 216 (14% of those contacted). The total number of households undecided or indifferent totaled 84 (5.5% of those contacted). See Figure One

Figure One: Results of Householder Survey

---

The actual number of residents was more than this as generally there was more than one resident per household.
The results show an overwhelming support for a boundary change.

A breakdown by suburb is set out in Table Two.

**Table Two: Results by Target Suburb**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Number Supporting</th>
<th>Number Opposed</th>
<th>Number Undecided/Indifferent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1278</strong></td>
<td><strong>216</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>1538</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest level of support came from Doonan (82.5%), followed by Eumundi (81%), Weyba Downs (78%) and Verrierdale (75%).

*The extent community support demonstrates a clear need to investigate a boundary change.*

**Reasons for Decision**

Doorknockers were able to provide some qualitative data on the arguments or reasons that householders put forward to support their decision.

The reasons given for supporting a boundary change included:

- Agreement with community of interest argument (most common)
- A general sense that a boundary change is the most logical outcome (common)
- Preference for the planning approach of Noosa Council (common)
- Dislike of some action taken by/policies of Maroochy Council (occasional)
- To address a particular issue or problem faced (e.g. transport problems faced in accessing aged care or other services) (occasional)
- Perception of a personal benefit (e.g. rate reduction, change in status, access to a particular service) (least common)
The reasons given for opposing the change included:

- No desire for change to occur (most common)
- The community of interest argument was not sufficient enough to warrant a change, even when agreeing with this argument (occasional)
- Dislike of some action taken by/policies of Noosa Council (occasional)
- Perception of a personal loss if changed (e.g. rate increase, reduced ability to maximise land use) (least common)

The reasons given for a neutral response included:

- Could not make up mind (most common)
- Did not mind either way (occasional)
- Did not want to commit for personal reasons (least common)
- Not in a position to give an opinion (rare)

There is overwhelming evidence that the majority of residents want a boundary change.

Businesses

During the course of the door knock campaign, a number of local businesses were identified and it was decided to extend the household door knock to local businesses. In a small number of instances, people were living on the site of their business (e.g. farms) and separate records were made for each.

Business Sample

Businesses were identified in each of the four areas. As it was not possible to identify home based businesses that do not have signs associated with them, the sample was limited to those visible businesses in the areas canvassed. According to Maroochy Shire, there are over 32,000 businesses in the Shire, but only half of these are actually functional business entities. Of this half, less than half of these are visible businesses in that they have a sign, shop front or web page. There is no current data available by suburb as to the number of businesses in operation.

Ninety two businesses were identified through signage and from the telephone book. The majority of businesses were either in Eumundi or in Doonan along the Eumundi Noosa road.
Of these, 74 were able to be contacted, giving a sample size of 80%. This again is a large sample and ensures that the results are valid and reliable.

**Business Results**

The overall results showed that a significant majority of businesses supported a boundary change. The total number of businesses supporting a boundary change was 42 (88% of those contacted). The total number of businesses opposed to a boundary change was six (8% of those contacted). Only three businesses were undecided or indifferent (4% of those contacted). See Figure Two.

*Figure Two: Results of Business Survey*

A breakdown by suburb is set out in Table Three.
Table Three: Results by Target Suburb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Number Supporting</th>
<th>Number Opposed</th>
<th>Number Undecided/Indifferent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for Decision

The anecdotal evidence from the businesses canvassed showed that the majority of supporters also supported the community of interest argument. Those opposed usually had some specific reason for not wishing to be in Noosa Shire – there was insufficient data to identify a particular trend.

A significant number of local businesses have indicated a preference for a boundary change.
CONCLUSION

The EDV Action Group believes that there are a number of grounds for consideration of a boundary change by both local authorities. Under the local Government Act and also under the guidelines put out by the LGAQ for a review of size and sustainability, cross border usage, community of interest and water catchment management are grounds for exploring the suitability and relevance of the current boundaries. This submission provides evidence and arguments for consideration of the relevance of the current boundary between the two local authorities.

The submission also takes note of potential Council concerns relating to revenue and assets and believes that the financial sustainability assessment process that is part of the LGAQ size, shape and sustainability review process should enable both Councils to carefully consider the impacts of this proposed boundary change.

Both Councils in their corporate plans make strong commitments to effective community consultations and engagement. The EDV Action Group is arguing a case on behalf of some 1800 residents who wish to express their desire for a change to the current boundary arrangements - we ask that this submission be given careful and thorough consideration.
ATTACHMENT ONE: RESULTS OF NOOSA SHIRE COUNCIL'S NEIGHBOURS' SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Percentage of residents sampled using Noosa Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doonan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish tip</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General services</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare/Schools</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni/Other</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts/movies/dining/theatre</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach/river/fishing/boating</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major shopping</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes shopping</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Shopping</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT TWO: STREETS IN AREA OF INTEREST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCALITY</th>
<th>STREET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Ajax Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Alice Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Annie Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Arbour Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Anundell Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Babbling Brook Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Balkin Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Balkin Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Ball Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Rahumn Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Barbara Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Barlee Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Battle Frere Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Beddington Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Beddington Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Black Stump Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Blueberry Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Bonavista Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Bond Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Botanica Circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Bowden Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Bunya Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Butler Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Butler Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Callly Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Capricorn Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Cash Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Charlotte Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Clarenendon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Coast View Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Cock Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Creek Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Crescent Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Dahlia Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Dean Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Dierdre Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Doonan Bridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Duke Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Eagle Farm Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Street Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Elizabeth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Etheridge Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Eumarella Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Eumundi Range Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Eumundi-Noosa Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Eumundi-Noosa Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Finley Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Forest Ridge Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Gidgee Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Golden Rain Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Grasstree Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Grays Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Greenacre Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Greentree Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Gridley Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Gumleaf Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Gwaneth Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Hatfield Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Jamaican Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Jocelyn Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Justin Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Kimberley Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Kyle Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Laguna Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Lake View Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Lake Vista Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Lake Weyba Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Lakeside Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Lakewood Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Lilly Pilly Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Lily Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Luffin Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Littleridge Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Lone Hand Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Lone Hand Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Low Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Main Camp Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Mallee Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Mango Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Marlock Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Marnie Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Martha Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Martins Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Mary Anne Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Meadow Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Memorial Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Merrgard Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Road Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Mindi Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Monak Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Monomeet Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Mork Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Morrell Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Mount Cooroy Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Mt Eerwah Vista Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Murdering Creek Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Napier Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Naturalist Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Noakes Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Noorman Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Nyell Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Omega Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Orchard Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Pacey Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Paige Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Panavista Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Panorama Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Paradise Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Parkdale Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Payne Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Penda Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Persoonia Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Pheasant Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Pryor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Rangeview Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Redwood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Regency Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Rutoh Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Sale Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Selb Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Silverton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Solar Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Stewart Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Sudholz Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Sunrise Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Sunrise Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Tallagum Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Tallagum Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Templeton Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Timbercock Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Trafalga Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Valley Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Valley Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Venning Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verrierdale</td>
<td>Verrierdale Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Viewland Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Street Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Ward Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Whispering Gum Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Whyendra Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>Wilkes Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumundi</td>
<td>William Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyba Downs</td>
<td>Win Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Wust Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doonan</td>
<td>Youngs Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT THREE: MAP OF AREA OF INTEREST
ATTACHMENT FOUR: METHODOLOGY FOR DOOR KNOCK CAMPAIGN

Organisation

One member of the Group coordinated the campaign which was undertaken by member volunteers. The geographic area was broken down into 13 sectors of approximately equal size. Each volunteer was issued with a sector map with the names of the streets, given a set of instructions of how to approach residents, background information to address any questions that might be raised, identifying game tags and letters of introduction, record sheets and copies of the Letter of Support. Volunteers followed standards for approaching a household as set down by other organisations that door knock for charity (e.g. Red Cross). Copies of the material used are appended to this attachment.

Volunteers were also given the street numbers of households where a letter of support had already been obtained from the letter box drop or where the householder had written back to indicate no support. This was to ensure that householders were not needlessly contacted. No names were provided to volunteers.

Volunteers were asked to revisit households where no contact was established on the first occasion at least one other time and preferably at a different time of day and day of the week. In practice all such households were visited between 2 and 4 times, depending on the volunteer.

Volunteers submitted their completed Letters of Support and record forms to another member of the Committee who entered them into a master list on a regular basis. The record forms listed those households who were neutral or undecided, who were against or who could not be contacted or were unable to participate.17

The master list was updated progressively and analysis of the data was undertaken in late September, October, November and December.

---

17 This Letter of Support was designed after consultation with the local Councillor who advised that Council required individual letters rather than a petition as it was easier to verify the data.
15 The reason for lack of contact included locked gates, savage dogs, absentee owners, empty houses, houses under construction and residents never at home when someone called. Five individuals abstained from any form of participation for personal reasons (e.g. religious) and these were also listed in the no contact section.
Information

During 2005, the EDV Action Group generated a number of information sheets which were available to members and supporters at the quarterly public meetings. These sheets were also provided for door knockers.

There have been seven information sheets prepared and these are attached. The most relevant information sheets for the campaign were Information Sheets Two, Three and Seven. During the course of the campaign, some information changed and where this occurred, sheets were updated and reissued. The changes included changes to the rates (as this was important), a separate sheet was prepared for 03/04 and 04/05, changes to the committee and some additions to the reasons for a boundary change.

Audit of Data

When the cut off date for the door knock was passed, a final audit was conducted on the data as follows:

- Each Letter of Support was cross checked against the database by someone not involved in data entry. In the course of this cross check, 79 duplicate Letters of Support for the same household were identified. This occurred when some householders each completed a form, some households were visited twice, some had changed hands from the time of first contact and some had completed separate forms for vacant land. All duplications were removed from the database although the forms have been retained for presentation;
- Each record form was cross checked to ensure that no preferences were excluded;
- A comparison was made with the data provided by Maroochy Council as to the total number of households and the data collected by the door knockers to see if there were any discrepancies and where possible to reconcile these (e.g. in one area the door knocker had not recorded the houses that had not been contacted and this had to be physically checked by another door knocker).

The audited data was then sent to an independent statistician to provide a probability analysis. This revealed that the sample size provided a level of confidence in the data of 95% - in other words, there is an extremely high level of validity of the data, suggesting a clear majority of households in favour in all four areas surveyed.
ATTACHMENT FIVE – FORMS AND INFORMATION SHEETS USED BY EDV GROUP

Letter of Support

The Secretary
EDV Action Group
P.O. Box 2028
NOOSA HEADS 4567 QUEENSLAND

Dear Madam,

We support the objective of the EDV Action Group to include the property in which we reside in a boundary change between Maroochy Shire and Noosa Shire so that this property would be gazetted as part of the Noosa Shire.

NAME: ____________________________________________

MY ADDRESS IS: ________________________________________

__________________________________________________ POST CODE:

PHONE NUMBER: _________________________________

My Lat number is ______________________ on RP ______

(Note – This information appears on your Rates notice and is the most accurate address information – it will help us demonstrate to Maroochy Council where people who support us live)

SIGNATURE: ______________________________________ DATE: ___________

☐ Please tick here if you would like to be kept informed of our progress

Would you please write your email address below if you have one. We will add it to our data base – email is the most cost effective way of keeping in touch with our supporters.

My email address is: ______________________________________
Instructions for Door Knockers

EDV ACTION GROUP INCORPORATED

DOORKNOCKERS' GUIDELINES

1. Look up your assigned area in a street directory and familiarize yourself with the area. Note any suburb or shire boundaries at the edge of your area.

2. Wear your badge at all times when you are door knocking.


4. Do not enter a yard if you are:
   a. worried about a dog attacking you,
   b. there is an ENTER AT YOUR OWN RISK or NO TRESPASSING sign, or
   c. if access is too difficult.

When the door is answered identify and introduce yourself.
Always SMILE and be polite.

Say,
Good Morning/Afternoon.

I'm/we're (name) ________________________ and I'm/we're here on behalf of the EDV Action Group.

We are a community-based group which was formed last year by concerned residents with the aim of trying to bring about a change in the boundary between Noreen and Maroochy Shires.

1. Refer to the recent letterbox drop.

2. Ask if they have had a chance to look at the information.

3. Ask them how they feel about the proposed boundary change.

4. Ask if they would be happy to record a response NOW.

5. Have them fill out and sign the Letter of Support if they agree and collect it from them OR if they do not agree or are not interested ask if you can record this on your record sheets.
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EDV Information Sheets

INFORMATION SHEET ONE: ABOUT THE EDV ACTION GROUP

WHO ARE WE?
We are a group of concerned residents of Eumundi, Doonan, Verandah and Weyba Downs who see the community of interest as being Noosa Shire and Marcoooy Shire.

We were formed following a public meeting in Eumundi in February 2004.

WHAT IS OUR MAIN PURPOSE?
To lobby for a boundary change between Marcoooy and Noosa Shires (with the transfer Eumundi, Doonan, Verandah and Weyba Downs from Marcoooy to Noosa)

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF JOINING?
We cannot make a boundary change without your support - joining with us makes the change possible. Other benefits include:

- Being part of a network of like minded people
- Help shape your community
- Helping to keep your environment they way you want it.
- Learning more about what is happening in your local community
- Protecting and promoting your community of interest
- Developing networks to expand support for our objectives

INFORMATION SHEET TWO: BENEFITS OF BELONGING TO NOOSA SHIRE

The benefits of belonging to Noosa Shire include:

- Noosa Shire is in your community of Interest
- We do more of our shopping in Noosa Shire
- The majority of our children go to a school in Noosa Shire
- The majority of residents use other professional services provided in Noosa Shire
- Many residents go to work in Noosa Shire or have a business in this Shire
- For most of us, all the facilities in Noosa Shire are closer than similar facilities in Marcoooy Shire
- Most residents use Noosa Shire services such as the library and the parks
- We receive the local Noosa papers but do not receive the local Marcoooy papers, so we are better informed about what is happening in Noosa Shire

For many reasons the rates are lower in Noosa Shire however, by need to be checked by individual houses it is dependent on the LCV.)

- Noosa has a lower debt than Marcoooy (see Information Sheet Three)
- Noosa has a population cap and a policy of keeping its rural town as villages to protect their unique character
- Noosa has more green space as National Parks - there is a higher percentage of National Park in Noosa Shire than Marcoooy Shire
- Although both have traffic congestion, it is worse when travelling to Marcoooy
- Noosa is a smaller community and there is therefore more chance of influencing Council decisions so it is easier to be involved
- Noosa Shire is a series of communities with a rural and small rural theme whereas Marcoooy Shire has more of a town and urban theme.
INFORMATION SHEET THREE: RATE DIFFERENCES 04/05

Comparison of rates for single dwelling residential (owner occupied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of rate</th>
<th>Maroochy</th>
<th>Noosa</th>
<th>Costs in the Dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $250,000</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$962</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $300,000</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$1,210</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $400,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,580</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $500,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,140</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $600,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $700,000+</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Levy</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water A (Assumption 2004 water used)</td>
<td>$140.60</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water B (Assumption 5000 water used)</td>
<td>$205.50</td>
<td>$201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse (Assumption standard 240 litres)</td>
<td>$143.95</td>
<td>$221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of form properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of rate</th>
<th>Maximum rate</th>
<th>Costs in the Dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm UCV $100,000</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm UCV $200,000</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Levy</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection</td>
<td>$143.95</td>
<td>$221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Debt (As at 30 June 2004)

Maroochy - $151,554,000
Noosa - $25,115,000

INFORMATION SHEET FOUR: THE PROCESS OF A BOUNDARY CHANGE

Achieving a boundary change involves the following steps:

- Discussing the necessary formalities to identify the level of support in the community for a change.
- Getting support in writing from businesses in the area.
- Getting support in writing from relevant community groups in both Noosa and Maroochy.
- Getting support from each Council for approval in principle for an investigation of a boundary change.
- The Council has already provided this, and we will ask for a letter of support when ready to send information to the Minister.
- Maroochy Council wants us to collect letters from the residents supporting the move - once this is done they will sit down and discuss the issue with us further and ideally what other information might be needed.
- Preparing a submission to go to the Minister for Local Government Planning.
- The Minister’s Office requires that the submission contains arguments for a change and data regarding the number of people who are interested as well as evidence that each Council supports it.
- The Minister will follow current State Government Policy which is that boundary changes will not occur unless there is agreement from the two local authorities.
- Sending a petition to the Queensland Parliament to add weight to our arguments. We have been given the correct form of the petition from Kate McClymont’s office who checked with the Clerk of the Parliament.

SUBMISSION TO NOOSA AND MAROOCHY COUNCILS
The Minister must determine under the test whether this is a minor or major matter and make a Reference to the Local Government Electoral and Boundary Review Committee who then conducts its own investigation as to the merits or otherwise of a boundary change. Under the Act our Reference will be a major matter as it involves a significant number of residents.

Under the Local Government Regulations of 1994 this Commission will consider the following:

- The pressure to sufficiently for efficient and effective services
- The issue of planning - does the boundary change result with planning for population growth; is it for the benefit of the local community
- Community of interest - the most important consideration as it reflects the place where people work, engage in leisure and relates to it. It is also important however, under this regulation Part Three Item 15, the present boundaries should not divide local neighbourhoods and we have some interesting anomalies in the current boundaries that do just that. It was also one of the most significant aspects that the Commission pays attention to in its determinations.
- Water catchment principles - following natural geographic features
- Joint arrangements - this aspect requires the Commission to consider if a joint arrangement should be used instead of or in combination with a boundary

If a decision that is made for a change is supported then a joint transitional committee is established with representatives of both Councils to oversee the changes required.

INFORMATION SHEET FIVE: YOUR COMMITTEE

The current committee of the EDV Action Group are:

President: Johann Wright

Johann has owned land in Cooroy for over 20 years and lived as a resident for the last nine. She and her husband are both actively involved in the community and she has been on advisory committees for both Noosa and Maroochy Shires. Johann runs her own property management consultancy business.

Secretary/Treasurer Raymond Mitchell

Raymond has been a resident and has run his own business in the National, local and state organisations for 30 years. He is very keen to help try and bring about a boundary change in order to reduce the high-ways development of this area, as we have seen in other areas of the Sunshine Coast.

Member Mark Emery

Mark lives in Weyba Downs with his family and runs a very successful businesses company. Having grown up in Sydney and seen the uncontrolled impact of population growth he feels committed to maintaining our way of life and feels committed this will be done more successfully by Noosa Shire.

Member Jeremy Sarvent

Jeremy moved to the area in the mid 1990s following his retirement as chief executive of a large international organisation. Jeremy is totally committed to the aims and principles of the EDV Action Group, enhancing the expertise of the Committee with his wealth of management experience.

Member Peter Druitt

Peter is a semi-retired accountant who with his wife own property in Noosa and have owned an acreage in Eumundi since 2001. It is shared with their children and five grand children who also live in the area. Peter and his wife are passionate about the Noosa hinterland area. They strongly believe that these areas should be one to preserve their uniqueness.

Member Adrienne Prentice

Adrienne moved to the area at the beginning of 1998. She has a passionate interest in the environment and is totally committed to the objectives of the EDV Group.
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INFORMATION SHEET SIX: THE EXPERIENCE OF Peregian South on Moving to Noosa Shire

The benefits that the residents of Peregian South found after the boundary change when they became part of Noosa Shire are:

a. They very much enjoy living treated as a single community (they were previously split in 2 by the boundary).
b. Noosa councillors attended many community meetings that Maroochy councillors had never done.
c. The maintenance of the area had improved greatly. Noosa Council did not look after their requests, as did Maroochy. Requests were acknowledged and carried out promptly.
d. The consultation with Noosa councillors was outstanding.
e. Noosa is in tune with the environment and is much more "green" than Maroochy.
f. However, the overwhelming factor was the "presence" of being part of Noosa.

INFORMATION SHEET SEVEN: RATES DIFFERENCES 2008

Comparison of rates for single dwelling residential (owner occupied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Rate</th>
<th>Maroochy</th>
<th>Noosa</th>
<th>Cents in the Dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $100,000</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $200,000</td>
<td>$1,772</td>
<td>$1,762</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $300,000</td>
<td>$3,182</td>
<td>$3,095</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $400,000</td>
<td>$5,044</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House UCV $500,000</td>
<td>$7,900</td>
<td>$7,410</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - The rate at which Noosa becomes cheaper than Maroochy is for residential properties with a UCV $100,000 and higher or urban residential properties with a UCV of $100,000 and higher (taking discounts into consideration)

Comparison of new properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Rate</th>
<th>Maroochy</th>
<th>Noosa</th>
<th>Cents in the Dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry $150,000</td>
<td>$626</td>
<td>$679</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry $200,000</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>$775</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - The point at which Noosa becomes cheaper than Maroochy is for forms of a UCV $150,000 and higher

Comparison of asset properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation &amp; Heritage Levy</th>
<th>Maroochy</th>
<th>Noosa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refuse (Assume standard 220 lbs)</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$216.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water A (Assume 20,000 litres per year)</td>
<td>$145.45</td>
<td>$141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water B (Assume 250,000 litres per year)</td>
<td>$361</td>
<td>$297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of asset properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation &amp; Heritage Levy</th>
<th>Maroochy</th>
<th>Noosa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refuse (Assume standard 220 lbs)</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$128.50 or $64.50 for small or no bin service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBMISSION TO MAROOCHY AND MAROOCHY COUNCILS
Survey of Community Activity (Undertaken prior to door knock campaign)

EDV Action Group

Community Activity Survey Form

The EDV group is a group of residents living in Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and Wayba Downs who are investigating the possibility and desirability of those localities being transferred to Noosa Shire.

This part of the survey is to find out whether residents of these localities go for activities and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Noosa Shire</th>
<th>Maroochy Shire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale, Wayba Downs)</td>
<td>Noosa Shire (Noosa, Tewantin, Cooroy, Peregian, Sunshine (Beach))</td>
<td>Maroochy Shire (Yaroomba, Nambour, Coolum Maroochydore, Mooloolaba)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each activity, mark the **USUALLY** box for the locality you and your family **MOST OFTEN USE**, and the **OCCASIONALLY** box for other localities you or your family **ALSO USE**.

If you and your family are not involved in an activity **DO NOT** mark a box for that activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Noosa Shire</th>
<th>Maroochy Shire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Drink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes and Fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining (Restaurants, Clubs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (Discos, Pubs, Clubs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts or Live Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services, Centrelink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish Tip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports Participation</td>
<td>Team Sports Spectator</td>
<td>Fitness, Gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing Swimming</td>
<td>Fishing Boating</td>
<td>Running, Walking, Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre School</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Other, Craft, U3A etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charity Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Newspaper Read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17th August 2007

SUBMISSION REGARDING INTERNAL DIVISIONAL BOUNDARIES FOR THE PROPOSED SUNSHINE COAST COUNCIL

The Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale (EDV) Action Group, a community based incorporated organisation that represents over 3,000 electors in the areas of Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs (West Peregian), suggests the following regarding our preferred outcome for internal divisions.

Proposed Divisions

As we understand the situation, the Sunshine Coast Regional Council will have 12 Divisions and the total number of electors is 187,354. Based on the requirement that the average enrolment for each Division is 15,613, we further understand that each Division must be within the range of 14,052 - 17,174 to meet the Commission's tolerance levels of 10%. This has underpinned our thinking in the suggestions that we have put forward.

Basic Assumptions

We have assumed the following:

- With the proposed merging of the three existing local government areas into the Sunshine Coast Regional Council, the current internal boundaries will no longer be in existence and this allows a totally fresh approach, within relevant criteria, to review the boundaries;
- The electors of Doonan, Eumundi, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs have a demonstrated, well researched and proven strong community of interest with the electors of the current Noosa Shire;
- The electors of Peregian Springs and Coolum have very similar values to those of the electors of Noosa Shire as demonstrated by a survey undertaken by residents in these area and by the submissions to the Local Government Reform Commission from the Coolum Residents Association and Noosa Shire Council;
- The residents of Noosa Shire have strongly endorsed the linkages with residents in their surrounding communities and likewise have demonstrated that they share common values and have close linkages and communities of interest; and
- The criteria to determine the boundaries (once the overall numbers of voters is taken into consideration) are in order of importance:
  o Community of Interest (number one)
  o Natural boundaries such as rivers and mountains
  o Major highways and roads
  o Water catchment areas.

**Applying the Criteria**

1. **Community of Interest**

The data that was put to the Local Government Reform Commission clearly identified the strong linkages and shared community of interests that the majority of residents living in the northern parts of the existing Divisions 5 and 6 in Maroochy Shire share with the whole of Noosa Shire.

This larger area includes the existing Noosa local government area, the villages of Eumundi, Coolum Beach, Point Arkwright and Mount Coolum with the areas of Doonan, Verrierdale, Weyba Downs and Peregian Springs.

This data provides a basis for considering how new internal electoral divisions could be created which enable strengthening of specific communities that are in the northern part of the proposed Sunshine Coast regional Council.

This area is the focus of this submission as the EDV Action Group has insufficient knowledge to comment on areas in the central, southern and far western parts of the proposed new local government area.

This northern area has sufficient voters to justify the creation of three divisions. On that basis, we considered in more detail potential options for creating new divisions. In terms of community of interest, there is a very strong argument to group hinterland towns which have common interests together with their surrounding rural and rural residential areas. In most instances, hinterland and rural/semi rural communities do not feel as close to the beach side villages and towns who share interests relating to lifestyle and tourism and management of large influx of tourists at key times of the year.

It was therefore considered appropriate to group beach based communities that are mainly small beachside areas, linked by roads and sharing a common desire to preserve a low rise, village feel. We also considered that it was important not to create a significant imbalance of geographic size so that an elected member had the opportunity to easily cover his/her constituency to preserve their sharing of values.

2. **Natural and Man Made Boundaries**

The existing Noosa Shire area is covered by significant stretches of National Park, with a number of lakes. The Noosa River is a key feature as are man made features such as the Bruce Highway and the Sunshine Motor way. We considered the impact of these features in considering the potential divisions.
3. Water Catchment Areas

The two key water catchment areas in the northern part of the new local government area are Lake Meadonsland and Lake Wayba Catchments. These were also taken into account in the proposal below.

Proposed Suggestions

In making comments regarding townships and areas that are not part of our Action Group area, we took advice from Council officers regarding the numbers of electors and how the Councils were considering the potential new boundaries and our suggestions are based on our less than perfect understanding of what might be proposed to the Commission by Maroochy and Noosa Councils.

We understand that the North of the proposed Sunshine Coast Regional Council could be effectively divided into three electoral divisions. If this is to be the case, then in regard to the areas of interest to the EDV, we would propose/support the following:

Division One.

This Division, which we understand is being proposed by Noosa Council, would cover the far north of the proposed new local authority, using the existing northern and western boundaries of Noosa Shire and coming as far south as Federal with the Bruce Highway providing another boundary. We understand that the Noosa Council is proposing that Cooroy would be south of this Division which could include the following areas:

- Como
- Wahgunna
- Kin Kin
- Pinbarren
- Federal
- Cootharaba
- Boreen Point
- Teewah
- Cooran
- Pomona
- North Shore
- Cooribah
- Tewantin
- Noosaville

The composition includes a number of hinterland towns that have close links, as well as links with the more urbanised areas of Tewantin and Noosaville. Tewantin in particular has close contact with a number of the hinterland towns.

This area is outside of the areas of interest of EDV Action Group but highly compatible with what we would look for in the adjacent Divisions and we are supportive of this.
Division Two

This is an electorate of predominant interest to the EDV Action Group as it would contain the majority of residents who live in our area of concern.

The suggested Division is predominately a hinterland electorate which includes the area south of the line from Federal to Noosaville but including the Cooroy township, west of the Sunshine Coast Motorway to Eumundi, hooking towards Tewantin along the Eumundi Noosa Road as far as Beckman’s Road, all of the area west of Beckman’s Road with Yandina Coolum Road as the southern boundary. We propose that it should incorporate the following areas:

- Cooroy
- Black Mountain
- Eumundi
- Doonan
- Verrierdale
- North Arm
- Eerweh Vale
- Periegan Springs

The inclusion of Cooroy in this Division recognises the strong linkages that the residents of Eumundi, Verrierdale and Doonan currently have with this town.

The only area not included in this Division that is of importance to our supporters is Weyba Downs (West Periegan) which we propose to be in Division Three as the Sunshine Motorway is a natural barrier and their links would be more easily created with adjacent beach communities.

We are not certain if this suggestion of ours is entirely consistent with what might be proposed by the current local authorities and recognise that some adjustments might be required to ensure that the numbers are within the Commission's tolerances for Division size. It might need to include the town of Yandina to ensure that the numbers are sufficient.

3. Division Three

This is primarily a coastal strip from Noosa Heads to the north running down to Coolum in the south. We understand that this is being proposed by the local authorities. It would link those communities that have a shared interest and would also take in the Lake Weyba catchment area as well as the Noosa National Park. Areas to be part of this could include:

- Noosa Heads
- Noosa Junction
- Sunshine Beach
- Sunnas Beach
- Marcus Beach
- Periegan Beach
- Weyba Downs (West Periegan)
- South Periegan Beach
- Coolum
- Point Arkwright
The EDV Action Group has supporters in Weyba Downs (West Peregian) and close links with the Coolum Residents Association whose own members share similar values and we would be supportive of a closer link with the Coolum area.

Conclusion

In making these suggestions, the EDV Action Group has endeavoured to the best of its ability to gain some accurate data on numbers and geographic features within the very short time-frame available for comment. The suggestions for three Divisions in the north of the new local authority are based on a firm belief in the shared community of interest that our supporters have with electors in the current Noosa Shire and with electors in Coolum and Peregian Springs.

We appreciate that technical considerations with much more accurate data will determine the exact composition and the most appropriate boundaries, but we do ask that the Commission consider how important the shared values are to the community. The northern part of the Sunshine Coast region is very different to its southern neighbours and we do need effective representation to ensure that the values that drive decision making in the rest of the region do not swamp and overwhelm the values that should inform decision making here.
Anne Mitchell,
PO Box 150,
Mt Morgan, Q 4714.

To Whom It May Concern:

Dear Sir,

I am writing to voice my absolute
distress and disagreement with the idea
of being represented in Mt Morgan (a mere
35 kilometres from Rockhampton) by someone
who lives more than 300 kms away.

The voters of Mt Morgan (a large
proportion of whom work six days
a week) have been disenfranchised at a
Community level by the recent forced
amalgamations. In my case, I moved
out of Rockhampton 7 years ago because
the $2,500 yearly rates were a bit rich for
my single income. I also note that the combined
wages of all the new councillors and the mayor
still equate roughly to all of the salaries
for these positions in the four shires that were
merged. No cost saving there. The only savings
from the whole process is likely to be the one the
State Government makes from staff wages because
they are saving on administrative costs (which will
add to the ratepayer's more expensive to administer
Council salaries).
It would seem to make more sense to divide up the state so that the satellite towns coastal of the larger regional centres are part of the same State electorate. Then get your marker pen and go as far west as is needed to capture the required population.

The current proposal is preposterous and a serious enough issue to cause a change of Govt at the next election. We will be doubly disadvantaged if this proposal is allowed to happen.

Hoping some common sense will prevail.

Anne Mitchell

QRC | OBS 107
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong “community of interest”, but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]
Name: [Name]
Address: 46 Reinhold Crescent, Chermside

June 2008
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission's attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]
Name: Gary Cox
Address: 446 Boundary Street Chermside 4032

June 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecr@ecr.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

67 Alexander Drive Yungaburra Q. 4884
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district,

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;

(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100 000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

17 JUN 2009
ELECTORAL CHARTER
QUEENSLAND
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.
(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district
(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district
(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;
(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100,000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
The Secretary  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Secretary,

Re: QRC/O Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission's attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed:  
Name: K.M. MATTHEWS  
Address: 46 MYLANE St  
CHERMSIDE 4032

June 2008
30.5.05.

Dear Sir,

I wish to strenuously object to the redistribution plan as it affects Fort Nelson.

To be considered part of the Mackay, Hinchinbrook is nothing short of ridiculous - not particularly as residents within the area would have a minimum of 5 hours journey to Cairns Town - this, combined with the fact that the community needs are vastly different - means that any sort of progress in the northern region would be greatly hindered.

Another major concern is the
The fact that we would lose one of our local members who has done such an outstanding job for the port. Without Rosa Lee Long we will have no voice in Brisbane for our concerns and with the growth of the tourist industry, this will be an enormous handicap as the industry can impinge on mining and fishing concerns.

I would like to think that the Government wishes the best for the whole state - not just the South Coast - and can appreciate how the decision affects so many.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

[Name]
The Chief Electoral Officer.
Locked Bag 3304.
Brisbane 4001

12.6.2007.

P O Box 100.
Montville 4560

Dear Sir,

I wish to congratulate you on putting the Montville, Flaxton area into the Glasshouse electorate.
The reason for this is that we all live on a plateau, with Maleny as the principle town, and with people of similar taste and lifestyles.
Many of our people, shop, play sport, and go to school together, etc, etc, so it is fitting that we should be in the same electorate. Which would make it much easier for our Parliamentary Representative to work.
I am in contact daily with many locals and all that I have spoken to have the same opinions as myself.

Trusting you will not change this.
Yours sincerely

R J Hooper
222 Main St Montville 4560
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong “community of interest”, but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]

Name: [Name]

Address: [Address]

June 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008  
Address  
Darnley St.  
Brisbane.  
Q 4072.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

[Stamp: Cut 17 JUN 2009]
Dear Secretary,

Re: QRC/O  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

It is not broken and does not need repair or change.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]
Name: NOEL EDGER RPA  PRAIA
Address: 53/46 Playfield St.
Chermside 18  4032

June 2008
The Officer-in-charge,
Queensland Redistribution Commission.

I am writing to object strongly to your proposal to abolish the seat of Tablelands.

It seems extraordinary to consider splitting the wet tropics in half and combining the north of it with the already large seat of Cook and the rest with a new seat of Macrossan that reaches past Charters Towers to west of Mackay. This is particularly illogical following so closely the amalgamation of five shires to form one council covering the whole Tablelands region. Macrossan’s population will embrace areas of widely distributed settlements and cattle country that has little in common with the rainforested tablelands which support innovative primary and secondary production and tourism.

Our representative, Rosa Lee Long, has been an excellent advocate for recognition of the needs of the more closely settled and growing Tablelands region. She has made a superb effort to work for all communities within its boundaries. She has made a point of being present at cultural, farming and tourism events, and is well known to a wide cross section of the community as it stands. The area she represents is quite big enough for one devoted politician to manage without adding more area to each of the two electorates, one new, and leaving the important centre not represented as an entity.

Rosa is one of those politicians who represent the people she has been elected to serve. She does this without using her status as Queensland’s only One Nation Member to push for recognition. This is her electorate. It would be foolish in the extreme to force her to challenge the members in either Cook or Macrossan and thus deprive one half of an integrated whole of her services.

Yours faithfully,

Adrienne Smith

Adrienne Smith
Maria Bajema  
P.O. Box 40  
HERBERTON. Q. 4887

10th June 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
BRISBANE. Q. 4001

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to object to the redistribution proposal to eliminate the State seat of Tablelands. Having lived in Far North Queensland all of my life, I now find that I will be lumped in with Central Queensland politics. This makes no sense to me as we have very little in common with west of Mackay. Even our climates and landscapes are considerably different.

The Tablelands towns are very close knit with businesses, workers and shoppers going between towns daily.

Just recently the four Council Shires on the Tablelands were forced by the State Government to amalgamate and form one Tablelands Regional Council which oversees the whole of the Tableland. Apparently the Government's reasoning behind this was because we would then form a natural region where common interest would enable cost savings through efficiency of scale. Now this same Government is telling us that it is going to force us to split the State Tablelands seat which will effectively make us compete with each other at a State level but we are still expected to work together at a Council level. Where is the cohesiveness or logic in this?

Last week I attended a community consultation meeting regarding the Draft Far North Queensland Regional Plan 2025. In this draft plan "Far North Queensland consisted of the area covered by the Tablelands Regional Council and coastline just north and south of Cairns. Again, changing the State seat boundaries makes one question the State Government's reasoning after it has already drawn up this Far North Queensland Regional Plan 2025 which document is that this is the Government's vision until 2025.

Yours sincerely

Maria Bajema

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecql@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008  
Address  
8/4 William St  
Herberton 4897

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Marion Ockenden
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Qld 4001

13th June 2008

Mr JPM Williams
PO Box 770 Malanda Q 4885

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent who believes that your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district has such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south, deep into Central Queensland, is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region, and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan.

There is NO community of interest between the wet, tropical Atherton Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay. Nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Stamp: 17 JUN 2009]
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O   Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission's attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: SK Fuclo
Name: MR SK Fuclo
Address: 28 NICE AVENUE
          BRISBANE

June 2008
W.G. SPIZTERS & G.C. BERG

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane, Qld. 4001

Lake Eacham, 10 June 2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register our strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

In our opinion an intervention of this magnitude, likely to affect the lives and livelihood of many people, is calling for intensive public consultation, even before a definitive proposal would be constituted.

We are longtime Tableland residents and believe your proposal to divide the seat of Tablelands between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. It is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one, because this district has such a strong connection and identity!

Much of the taxpayer's money has been spent to prepare and institute the enforced Tableland Regional Council, which would be wasted totally if a new shire would be formed, while this in itself would generate again very high costs.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of the Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between Mareeba and Cape York.

Moreover, in the case of forming the proposed shire Macrossan, a new or extensively updated and widened road would have to be built between Atherton and Charters Towers. This exercise would probably cost close to one billion dollars.

We earnestly request that you review the elimination of the Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own identity and its own voice in parliament.

Yours sincerely,

W.G. Spitzers/G.C. Berg
PMB 71, Yungaburra, Qld. 4884
The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/0  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission's attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]
Name: Brenda Saul
Address: 31 Mayfair St
Chermside

June 2008
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely.  

[Signature]

Signed: [Signer's Name]
Name: [Your Name]
Address: [Your Address]

June 2008
June 10, 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane QLD 4001

Dear Sir/Madam:

Re: Redistribution of Tablelands Electorate

We are writing to express our dissent of the Electoral Commissions proposal to eliminate the Tablelands electorate in order to create a new electorate in South East Queensland.

There are several reasons the Tablelands electorate should not be removed and are as follows.

1. The issues and problems faced by the Tablelands community are unique to our area. The proposed redistribution involves huge geographical distances and very diverse issues.

2. We have excellent representation from our member for Tablelands. We will not have the same level of representation if this electorate is eliminated. If members of the community need to see their representative face to face they will have to travel large distances to do this.

3. The State Government will be removing a voice from the bush. The issues faced by people in South East Queensland are the same due to the small geographical region that represents the increased population.

In addition, the Queensland Government saw fit to recently amalgamate the four shires on the Atherton Tablelands and now wish to tear apart the community at a State level.

For the proposal to scrap the Tablelands electorate to proceed clearly demonstrates the lack of interest and concern our State Government has for the people of rural Queensland. The Tablelands region is growing and deserves representation in its own right.

We propose that the seats in South East Queensland are re-organised to equally distribute the increased population between the current electorates within the relevant geographical location. This would be a more fair alteration to seats within Queensland.

Sincerely,

Roger and Lynanee Strickland
Queensland Redistribution Commission 12th June 2008

Re: Nicklin Electorate boundary change.

We object to the removal of Palmwoods and Eudlo townships and environs from the Nicklin Electorate on the following grounds.

[a] Palmwoods and Eudlo have always shared economic, social, regional and other interests with Nambour, one example being that most high school students travel to Nambour to attend secondary school. Historically, due to the old shire boundary and geographically due to the high range between Eudlo and Mooloolah, Eudlo residents have gone north towards Nambour for their service provision whereas Mooloolah residents have tended to associate more towards Caloundra. Palmwoods and Eudlo have never had any community or local government connection with the likes of Glasshouse, Beerburrum or Elimbah, the physical connection of the railway is the only thing in common.

[b] Nambour, the major business centre for Palmwoods and Eudlo residents is only 10 minutes by either car or train from Eudlo and less from Palmwoods. The electorate office of our current Member of Parliament is in Nambour and hence very accessible and convenient when in town on other business. If Eudlo and Palmwoods were moved into the revised Glasshouse Electorate where would the electorate office be? Maleny is the obvious choice being the largest town and reasonably central but it is at least 30 minutes by car and no train [public transport] option. A lot of the elderly residents of Eudlo depend on the train service to do business in Nambour. I could not imagine many residents of Palmwoods and Eudlo needing to go to Maleny or other settlements such as Beerburrum or Elimbah for any business reason so it would be totally inconvenient and discouraging to visit our elected MP.

[c] Whilst the new amalgamated Sunshine Coast Regional Council has obliterated the shire boundary that was located on top of the range between Eudlo and Mooloolah this will still be the imaginary boundary of the central and southern divisions of the new Council for local government matters. If this electoral redistribution is implemented as proposed the residents of Palmwoods and Eudlo would be in the ludicrous position of dealing with Nambour in the Nicklin electorate for local government matters but having to drive a long convoluted route through the next electoral division of Caloundra to reach any other town in the Glasshouse electorate to access their MP. This is of course unless, the Member for Glasshouse establishes their office in Palmwoods, the only other sizable town, besides Maleny, in the proposed electorate and if this came to pass then the rest of the Glasshouse electorate would be similarly effected ‘in reverse’.

[d] Many of the long time locals knew Frank Nicklin and the contribution he made to this area and it seems almost an insult to move ‘his town’ of Palmwoods out of the electorate named in his honour.

Would it not be an idea to have Beerwah in the Glasshouse electorate, instead of Palmwoods and Eudlo? Beerwah would be the obvious ‘capital’ of south Glasshouse electorate with its growth rate and access to the railway [public transport].

Yours sincerely

Clive Plater

Lorelle Plater, Ross Plater, Michael & Gayle Schell, Kevin & Shirley Hansen
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Dear Commissioners,

As a private citizen of Tablelands State electorate I want to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed changes to electoral boundaries here and the consequent abolition of the seat of Tablelands.

It seems nonsensical to divide the presently coherent seat of Tablelands between Cook and the new seat of Macrossan. You seem to be basing this proposal purely on present numbers without consideration of the diversity of economic and social interests within the new seat; the difficulties of travel in the new seat; nor of the expected increase of about 100,000 people in the FNQ region in the near future.

The present seat looks to Cairns for all its support services none of which would be so easily accessed in the new seat. We have no relationship with the hinterland of Mackay; I have frequently driven down through Charters Towers and on to Clermont and further and can only state that Tablelands has no affinity with this huge swag of country.

Since most of the wealth of Queensland is generated in the inland areas and very little comes from the SE corner, it seems that you should increase representation there, rather than reduce it and not increase seats in the SE which is already over represented. This may mean some changes to the quota system but it would not be insurmountable, in my opinion. Would you consider this?

In the meantime, please record my objection to the proposed changes that will abolish the seat of Tablelands.

Yours sincerely

Mr D. I. Nicholson
The Secretary  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong “community of interest”, but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: J Matthews
Name: J Matthews
Address: 46 Mylne St  
Chermside 4032

June 2008
The Secretary  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Secretary,

Re: QRC/0  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong “community of interest”, but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility/ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed:  
Name:  
Address: 77 KURRAI ST  
CHERMSIDE 4032

June 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

28/05/2008

Address
P.O. Box 113
RAVENSHOE 4887
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

B.C. Turnbull

[Signature]
Villa 95,
21 Baywater Drive
TWIN WATERS 4564
Phone: 5450 6517
Email: irolle@westnet.com.au

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane 4001

QRC/O Submission.

Dear Secretary,

I am concerned that the Commission has recommended that the areas of Montville & Flaxton be removed from the present electorate of Nicklin & be included in the electorate of Glasshouse. As a long time resident of the Range the move does not make sense as residents of both towns including Mapleton look to Nambour as the focal point for banking, accounting, legal services, shopping & medical attention.

The community of interest definitely lies within the existing electorate of Nicklin, & I request the Commission to reconsider their decision.

I have based my opinion on 23 years as a Montville resident & having served as President of the Montville Village Association, Chairman Montville Fire Brigade & President of the Flaxton based Blackall Range Care Group, funded by our State & Federal Governments.

I request my submission be considered & should further information be required please contact me at the above address to where we have recently moved.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Rolle.

Thursday June 10, 2008.
The Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I wish to state my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution.

The proposed redistribution is not in accordance with guidelines for redistributions set out in the electoral Act 1992, Part 3- Electoral districts and electoral redistributions. This states that the commissioners must consider the following five matters, each listed in bold type, in the following paragraphs.

(a) The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed district. The existing Tablelands electorate does represent a community of interests as recognized by the local government amalgamation plan. The proposed Macrossan electorate, a vast new area containing only the Southern Tablelands, does not represent an extension of the Tablelands community; the hinterland is 1000km long extending far from the Far North Queensland region to west of Mackay.

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district. Macrossan, a vast electorate, has Townsville/Thuringowa as its primary service centre, while the primary service centre for the Tablelands is Cairns. The long communication lines will make Macrossan a difficult electorate to service and if the member’s base were Townsville or Charters Towers the Atherton Tablelands would be difficult to adequately represent.

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district. While the Tablelands have a distinct character the new proposed electorate of Macrossan has a wide variety of features. The Southern Tropical Highlands have little in common with the hinterland west of Mackay while the Northern Tableland has little in common with Cape York in the proposed Cook electorate.

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts. These have been completely ignored and the existing electoral district will be dismantled as an entity.

(e) Demographic trends in the state. The Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan is predicting a great increase in the population of the Tablelands. In one of its possible scenarios major Tableland towns could double in population by 2025.

As a Tablelands constituent I request that you review the elimination of the Tablelands in your proposed redistribution. Let the Tablelands community retain its unique regional voice.

Yours sincerely,

Helen & Stan McConnell
16 Ethel St
Ravenshoe 4888
13th June, 2008.

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Secretary,

Re: QRC/O – Comment on location of Chermside

Kedron-Wavell Services Club Inc. ("KWSC") is a community club located at 375 Hamilton Road, Chermside which is currently in the Stafford Electorate.

On behalf of KWSC, I would like to raise with the Commission our objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside of Brisbane with a strong "community interest" in which Kedron-Wavell Services Club Inc. plays an integral part, however, the proposed new boundaries will split the community in two.

Chermside residents share important community facilities such as the Westfield Chermside Shopping Centre; the Services Club; the Chermside Pool; the Chermside Library; the Bumle Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on the role our Club has in the local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Chris Barton
Secretary/Manager
The Secretary  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
BRISBANE QLD 4001  

WE ARE RESIDENTS OF  
MEEMAR STREET  
AND HAVE BEEN FOR 55 YEARS.  
NO CHANGES TO  
THE ELECTORATE.

Dear Secretary  

Re: QRC/O  
Comment on location of Chermside.

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong “community of interest”, but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Blue Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility/ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Signed:  
Name: DAN & LILIAN C. DOYLE  
Address: 27 MEEMAR ST  
CHERMSIDE 4032

June 2008

DAN DOYLE  
CMLS - ORALS  
27 MEEMAR ST  
CHERMSIDE 4032  
(07) 3359 1846
Ravenshoe District Chamber of Commerce Inc
PO Box 277
Ravenshoe Q. 4888

14/06/2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane QLD 4001

Dear Sirs,

Re the proposed carving up of the Tablelands Electorate with the FNQ Draft 2025 Regional Plan predicting population growth in the Far North of some 100,000 people, we believe it is difficult to understand how the ECQ can justify its proposed redistribution. The Tablelands must keep a united voice in Brisbane. There is already too much focus by the Major parties on Brisbane and the South East region. Having just amalgamated the four Shires in the Tablelands Electorate into a Tablelands Regional Council because we will then form a natural region where common interest will enable cost savings through efficiency of scale, another department has determine that for representation at a state level we be split among three quite diverse electorates. One of the problems is that it will hinder regional government especially significant development proposals by the necessary involvement of the three state parliamentary reps, none of whom will have the majority of their electorate in the Tableland region.

This will be a major problem for many organizations especially the new council. Ravenshoe would be in the new seat of Macrossan, which goes from North of Ravenshoe to below Claremont in the South, centered on Charters Towers. Servicing this electorate adequately will be near impossible.

Yours Faithfully,

RG Bewick
Secretary
Tuesday 10 June 2008

The Hon Alan Demack AO
Chairperson
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Qld 4001

Dear Mr Demack,

Thankyou to you and your colleagues Ms Rachel Hunter (Director-General, Department of Education, Training and the Arts) and Mr David Kerslake (Electoral Commissioner of Queensland) for your in depth and concise Draft Proposal Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries for State of Queensland that you have produced.

I am writing to present my few proposed changes to the draft proposal put forward in relation to the proposed new seat of Mermaid Beach.

**Mermaid Beach**
The new electorate of Mermaid Beach which encompasses the present electorate of Robina is a sensible suggestion considering the boundary move down the coast.

A minor change I would like to suggest is that Broadbeach State School be included in the new electorate of Mermaid Beach.

I would suggest moving the boundary one street further north to include the Broadbeach State School into the Mermaid Beach electorate as I have done extensive preparatory work with the schools P & C and Principal about future financial considerations for the school. In addition, there is a majority of students who live in the Mermaid Beach electorate and attend the Broadbeach State School so it would maintain the community of interest that is so important in any electoral redistribution.

The Member for Surfers Paradise has raised no objection to the proposed move when I advised him of my intention.

Thankyou for your consideration of these minor changes to the new electorate of Mermaid Beach.

Kind Regards,

Mr Ray Stevens MP
Shadow Minister for Housing Affordability & Public Works
Shadow Minister for Information and Communication Technology
State Member for Robina

Electorate Office
Suite 44, Level 1, Nelson Plaza, Victoria Avenue, Broadbeach, QLD 4218 | PO Box 1058, Broadbeach, QLD 4218
Phone (07) 5580 0071 | Fax (07) 5580 0303 | Email return@mpa.qld.gov.au

QRC/09/139
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Mary G. Reddick

REMOVE THIS DICTATORSHIP THAT IS NOW ERODING OUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS!
Dear Secretary,

Re: QRC/O Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission's attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility/ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Name: HARRY ZEWINICK
Address: 26 PAYFILDS CRT
             CHERMSIDE 4032

June 2008
The Secretary  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission's attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility/ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed:
Name: [Signature]
Address: 26 Rawfells St, CHERMSIDE QLD

June 2008
The Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I wish to state my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution.

The proposed redistribution is not in accordance with guidelines for redistributions set out in the electoral Act 1992, Part 3- Electoral districts and electoral redistributions. This states that the commissioners must consider the following five matters, each listed in bold type, in the following paragraphs.

(a) The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed district. The existing Tablelands electorate does represent a community of interests as recognized by the local government amalgamation plan. The proposed Macrossan electorate, a vast new area containing only the Southern Tablelands, does not represent an extension of the Tablelands community; the hinterland is 1000km long extending far from the Far North Queensland region to west of Mackay.

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district. Macrossan, a vast electorate, has Townsville/Thuringowa as its primary service centre, while the primary service centre for the Tablelands is Cairns. The long communication lines will make Macrossan a difficult electorate to service and if the member's base were Townsville or Charters Towers the Atherton Tablelands would be difficult to adequately represent.

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district. While the Tablelands have a distinct character the new proposed electorate of Macrossan has a wide variety of features. The Southern Tropical Highlands have little in common with the hinterland west of Mackay while the Northern Tableland has little in common with Cape York in the proposed Cook electorate.

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts. These have been completely ignored and the existing electoral district will be dismantled as an entity.

(e) Demographic trends in the state. The Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan is predicting a great increase in the population of the Tablelands. In one of its possible scenarios major Tableland towns could double in population by 2025.

As a Tablelands constituent I request that you review the elimination of the Tablelands in your proposed redistribution. Let the Tablelands community retain its unique regional voice.

Yours sincerely,

[Signatures]

Ms W. M. Board.
Old Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express and register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution.

I am a Tableland resident and believe your proposal to divide our seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is greatly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such strong connections and identity. Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 km South of deep into Central Qld, is inconsistent with the Dept of infrastructure Planning's Draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far Nth Qld. Nor do your claims of low and falling numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2026. You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the Wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the Winterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament. 

Yours sincerely, 
Mary Shanahan
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

17 JUN 2008
ELECTORAL COMMISSION
QUEENSLAND
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;

(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100 000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission's attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]
Name: [Name]
Address: 4 & Inglis St

Chermside 4032

June 2008
QRC/OBJ 147

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q. 4001.

Dear Sir,

A letter to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution.

I have been and still am a resident of the Tablelands all my life and strongly believe your proposal to divide our seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is greatly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shires should be amalgamated into one because this district had such strong connections and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of Tablelands into a new seat of Macrossan, which runs some 100 km South and deep into Central Qld, is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area deep and firmly in far North Qld. How does your claim of low and falling electorate numbers align with the growth identified in FNQ 2025?

You are also ignoring the fact that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport, also the communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the North South alignment of Macrossan in particular.

Also there is no community interest between the wet tropical highlands of Tablelands and the Hinterlands of Mackay. How is there any connection between Mareeba district and Cape York?

I am requesting you review the scraping of Tableland in your proposal and restore the region’s capacity to have its own voice in parliament. Afterall we are a democracy? or are we now a communist country?

Yours sincerely,

Ron Shanahan
Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
Brisbane, Q. 4001

To whom it may concern:

My husband and I moved from
Mount Isa to the Alt based Tablelands with our two young children
in December 1991, and ran businesses in Altburnton and
Havenheide till our retirement in 2001. We consider it a
unique and very beautiful part of Queensland and Australia,
and intend to stay here for some years to come.

Last year, we returned from a trip
to the U.S.A. for a 40 year reunion between my husband and
his brother, to find a proposal to amalgamate the four
local councils had been put through Parliament. Despite the
majority of votes objecting to this in writing, our submissions
were ignored, and we are now part of the Tableland
Regional Council.

After beginning to get used to this
new situation, which requires major adjustments by the
mayor and his councillors, we are now faced with the
abolition of our state seat, run by the competent, caring
vote-remaining One Nation member, Rose Le Long, for
the last 7 years.

It is contradictory and confusing
that the four shires which have just been united, are now
being divided into three separate seats. I understand
the new seat of Macquarie extends as far south as
Clermont, and covers a huge area based on Charlevaux,
five hours drive away. Our region has little in common
with completely different focuses and climate, and we stand
to lose our local identity and close access to representation,
which has always provided. She has been a fierce,
loyal defender of the Tablelands, and this seems a
deliberate attempt to try and get rid of her, as she is no
doubt a thorn in the side of state government.

The reason given of needing to create
two new seats in the increasingly populated 5x corner
heeds of favouritism, as it already receives the majority
of funding and facilities, leaving us the largely
forgotten north. We feel we deserve some compensation
for our smaller population to counteract the huge
area you are planning to create. We feel strongly
that the seat of Tablelands should be left intact,
and are appealing to you to review your redistributive
plans to do otherwise.

We await your reply.

Yours faithfully,

Judy and Brian

RJ66
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and failing elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: econ@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eeo@ecg.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

17 Jun 2009
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: gco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Katie Farquharson
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Jack Pettingy
16 Herbert St, Reveshro
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Chris Fryer
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecg@ecg.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Nicole Baker
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au  

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capability to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecp@ecp.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

M. McGechnie
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Lyn James
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecc@ecu.qld.gov.au  

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ece@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
28/05/2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecd.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

F. Winkel

15 Rankine St
Ravenshoe
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Hillary Smith
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

28/05/2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecd@ecd.qld.gov.au
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391,
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecp@ecp.qld.gov.au  

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
Patricia Ward
21 Lydia St.,
Ravenshoe.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Calms is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

P. J. Ward
[Signature]
17 JUN 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Gary Burgess
RN 428 Wooroon Rd.
Ravenshoe, Qld. 4888

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

[Stamp: 17 Jun 2008]

[Stamp: Queensland]

[Stamp: 17 Jun 2008]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

28/05/2008

Address

KATHRYN LARSEN
ANITA ST.
RAVENSHOE
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely, C.G. Dawes
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: econ@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
J. Mitchell
4 Anzac Ave
Millstream
Ravenshoe 4888

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
 Locked Bag 3304
 Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
 Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

B.S. [Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: cco@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
MIRIAM HOEDT
P.O. Box 493
RAVENSHOE
Qld, 4888

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

M. Hoedt
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecg@ecg.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

28/05/2008  
Address  
Eoin Harrison  
10 Herbert St  
Ravenshoe.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
Shannon Brennan
6/B Argy
RAVENSHOE 4878

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Shannon Brennan.
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: eecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

B. M. Harwood

17 JUN 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Address

Luan Wilkinson
35 John St
Ravenshoe
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Gary Kennedy
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

28/05/2008

Address

O R A N K U N St
Ravenshoe Q 4868

Fiona Dempsey

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecoq@ecq.qld.gov.au
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17 JAN 2006
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

17 JUN 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

28/05/2008

Address
36 Kennedy Hwy
Roverghaer
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

June C. Mackay
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecg@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: egc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecg@ecg.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,  
[Signature]  

17 JUN 2009
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eca.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecm@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeiba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

17 JUN 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: gco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecd@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
90 COCKRAM RD
RAVENSHOE
4868

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

CHRISTINE M HILL
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: gccc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008  
Address

Sharon Berridge  
29 Gordon Ect D  
Ravenshoe 4888

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Jane Rockwell
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: egeo@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Teresa Staines

17 JUN 2009
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Kevin M Larsen
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Gaye Shailer.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Elsie Davis
9 Monument St
Ravenshoe

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Elsie Davis
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecg@ecg.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely, [Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eecg@eecg.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Carole E Baillie
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecg@ecg.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

17 JUN 2003

[Stamp: Queensland]

[Stamp: Tablelands]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au  

28/05/2008  
Address  
166 Quandamba Road  
Millstream  
4888  

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Stamp]  
17 JUN 2008
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Roy Johnston
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecp@ecp.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

W. Palmer

Timouline Rd.
Ravenshoe

17 Jun 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
Kirstie Wiseman
432 Wiseman rd.
Ravenshoe
P.O.Box 675 Ravenshoe 4888

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Address 4 Mahul St
Darrah John Parkinson Ravenshoe QLD 4886

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391  
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au  

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,  

[Signature]

17 Jun 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: echr@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@ecq.ald.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

28/05/2008

Address

LYNETTE STANFORD
496 Woodward Rd
Ravenshoe Q 4885

[Stamp: 17 JUN 2003]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecg@ecg.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
6 Grevillea St
RAVENSTHORPE QLV 4888

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Elizabeth Town
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

*Margarit Ferris*
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and failing elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Marie J Smith
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecos@ecos.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

28/05/2008

42 River Rd
Ravenshawe
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecg@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

28/05/2008

Miss J. R. Winkel
P.O. Box 614
Ravenshoe 4888
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s council to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecco@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Jack Roberts  

203 SACRAMANDA DVE  
L888
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.aid.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

17 June 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304 
Brisbane Q 4001 
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Calma is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Ian Fletcher
Lot 7 Brodie R
Innisfail Springs

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Bim Atkinson
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

C. Julian

28/05/2008
Address

CHRISTIAN JULIAN
LOT 3 KENNEDY NUK
WNOO HOT SPRINGS

17 JUL 2003
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

28/05/2008

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fnx: 3229 7391.  
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eca@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Pat Gollan
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Robert Martin.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
Noreen Allard
232 Jacaranda Drive
Raevala

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communications links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Noreen Allard
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@eca.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Leigh Miller
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Address
Jennifer Beckham  
10 Kerr St  
Ravenshoe QLD  
4888

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Beckham
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

P. E. Woodland
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Cherie Bevan
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: gco@gco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Ken Stewart
36. Kays Rd, Ravenshoe
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecpp@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Lynnell Rayce
94 Ascham Street
Ravenshoe Qld 4888

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district has such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Calms is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecg@ecg.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecg@ecg.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Clarks is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

G.F. Cornwall

8 Herbert St
Ravenshoe 4888
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: gcc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

D T Cornwall
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Karina Simpson
49 Anzac Avenue
Millstream
QLD 4888

28/05/2008

17 JUN 2008
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Bruce Frazer
R 34 Bellview Drive
Bellview Estate
Via Ravenshoe 4886
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

M. K. Bolton.
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Cassandra Pengelly
21 Herbert St
Ravenshoe, Qld.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

K. Earl
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: gco@ecu.qld.gow.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Joshua Earnley
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Shelley Barnes
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecof@ecq.qld.gov.au  

28/05/2008  

Address  

P.O. Box 67  
Mt Garnet  
Qld 4872  

Dear Commissioners,  

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.  

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.  

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.  

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.  

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.  

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.  

Yours sincerely  

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Evelyn J. Fatur.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Albert Riddle
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: econ@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

28/05/2008
Address
J. Dodds
90 Gannet St
Ms. Garnet
4872
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: econ@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

George & Gloria Turner

[Signature]

28/05/2008

G. V. G. TURNER  
92 OTTO RD.  
KENNEDY HWY,  
MILLSTEAM.  
RAVENSHOE.
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecp@ecp.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: eecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008  
Address  

RICHARD BUTT  
35 ANZAC AVE  
PAVENSHEE Q 4850

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As elector residents in the Blackall Range we write formally to applaud you on your currently proposed electoral redistribution to withdraw Montville from the Nicklin electorate and place us into the Glasshouse electorate.

Our grounds for this are:

Many people from this area use Maleny for their shopping, banking, vehicle servicing, high schooling etc.

Being on the same plateau would make a Member of Parliament’s work easier as voters have a similar interest.

Since amalgamation of the Shires – Montville has been linked with Maleny even more.

All the people I have spoken to applaud this move and this view we would think would be the view of the silent majority.

Trusting that your decision will not be altered.

Hamish & Anne Borthwick – 146 Balmoral Rd., Montville
Robert & Joan Allen – 47 Western Avenue Montville
To sir/madam,

Attached is a letter of concern and objection to the Electoral Boundary changes. I have been a resident of the Blaxland Range for 25 years and have absolutely no connection with the glasshouse electorate. I am completely at odds to understand why you would look at this Redistribution of electorates/boundaries.

So please register my letter of objection.

Regards

Leroy Hutton 54429242 Po Box 98 Montville 4560
QRC/0
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane, 4001

Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of
the active and effective community representative group Montville Village Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through gymnasia to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially, culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being practical developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present customs, illogical on “community of interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Name

Leong H. Poon

Address

1, Western Ave

Montville
From: Luke Law [mailto:red5l@law@yahoo.co.uk]
Sent: Tuesday, 17 June 2008 11:18 PM
To: ECQ User
Cc: Luke Law
Subject: Redistribution of Boundaries: Logan City

Dear Sir / Madam,

I wish to comment on the proposal to redistribute the boundaries of Logan City. I reside in Boronia Heights and I am totally opposed to any changes. I believe that Boronia Heights and Hillcrest should be PUT BACK into Logan City. We have many commonalities and ties to Logan City. Our children interact with children from Logan City, competitively and socially.

We use the Logan Community health services and the changing of the boundaries would impact on our family negatively. We would have to travel further to a different facility. We have had Mr John Mickel as our State Member for many years and have been served by him very ably, we might lose his representation. Mr Mickel has been at many many events close to my Family, especially School functions (Boronia Heights State School and Park ridge High School) Sports functions (Greenbank Cricket Club) and 214 SQN Australian Air Force Cadets.

My daughters currently go to primary school at Boronia Heights S.S. but when they attend the nearest High School, Park Ridge, it would still be in Logan City.

The people we consider our neighbours in Park Ridge, Hillcrest & Regents Park, would lose access to the things that Mr Mickel has worked for in our Local area. Notably the Police Station, the Ambulance Station, The Fire Brigade station and the New Health Centre being built.

I also disagree with the moving of the southern boundary to take in area's that are part of the Beaudesert Environ, Jimboomba and Flagstone belong in the Beaudesert District. we have nothing in common with the people of that area, rarely interacting with them.

We live, work, shop and play in Logan City. My family and I have lived in Boronia Heights for many years and we have Traditionally and Historically been part of Logan City. I'm sure that other adjustments can be made to allow us to remain part of Logan City.

Thank you for reading my letter.
Luke Law  (07) 38007385
NOTICE OF OBJECTION: CHANGE OF STATE ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

17/06/2008
Kathleen May Langtree
16 Golflinks Rd
Atherton 4883

Queensland Redistribution Commission
ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

To the Commissioner,

I am writing to object to the proposal of redistributing the State Electoral Seat of Tableland among neighbouring shires.

The 2025 draft Regional Plan considers the whole Tableland Region as part of the Cairns hinterland. Charters Towers is considered to be in the Townsville hinterland. How can we on the Atherton Tableland be expected to connect socially or politically with the Townsville or Mackay hinterland? There is no shared community of interest between the Southern Tableland and the proposed new centre of Charters Towers, let alone the rest of the Macrossan electorate.

This proposed centre is a five hour drive away from Atherton where I live and work, in a separate geographic region, with a different climate, different industries and a different culture. Our day to day lives and problems are unconnected with theirs. Our infrastructure and access by road, rail, and air are very disparate. Our resource base for water and power are separated geographically. Our growth rate is much higher.

How can this situation be of assistance with the progress of this region? The other two seats which Tableland voters will be split into also have centres based off the Tableland. How will this assist their progress?

I fail to see how splitting the Tableland Region has any benefit to our Region. Who does it benefit? How does it benefit them?

Yours faithfully

Kathleen May Langtree
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Level 6 Forestry House  
160 Mary Street  
Brisbane Q 4000  

Dear Sir/Madam,  
In regard to the abolition of the Fitzroy Electorate and placing Mount Morgan in the Seat of Mirani.  
I draw your attention to Section 46 of the Act:  

1. The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.  
2. The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district.

Mount Morgan is completely connected economically and socially to Rockhampton and not Mackay. If Mount Morgan does end up in the Seat of Mirani and if people want to talk face to face with their local Member of Parliament they will have to travel at least 373.64 kLms to Mackay to do so. For a Community with a very high Senior Citizen population on pensions, and the way the price of petrol keeps on going up some people will not be able to afford the trip and therefore, will be very disadvantaged and not have their democratic right of speaking to the elected Member of Parliament over any problem on a face to face basis.  

Compared to being part of the Seat of Rockhampton, of which Rockhampton is only 40kLms away and which most Mount Morgan people travel to on a regular basis to shop and do business. I think that Mount Morgan should be included in the Seat of Rockhampton and not Mirani.  

Hoping that you will take these suggestions into consideration when you come to your final decision.  

Yours faithfully,  

Rose Molloy  
Secretary  

Frank Molloy  
President  

Frank Fedrick  
Vice President
Dear Sir,

I must speak about the re-elective of Mr. (Redacted)

Recently the re-elective of (Redacted) spoke to a group in hospital. Stating that he could not come until the electorate properly. I feel because of the enormous size of (Redacted).

The area of (Redacted) is huge. We don’t keep the same representatives of the people. Connected to some of the distance over two and a half.

Sincerely,

Shelley E Coxon
16.6.08

N. J. BUCK
BOX 139
HERBERTON
N.Q. 4887

QRC/081 343

Dear Sir,

I am writing this note to object to the proposal to eliminate the seat of TABLELANDS, or make any boundary changes. Both myself and family believe the changes are unnecessary and will only further divide the tableland people.

Yours faithfully,

N. J. Buck
Tableland Resident
Seville John Buck

[Handwritten dates and stamps]
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong “community of interest”, but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility/ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]
Name: Mrs. Betty Brown
Address: 6, Bellarine Dr,
             Chermside, 4032

June 2008
Ms L Crossie  
PO BOX 770 MALANDA  Qld 4885

Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001

13th June 2008

Dear Commissioners,

Have you any comprehension of the difficult and dangerous conditions impeding the ability of our State Government Representatives to access the constituents of the proposed electorate of Macrossan? Mobile phone coverage, whilst improved, is still intermittent.

There are 2 routes between the Atherton Tablelands & the Northern & Central regions of this proposed electorate. There is the inland and the coastal. Let's take the coastal one first.

You set out in Macrossan on the Tablelands, pass through Mulgrave en route to Innisfail. You travel the length of Hinchinbrook before entering Townsville. After leaving Townsville, you finally re-enter Macrossan as you head towards Charters Towers where, we are told, our Representative will be based.

This route is 60k shorter than that which is within the electorate, the inland route.

The inland route traverses the Kennedy Highway and the Gregory Development Road. Whilst the tourist route the Savannah Way section is being upgraded in parts, other sections are potential death traps.

Single width bitumen of widely varying quality permits the passage of 1 vehicle only. Many mining and cattle road trains pulling up to 4 trailers regularly and frequently traverse this road. Pray that you get adequate warning of their presence to vacate the road for them. Road shoulders, many rough, vary from non-existent to steep, deep, dusty or mudpuddles. Caravans, especially when driven by inexperienced or elderly drivers, have the potential to roll on these shoulders.

Please take a look for yourselves before condemning others to these conditions in the course of their electoral duties.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

S.A. Chapple
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 - Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;

(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100 000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/0 Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility/ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]
Name: LINDA BRACK
Address: 21 REHNOLD CRESCENT

June 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

[Stamp]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eccq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Scott Steward

[Signature]
Christine Rees  
30 West Street  
Mount Morgan  
QLD 4714  

3-6-2008  

Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Level 6 Forestry House  
160 Mary Street  
Brisbane QLD 4000  

Ref: Proposed Boundary Changes  

Dear Sir or Madam,  

As a resident of Mount Morgan, I strongly object to the proposed boundary change.  

As you probably know, on November 24th 2007, Mount Morgan became part of the Rockhampton Regional Council, and now you, the QRC, want to put Mount Morgan under the jurisdiction of Mackay.  

Mount Morgan is 4 hours from Mackay and only 90 minutes from Rockhampton.  

In these times of crippling high petrol prices, this proposal shows little or no regard for the cost of travel, should one need to see our so-called local state Member of Parliament.  

I am getting really annoyed with "the powers that be," treating Mount Morgan like a pawn in someone else's cheap game.  

Yours Faithfully,  

signed  

Mrs. C. Rees  

Christine Rees
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.  
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely  

[Signature]  

[Date] 14/6/08
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;

(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100 000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.

THE NEW SEAT OF MACROSSAN LAMBERG
FOLLOWS THE GREAT DIVIDING RANGE
FROM MURWAN TO FAIR DOWNS MINE
13th June, 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
Brisbane, Q. 4001

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed re-distribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan, which will run about 1,000 kilometres south, to not make much sense. Far North Queensland has always had an identity of its own as far as the people who live in it are concerned. We are growing all the time in population or we wouldn’t have such a high rate of house building going on.

This is also totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the four shire council of Atherton, Eacham, Herberton and Mareeba be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity. Cairns has always been and will continue to be, because of the distance of other large towns, our main town for health, transport and communication and is the service centre for this region.

Also I find it strange that you have towns situated on the same main roads, within an hour of each other, and they’ll be in different electorates – Petford and Almaden – 2 tiny little towns, so close, and they’ll be in different electorates. Also Dimbulah and Mutchilba, plus Petford, they all go to Mareeba for their shopping as they are on the same main road and are part of the Mareeba Community.

I think, before electorates are carved up, that you should come and take a look and you would find that Mutchilba and Dimbulah are almost part of Mareeba, in community spirit.

I would like very much if you would review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed re-distribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament. I have been extremely satisfied with our representation to date and our member is always available to the public and is well-known by all which couldn’t happen if a distance of 1,000 kilometres had to be traversed all the time.

Yours sincerely,

Judith Brown,
10 Beatrice Street,
Atherton, Q. 4883
QRC/0
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane, 4001

Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly
rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of the active and effective community representative group Montville Village Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through gymnasiums to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially, culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of interest”
grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Name        LOTHAR & GLENGA HEIDORN
Address     254 Western Ave
             MONTVILLE 4560.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the carving up of the current electorates of Tablelands and Cook in your proposed Redistribution. I believe these electorates are completely separate identities.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to change the boundaries is counter productive to the economics of the Far North Queensland.

The Tablelands electorate is a fruit bowl; they are the growers of Far North Queensland. The Cook electorate is mainly a sparse desert and are into cattle, mining and aboriginal settlements. The Tablelands electorate has nothing to do with the mining and cattle industries of the southern end of the proposed Macrossan electorate either.

I live in Julatten and we have more in common with the Tablelands electorate than with the Cook electorate. Socially most of our community groups and the theatre group have dealings with the Tablelands electorate. Our kids went on excursions to the Tablelands electorate mainly (Maroochy), not to the Cape. Mareeba Hospital nurses come to Julatten to the Croyong Aged Care Facility. My family and friends shop in Mareeba for groceries and all our main supplies including hardware and farming equipment. We totally identify with the Tablelands electorate.

I grow horticultural produce and in the future, I am going into a venture with Durian trees. This type of industry is more in-keeping with the Tablelands that is the Fruit Bowl of the Far North Queensland.

I believe that the Tablelands electorate should take in all of Julatten up to and including the Rex Range. The Cook electorate should take in the Cairns electorate. Mr Jason O’Brien’s main electorate office is in Cairns, not even up in his own electorate, so if Mr O’Brien believes his electorate is more in keeping with Cairns. So, join Cook with Cairns electorate.

Cook electorate is now going into Tourism, like Cairns. Julatten is Fruit Bowl, completely unique and has exactly the same industries as the Tablelands electorate and it has the same climate and social activities as the Tablelands electorate.

We in Julatten are Tableland Constituents. Please do not join us with Cook electorate.

Yours faithfully,

Mr Gerald Aston
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

L. A. Farrell
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESsing THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.
(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district
(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district
(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;
(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100 000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely, Rose Ettlin
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.
(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district
(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district
(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;
(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100 000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
2nd June, 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
BRISBANE 4001

Dear Commissioners,

I wish to submit an objection to the proposed new boundaries for the State electorate of Logan.

I propose that the new boundary proceeds up Browns Plains Road to Trulson Drive and continues down to Augusta Street into Julie Street (in effect keeping the same boundary). These are the main thoroughfares through parts of Crestmead and would be understood locally. It is a stronger community of interest to align Logan with the existing boundary at Crestmead.

By separating that pocket of houses bordering on Coffey/Kilby Streets from the other streets north to Browns Plains Road and west to Trulson Drive, well and truly divides the community in this corner of the electorate and serves no useful purpose at all.

That would mean that the Logan electorate would be on the western side of Trulson Drive, Augusta Street, and Julie Street to Burnstead Road.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

21 CARINTA ST
CRESTMED
4132.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
June 11 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane  Qld  4001

Dear Mr Commissioners

I wish to tell you what I think about changing the boundaries for where I am here at Hillcrest. I am not in favour of taking away Boronia Heights and Hillcrest from the Logan electorate. John Mickel is our Member and we have a good rapport with him and his electorate staff. He has helped us with our business. I know he is a good member for the area and he has helped establish a lot of community organisations which will all be lost by giving them to another member to look after, not to mention the confusion to everyone in Hillcrest and Boronia Heights that will result from this. Our side of the highway works very closely with the other side of the highway and we have a good sense of community spirit. By splitting us up you have really destroyed the affinity we all have. Families will be divided in a sense because we will have different State members, whereas now, we are all on the same wavelength with the doings of the same member and know what is going on in the community. I would ask that the electoral commission reconsiders what they have done and give us back the old boundaries where we are all included in the electorate of Logan and John Mickel is our member.

I hope you consider my letter.

Yours truly,
Dear Sirs,

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral distributions which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them in the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community interest in it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been, and continues to be, with the regional service town of Nambour, which is the location of the electoral office of the Nicklin electorate. There is not now, nor ever has been, any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electoral offices of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall Range connect to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville and Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times more difficult and potentially congested than is the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public and private hospitals reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. It is also the location of the nearest and most used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents.

Nearly all the high-level banking and financial services used by Range residents are based in Nambour and it would be fair to say that there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is, by far, the most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Blackall Range. There is no such association with any such services in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the "railway corridor" which accommodates the major population density of the Glasshouse electorate is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine this population not increasing by far more than the 10% electoral quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, possibly within as little as three years.
Exclusion of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transference to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the area from which membership of the Montville Village Association, an active and effective community representative group, is drawn, into each of the new electorates and this would also apply to the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association and the effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed redistribution would fragment the services provided by The Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which residents of the current Nicklin electorate played major roles in establishing and continue to manage, to the benefit of the Frail Aged and otherwise disadvantaged members of the community.

In summary, historical development of the Central/Northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and other enlightened and altruistic community “self-help” programmes and these attitudes have endured and passed the test of time. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Mapleton, Flaxton, Montville, and beyond. They share community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through to gymnasiums, arts and crafts societies, land and water-care and planning groups, as well as strong social cohesion. There are well over thirty community-based associations and activities groups which embrace the entire Range. It is, in fact, uncommonly and cohesively motivated to mutual community support. This cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups which would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government too.

All of the “off-Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is North and East and Nambour-directed with little, if any, to the South and West. This direction is not only by reason of historical association but also strongly dictated by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. It has no commercial, industrial cultural or social significance to anywhere in the Glasshouse electorate. The topographical characteristics of the Blackall Range effectively isolate it and preclude infrastructure being effectively developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical community sense and against the strongly held and voiced community wishes.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Mr. Thaddeus and Mrs. Lavinia Ryan.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Clarm is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

JENNIFER J. COLLINS
The Secretary  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Secretary,

Re: QRC/0  
Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission's attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]
Name: [Name]
Address: [Address]

June 2008
From: Richard & Bronwen [mailto:rbwinn@bigpond.com]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 8:39 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Proposed naming of new Electorate

To whom it may concern:

We strongly support the proposal to name the new electorate Pine Rivers and not Samsonvale.

With the Council amalgamation, this gesture would assist in Pine Rivers retaining and promoting an identity.

Our family were some of the early settlers in Samsonvale and yet, still support the new electorate being named "Pine Rivers".

Thank you,

Alice, Richard and Bronwen Winn
From: McDonald, Candice (RTP) [mailto:Candice.McDonald@riotinto.com]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 9:28 AM
To: EQC User
Subject: QRC/Q

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Candice McDonald

Rio Tinto
Supply Officer - RTP
Beler Athol Mine
PO Box 177
Clermont QLD 4721
Phone: (07) 4980 2353
Mobile: 0418 746 287
The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Electoral Commission of Queensland

19 June, 2008

Dear Secretary,

This objection relates to the electorate of Nicklin and the direct flow-on effect to the electorates of Noosa and Glasshouse.

Generally, the redistribution for the Sunshine Coast which has effectively moved the electorate of Nicklin north is sensible and the Commission should be congratulated. However, there are three areas of dispute which fly in the face of the Commission’s own philosophical commitment to ensure the preservation of a COMMUNITY OF INTEREST.

1. It is believed that the communities of Doonan, Verrierdale and Peregian Springs that you propose to be in Nicklin would be better off included in the electorate of Noosa.
2. The second is the town of Cooroy which is divided in two – half to Nicklin and half to Noosa; and
3. The third is the towns of Flaxton and Montville which are an integral part of the northern Blackall Range and are proposed to be included in Glasshouse.

**Montville and Flaxton**

It has been pointed out in Commission documents that a Community of Interest should be preserved and in the case of Montville and Flaxton it is believed that they should be retained in the Nicklin electorate with which they have strong geographical, historic and social ties.

These two towns form part of the scenic tourist strip called the Blackall Range (see attached map and description).

Residents of Montville and Flaxton have strong ties with Mapleton at the northern end of the Blackall range and belong to community groups and organisations that encompass all
Residents also have geographic, historic and social ties with Nambour. They are on the eastern side of the Great Dividing Range with a good standard connecting road to Nambour. Residents attend shows, plays and concerts, shop and use the Nambour hospital and dental clinic they conduct their financial affairs in Nambour and many have relatives in retirement villages and nursing homes there.

There are no direct roads connecting Montville and Flaxton with Glasshouse which would make electorally servicing these towns from Glasshouse difficult.

Glasshouse will benefit from the removal of the 1765 residents of Montville and Flaxton because its projected growth far exceeds that of Nicklin. In particular, with the upgrade of the rail line between Caboolture and Nambour, there is huge projected growth for the railway towns of Palmwoods, Glass House Mountains.

By contrast, the towns of Montville and Flaxton have a very limited growth projection under the SEQR plan and are the subject of iconic status to be determined by State Government which will further limit growth.

The removal of 1765 electors from Glasshouse would bring it down to 28,603 and would allow it to more effectively cope with the burgeoning growth that is projected for that area.

**Cooroy**

It is felt that splitting towns should be avoided and in this respect the east and western parts of Cooroy would be better off consolidated and not split as has been proposed by the Commission. (See attached map and description).

To split Cooroy in two is contrary to the Electoral Commission’s own criteria which is to preserve community of interest.

Nicklin includes the major portion of Cooroy to the west including Ridgewood and Black Mountain and all of the area up to and including Federal. People in these western areas consider Cooroy “their town”. Residents of the area west of Cooroy township work in Cooroy, conduct businesses in Cooroy send their children to primary, high and kindergarten in Cooroy, belong to community groups and sporting organisations in Cooroy, conduct their financial affairs in Cooroy shop and socialise in Cooroy.

Cooroy is a vibrant hinterland community with a mix of older residents, families and new residents seeking a quiet country lifestyle away from the busy coast. They have more in common with the Nicklin electorate than the Noosa electorate.

To divide Cooroy in two and have it represented by two Members of Parliament, one for the east and one for the west are not sensible or efficient.
Divisions would cause confusion between people living on the east and those on the west. For example, when community groups or organisations whose members live on both the east and west of town need to seek help from their local MP, which MP do they go to?

Members would have twice the workload representing residents from both parts of the town when they are required to attend meetings or functions at schools, Fire Brigade, Ambulance committees Aged Care matters, AGM and the list goes on.

**Pererian and surrounds**

It is proposed that the southern boundary of the Noosa electorate be extended south and east to include areas Doonan, Verrierdale and Pererian Springs. (see attached map).

These areas are part of the present have strong social, tourism and economic ties to Noosa. And, in the past residents of these areas have fought strongly to be included in the old Noosa Shire. They form part of the present Noosa electorate and

Pererian Springs is a new modern coastal town whose residents have chosen to live close to the beach and its associated tourism facilities. Residents shop, socialise and enjoy the coastal lifestyle and have little in common with the hinterland based Nicklin electorate.

**My proposals are to:**

Remove 1765 residents in Montville and Flaxton from Glasshouse and include them in Nicklin.
Remove 2364 resident from Pererian and Surrounds and include them in Noosa
Remove 2529 residents of Cooroy and include them in Nicklin

Total number of residents in Nicklin 30,911
Total number of residents in Noosa 29,459
Total number of residents in Glasshouse 28,603

These proposals are in line with the Commission's own guidelines, within quota requirements are considered reasonable and necessary.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Wellington MP
Flaxton Montville

Starting at the intersection of the Druce Highway and Nambour Connection Road follow your recommended boundaries all the way to the junction of Razorback Road and Mapleton Montville Road south along the Montville Maleny Road to just past Mill Hill Road and following the northern boundary of Lake Baroon and connecting with the Obi Obi until it adjoins the Sunshine Coast Regional Council boundary of Division 10 near Susies Pocket Road.

The South East Queensland Regional Plan has restricted the growth of these areas and therefore it is anticipated that there should not be significant future growth in these areas. As well, Isometric Status is being considered for the Blackall Ranges by the State Government which will reinforce the restricted growth proposed for these areas.
Cooroy

Following the proposed ECQ boundary along the Bruce Highway to the Cooroy exit before Ferrells Road. Up Myall Street and across the Southern boundary of the Cooroy Golf Course to the railway line, cross the railway line at the southern property boundary of Miva street and up the external boundary of Miva St, taking in Diamond St, Tewantin Road, McPauls Road and crossing the Cooroy Noosa Road to take in all properties on Swift Drive, Fantail Crescent, crossing Lake Mc Donald Road to take in Widgee Court and the following Lake McDonald Drive to the Intersection of Elm Street, along Elm Street into Cooroy Connection Road and reconnecting with the proposed ECQ boundary at the Bruce Highway intersection with Cooroy Connection Road.
The Proposed southern boundary definition for the seat will now be as follows:

Sunshine Coast: North-Coast Road north along Selb Road to Ventersdale Forest Road, east along Ventersdale Forest Road along Ventersdale Road continuing east along Ventersdale Road to the end of Ventersdale Road junction Devenish Bridge Road continuing east along Devenish Bridge East Road to Devenish Bridge West Road turning south along Herron Road until the end of Herron Road and then turning east from Herron Road cutting across to Sunshine Coast Motorway. The rest of the boundary is then as per the ECQ proposal. (Blue shaded area above is current ECQ proposal. Red line is proposed southern boundary change)
From: Patricia Booker [mailto:raybooker@bigpond.com]  
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 10:11 AM  
To: ECQ User  
Subject: boundary changes

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilkivan will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Mt. Burton through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilkivan and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Pat Booker  
24 Doon Street  
BLACKWATER QLD 4717  
07 49626243
From: cchaosi bigpond [mailto:cchaosi@bigpond.net.au]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 10:19 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/0

19.06.08

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away whilst the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Bronwyn Thorogood
PO Box 266
I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Maryann Nicholson
"Emerald"
M/S 627
Legian Road
Clermont QLD 4721
From: Thompson, Cailey (RTCA) [mailto:Cailey.Thompson@rtca.riotinto.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 11:28 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRO/O
Importance: High

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in
the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando
Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly
created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of
Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the
Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah
within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one
shire and local government administration and resources are shared between
the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional
commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but
also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important
factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that
current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the
midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new
mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to
attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and
are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to
develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of
single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the
population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop
additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income
workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in
Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a
service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a
position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the
electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah
residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one
will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the
Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local
member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and
residents within these communities traditionally use the services available
within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont.
Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Cailey Thompson
50 French Street Clermont QLD 4721
Ph: 07 49 802 437 M: 0406 993 906
Email: cailey.thompson@rtca.ricltino.com.au
From: Rhonwen Tighe [mailto:rtighe@bigpond.com]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 11:51 AM
To: EQ User
Subject: OBJECTION TO BOUNDARY CHANGE

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Cloncurry electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Cloncurry, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Cloncurry.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Cloncurry (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Rhonwen J Tighe
'Greenmantle' 2314 Kenlogan Road, via Clermont 4721
To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However, the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcoyunmin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramie and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcoyunmin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely,

Laura Murphy
209 Peakvale Road
Clermont 4721
To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However, the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcoyun will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcoyun and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Gary and Rebecca Broad
Broady's Bobcat & Truck Hire
14 Daintree St
Clermont QLD 4721
Ph/Fax 07 4983 3003
Rebecca's Mobile 0419 022 238
Gary's Mobile 0427 833 090
From: Mary Snell [mailto:mdsnell@acenet.net.au]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 12:34 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Name

I would like to see the name Pine Rivers kept by calling the electorate of Kurwongbah the electorate of Pine Rivers.

Mary Snell
Resident of Pine Rivers for 25 years next month
From: Noel & Sue [mailto:rsfinger@bigpond.com]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 11:55 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Fw: Electorate boundaries objection

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Noel & Suellen Finger

"Talarah"

Clermont Q 4721
From: Carrie Guiffoyle [mailto:cguiffoyle@iinet.net.au]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 1:12 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/0

To the Electoral Commission Queensland:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Multaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Regards

Carrie Guiffoyle

C. Guiffoyle & Associates
Solicitors
PO Box 342
MORANBAH QLD 4744
Phone: (07) 4941 5244
Fax: (07) 4941 5744
email: cguiffoyle@iinet.net.au
From: SARAH GUILFOYLE [mailto:guilleusa@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2009 1:18 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/O

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns. The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburr to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away whilst the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely
Sarah Guilfoyle
From: Danny McKay [mailto:dpmckay@bigpond.net.au]
Sent: Monday, 26 May 2008 1:21 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: 

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Danny and Pauline McKay
Clermont residents and Business owner
To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Valda Bettridge
6 Davis Court
Clermont 4721
To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Valiska & John Jago

JC & VJ JAGO
V/as MORAMANA FARMING CO
"MORAMANA"
CLERMONT QLD 4721
To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcumsin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Awanui and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. Thus Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcumsin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Col Kimber

Clermont
Kenleigh Mather
5 Tamarind Close
P.O.Box 1014
Atherton, 4883.

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane. Q. 4001
Fax: 0732297391
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

WHAT A JOKE

If you can’t beat them get rid of them.

The Australian Electoral Commission in redistributing the Tablelands electorate will remove Rosa Le Long Who is a voice for the people NOT someone who has to tow party lines and With Shane Knuth being the sitting member for Charters Towers at least one if not two non-labour members will be removed with the redistribution.

Also coming to thought is the FNQ 2025, with no up grades of Cairns-Atherton Tablelands range roads, combined with the expected population growth to doubled existing by 2025 WHY would any non-politically motivated person want to split up an area (Tablelands) that has a strong voice in parliament and speaks what the people think and want.

CLAIMS of low and falling elector numbers cannot be justified. As a person in the building industry I know first hand of the building boom that is happening in Queensland including the Tablelands region. Recent figures from RP Data show Atherton is the sixth fastest growing “suburb” outside of Brisbane.

Most Tablelands residents have a view that we don’t exist up here on the Atherton Tablelands and we feel in the eyes of the state government, that Queensland stops at Maryborough. With the proposal of Electoral redistribution it is just another show that the State Government and South-East Corner think everything revolves around them and any change to the Tablelands electorate cements these ideas. We feel ignored again, so for the FNQ people prove us wrong and that you listen to the people and revaluate the boundaries.

We the Tablelands electorate are a strong region and your proposal to combine a large portion of the tablelands into Macrossan, which covers an area 1000 kilometres south is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025.

Regards K Mather
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing on behalf of my husband and myself to register our strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

We have lived in the Far North for 36 years, and have been in our present home on the Tablelands for 28 years and we believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission, which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity. We do not want to be divided and lose this identity or our representation in Government.

Added to this with the FNQ Draft 2025 Regional Plan predicting population growth in the Far North of some 100,000 people, it is difficult to understand how the ECQ can justify its proposed redistribution. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025. You only have to drive around our region to see the number of new homes being built all over the Tablelands and our coastal regions every day. Qld needs more electoral seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads and Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland. Not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the hub for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay. Not is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tableland Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.

Therefore, we request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in the proposed redistribution and instead allow our region to remain a strong unfractured community and retain its capacity to have its voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

WE & J Moull
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Level 6, Forestry House  
Locked Bag 3304  
Urbane  
Qld 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391

19 June 2008

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Objection to the Potential Abolishment of the Electorate of Fitzroy, Qld.

The Bouldercombe Progress Association is a key advocate for the community of Bouldercombe and wishes to express its concerns about the potential abolition of the Electorate of Fitzroy and the redistribution of the electorate into four neighbouring seats.

Bouldercombe is a community of approximately 1000 people and is situated 21km south west of Rockhampton and 17km north east of Mount Morgan. The Bouldercombe Progress Association has been in existence for over 25 years. During this time, the Association has sought to progress the community of Bouldercombe, action community identified needs and support residents to be active participants in the social network of the community.

Residents of Bouldercombe, whilst enjoying the array of local services (such as a hotel, petrol station/general store and primary school) have as their main communities of interest, the township of Gracemere and the city of Rockhampton. For many residents, Bouldercombe is seen essentially as a satellite suburb of Rockhampton, with the majority working in Rockhampton, having family members in Rockhampton and accessing both health and high school education services within Rockhampton. Additionally, Bouldercombe residents listen to, read and watch Rockhampton media.

The township of Bouldercombe and its residents, have no connection with a seat that is based around Sarina as the main community of interest. The Bouldercombe Progress Association strongly believes Bouldercombe should not become part of the Mirani Electorate.

The Bouldercombe Progress Association believes it is essential that the region of Fitzroy maintains direct representation at a State Government Level and urges the State Government to maintain the seat of Fitzroy. If this is not possible, we strongly believe that the township of Bouldercombe and the surrounding district should be included as part of the Rockhampton electorate.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Roxanne Hodda
Hon. Secretary
Bouldercombe Progress Association

83 Richmond Drive
Bouldercombe
Qld 4702
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: eco@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Catherine Anne JENKINS, Mrs
Thursday 19th June 2006

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane
Queensland 4001

Email: eco@eco.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioner

I am just another person that has been thrust into a new electorate division at the last redistribution effort by the Commission and now vote in the Cook electorate and while you may consider it is outside our province to object about the demise of the Tablelands electorate I wish to disagree. My husband and I live on the Tablelands close to the boundary of the Tablelands electorate. We do not live in the Peninsular, the same as we do not live outside of the Tablelands to the south.

I believe that the proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan does not reflect what the people want.

The Tablelands is an area that is firmly in Far North Queensland and has no connection with the proposed new seat of Macrossan in that the community relates to the present area as being an integral whole and not a part. The Tablelands relies on the City of Cairns for all of its infrastructure. Any political representative of Macrossan would find it not less than a truth reflect the commercial input/output of the Tablelands region.

Again the area of Mareeba has the same infrastructure requirements as the rest of the Tablelands and has virtually nothing in common with the Cook electorate except that a road runs from Cairns through Mareeba and then on to the Cape York region.

In addition there appears to be a conflict between the Department of Infrastructure Planning draft FNQ 2025 plan for the area and your proposal. The actual demography increase that is taking place in this area (Cairns and the Tablelands) is plus, whether Brisbane plans for it or not. It is happening. Cairns has the fastest growth outside the South-East area of Queensland and that growth is spilling over onto the Tablelands due to the limited land areas and costs available for development on the coast and the lifestyle of the Tablelands appeals to many. One would therefore believe that the Commission's belief that the areas electorate numbers are low and falling (is this to the south? It certainly is not to the North!) does not bare witness to the facts.
We have just been through a grandiose political juggling of the regions Local Government area where it was said that the combination of the Tablelands Local Government Areas must take place as it identifies the area, emphasising again the single unity factor.

You may say that a boundary is a boundary and that is all there is to it and makes little difference to the voting requirements of the government in power. This is in fact incorrect. Constituents in an area tend to vote along the lines that effect there livelihood rather than political party dictates. Just look at the Seat of Tablelands since the demise of the conservative government in Queensland. Good enough evidence is it not? Constituents do not vote how the Government of the day would like them to vote. This redistribution appears political manoeuvring for the Party’s sake and has been obvious on many occasions not just in Queensland but in other States and within the Federal sphere. It has happened before and will happen again. The Commission is as ever not free from political interference especially from the Party in power who appoint the Commissioners.

The Premier has been on TV saying that she wants to increase the number of politicians but she knows this is unpopular and to get over that she will sacrifice at least two independent members of the parliament. A party political move. Yes she has also given one of her own party the ‘The Short Straw’ but that only means that she will sacrifice one of her own to gain two. Not a bad manoeuvre! No doubt keeping her fingers crossed that she will actually gain three.

I believe that the commission should take one step back (two would be better) and have a real look at the area and consider what the people want. Surely this was emphasized at the last State election and was again, not what the Government of the day wanted. If the people do not want what the party dictates is this not what governments call democracy?

I sincerely request that you reject the proposal to split the Tablelands. As I have said the Tablelands is an integral region emphasized by the Local Government Reform Commission and should stay that way.

Yours sincerely

Jennifer Nicholl

JENNIFER NICHOLL
W J NICHOLL
PO Box 354
Smithfield
Queensland 4878

Residential address:
468 Koah Rd
via Kuranda (not postal address)

Telephone 07 4033 7070
email william.nicholl@gmail.com

Thursday 19th June 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane
Queensland 4001

Email: qcc@qcc.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioner

I am just one pawns that has been thrust into a new electorate division at the last redistribution effort by the Commission and now vote in the Cook electorate and while you may consider it is outside our province to object about the demise of the Tablelands electorate I wish to disagree. My wife and I live on the Tablelands approximately 300 metres from the Tablelands electorate boundary. We do not live in the Peninsular, the same as we do not live outside of the Tablelands to the south nor do we live in New South Wales.

I believe that the proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macroissan does not fit the true picture.

The Tablelands is an area that is firmly in Far North Queensland and has no connection with the proposed new seat of Macroissan in that the community relates to the present area as being an integral whole and not a part. The Tablelands relies on the City of Cairns for all of its infrastructure. Any political representative of Macroissan would tend if not, to have to relate their activities towards ports further south such as Townsville and Mackay which would not in truth reflect the commercial input/output of the Tablelands region.

Again the area of Mareeba has the same infrastructure requirements as the rest of the Tablelands and has virtually nothing in common with the Cook electorate except that a road runs from Cairns through Mareeba and then on to the Cape York region.

In addition there appears to be a conflict between the Department of Infrastructure Planning draft FNQ 2025 plan for the area and your proposal. The actual demography increase that is taking place in this area (Cairns and the Tablelands) is plus, whether Brisbane plans for it or not, it is happening. Cairns has the fastest growth outside the South-East area of Queensland and due to limited land areas and high costs is spilling over onto the Tablelands where the lifestyle of the Tablelands appeals to many. One would therefore believe that the Commissions belief that the areas electorate numbers are low and falling (is this to the south? it certainly is not to the North!) does not meet the basis arithmetical test of 1+1=2.
We have just been through a grandiose political juggling of the regions Local Government area where it was said that the combination of the Tablelands Local Government Areas must take place as it identifies the area, emphasising again the single unity factor.

You may say that a boundary is a boundary and that is all there is to it and makes little difference to the voting requirements of the government in power. This is in fact incorrect. Constituents in an area tend to vote along the lines that affect their livelihood rather than political party dictates. Just look at the Seat of Tablelands since the demise of the conservative government in Queensland. Good enough evidence is it not? Constituents do not vote how the Government of the day would like them to vote. This redistribution appears political manoeuvring for the Party’s sake and has been obvious on many occasions not just in Queensland but in other States and within the Federal sphere. It has happened before and will unfortunately happen again. The Commission is as ever not free from political interference as it tries to indicate especially from the Party in power who appoint the Commissioners.

The Premier has been on TV saying that she wants to increase the number of politicians but she knows this is unpopular and to get over that she will sacrifice at least two independent members of the parliament. A party political move. Party politics hate independents. Yes she has also given one of her own party the ‘Sword of Damocles’ but that only means that she will sacrifice one of her own to gain two. Not a bad manoeuvre! No doubt hoping that she will actually gain three.

I believe that the commission should take one step back (more if necessary) and have a real look at the area and consider what the people want. Surely this was emphasized at the last State election and was again, not what the Government of the day wanted. In this ability to be able to not toe the party line what governments call democracy?

I sincerely request that you reject the proposal to split the Tablelands. As I have said the Tablelands is an integral region emphasized by the Local Government Reform Commission and should be kept that way.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

WILLIAM J NICHOLL
From: CRUICKSHANK Jenny [mailto:jcrui5@eq.edu.au]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 4:55 PM
To: EQ User
Subject: QRC/O

To whom it may concern:
I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilkummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aroonac and Multoburr to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilkummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely
Jennifer Cruickshank
66 Box St
Clermont Q4721

07 49931023
From: Nadine E. Cluff [mailto:nadine.cluff@isaac.qld.gov.au]
Sent: Thursday, 13 June 2008 4:49 PM
To: EQC User
Subject: QR/O

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kliaummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Arama and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kliaummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Nadine Cluff
Technical Support Officer
PO Box 229
Clermont, Qld 4751
Ph: (07) 4983 4737
Fax: (07) 4983 2978
From: David Fletcher [mailto:david.fletcher@isaac.qld.gov.au]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 4:46 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/0

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilkummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was once of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry and also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilkummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

David Fletcher
ISAAC REGIONAL COUNCIL
Operations Engineer – Clermont
Mob: 0408 150 795
Ph: (07) 4983 1133
Fax: (07) 4983 2978
Postal: PO Box 97, Moranbah, Qld, 4744
david.fletcher@isaac.qld.gov.au
From: Brendon & Rhiannon [mailto:brendonrhiannon@activ8.net.au]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 6:07 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/O

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aneamac and Muttabalra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Rhiannon Moriarty
"Teetarah"
Clermont QLD 4721
From: Brendan & Rhiannon [mailto:brendonrhiannon@activ8.net.au]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 6:10 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/O

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilkimmin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilkimmin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Brendon Finger
"Teinarah"
CLERMONT QLD 4721
From: Brie & Naomi [mailto:bngoodale@bigpond.com]
Sent: Thursday, 19 June 2008 7:15 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/O

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Morambah, Belyando Crossing and Klicummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Morambah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Morambah. The Morambah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Klicummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Naomi Goodale
From: Clermont IGA Everyday [mailto:clermontigaeveryday@bigpond.com]
Sent: Friday, 20 June 2008 7:09 AM
To: ECO User
Subject: QRC/O

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to
develop additional land for the provision of service industries and
other
low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate
office
in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result
in a
service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a
position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of
the
electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The
Moranbah
residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the
closest
one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while
the
Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their
local
member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont
and
residents within these communities traditionally use the services
available
within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to
Clermont.
Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the
residents as
their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be
re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the
electorate
of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue
to be
served by the electorate office within the town and remain with the
other
towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely
Richard Beale
3 Blamey Street
Clermont QLD. 4721
From: Dale E Lorrway [mailto:dale.e.l@bigpond.net.au]
Sent: Friday, 20 June 2008 8:31 AM
To: EQ User
Subject: Objection to proposed boundary changes to the State seat of Tablelands

We wish to object to the proposed boundary changes that will result in the abolition of Tablelands seat and the inclusion of the Atherton area in a new seat that stretches from Mackay to Dimbulah and will be centred on Charters Towers.

Trying to service electors in such a large area will be very difficult and would be far more difficult than servicing an area with twice the population centred in the south east. The electors of Tablelands will most likely drop off the radar and be largely forgotten about which is contrary to the current situation. The agricultural and business activities of the towns within Macrossan will be quite different and it is difficult to see how a member based in Charters Towers could care less about the agricultural and tourist needs of the Atherton Tableland. Tourism is an increasing source of income for this area which will be not likely to be the case for Charters Towers or areas west of Mackay and less likely to get the attention it deserves and result in long term losses to business and employment.

The Tablelands area should remain as is and boundary changes made to southern areas.

This appears to be another case where the interests of south east Queenslanders are again placed ahead of the interests of the more remote areas of the state. Such a move will make the current government even more unpopular.

Regards

Dale Lorrway & Marcia Brennan

PO Box 175
Yungaburra
Q 4884
From: Joe and Elle Bray [mailto:joebray@bigpond.com]
Sent: Friday, 20 June 2008 8:43 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/O

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Joseph and Ellen Bray
From: Carl & Andrea [mailto:cmoller@bigpond.com]
Sent: Friday, 20 June 2008 8:47 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/O

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries; notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilise fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal and are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Carl Moller
Springvale Station
4522 Pioneer Rd
Clermont 4721
From: Dyane Richard Hughes [mailto:wuthung@bigpond.com]
Sent: Friday, 20 June 2008 10:07 AM
To: EQ User
Subject: Electorate boundaries objection

To whom it may concern:

I wish to lodge an objection to the boundary changes recently announced in the redistribution of electorates. Clermont as part of the former Belyando Shire and current Isaac Regional Council will no longer be a part of the newly created Macrossan electorate. However the surrounding communities of Moranbah, Belyando Crossing and Kilcummin will remain within the Macrossan electorate.

The town of Clermont was one of two major centres alongside Moranbah within the former Belyando Shire. Both communities remain within the one shire and local government administration and resources are shared between the two centres. Both communities have economic, social and regional commonalities due to the current industries, notably the mining industry but also the grain and beef industries.

While it is understood that the numerical requirement is the most important factor when making changes to electoral boundaries, it should be noted that current population figures are less than accurate as both centres are in the midst of a mining boom which has seen the opening and development of new mines. While mine management currently utilises fly in fly out methods to attract and retain employees, they are of the opinion that this is not ideal. They are currently making provisions along with the Isaac Regional Council to develop extra land for additional housing.

The Isaac Regional Council is against the reliance and the development of single person quarters within the shire boundary, and so it is expected that the population will exceed all predictions. Council is also working hard to develop additional land for the provision of service industries and other low income workers necessary for the expansion of both towns.

The Charters Towers electorate has for many years had an electorate office in Clermont and the removal of Clermont from the electorate will result in a service loss to the town, and an employee of the state no longer with a position. The office in Clermont services the entire southern part of the electorate from Aramac and Muttaburra through to Moranbah. The Moranbah residents will no longer have access to an electorate office as the closest one will be in Charters Towers, more than five hours travel away while the Clermont residents will have to travel to Emerald to approach their local member.

Kilcummin and the Belyando Crossing are physically closer to Clermont and residents within these communities traditionally use the services available within Clermont. The strongest link they have to a town is to Clermont. Removing Clermont from the electorate will further isolate the residents as their closest electorate office will be in Charters Towers.

I would therefore respectfully request that the proposed boundaries be re-examined to accommodate the retention of Clermont within the electorate of Charters Towers (to be known as Macrossan) so that we can continue to be serviced by the electorate office within the town and remain with the other towns that we share commonalities with.

Yours sincerely

Richard Hughes

Wentworth

Clermont 4721
From: Clement McMillan [mailto:clemmc@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, 20 June 2008 1:57 PM
To: EQ User
Subject: Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries - Nicklin

A short note to express my objection to changes to the Nicklin Electoral boundary. I live in Flaxton an area, along with Montville, closer in relationship geographically and community-wise with Nambour. This area has long been part of Nicklin and has community ties within the electorate that would be severed. At present, our local MP is readily accessible - a factor that will be lost with the area being electorally tied to Glasshouse.

Forcing a union with Glasshouse severs ready transport with that area. Nambour is the closest major town and the easiest for people in the Montville/Flaxton area to access. I do not believe that we can gain in Parliamentary representation by having as our member someone difficult to get to see - many in this area are dependent upon others for private transport as it stands and, given the current oil crisis, forcing drivers to go further for face-to-face meetings with an MP is unreasonable.

Communities currently existing on the North Blackall Range will be split - most certainly so when it comes to issues where they may need the assistance of an MP.

I am keeping this short as I have not had time to write a letter and I know how annoying long emails can be.

I trust that this matter will get closer consideration.

Clement McMillan
clemmc@gmail.com
clemmc@bigpond.net.au
Shirley & Vince Jeffrey
849 Wooroora Road
RAVENSHOE QLD 4888
Ph (07) 40977069

Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001.

RE: Protest to the proposed carve up of the Tablelands
& possible loss of our Local Member

Dear Sir/Madam,

We would like to take this opportunity to register our protest & strong disagreement against the proposed redistribution of the Tablelands area.

As voters from the tableland area, we are of the opinion that a split of the two major tableland towns of Mareeba and Atherton would greatly hinder progress in the region. We strongly feel that this area needs to be under the same umbrella as it has been for past years, to enable growth and progress of both towns to assist each in growth, business and tourism. This area needs to remain intact as one, not split as the current proposal.

Having a Tableland's Member, means the Tablelands Community will progress to compliment both the north and southern Tablelands area. Our current Local Member, Rosa Lee Long has been a very effective advocate and we would like to see this remain.

We did not get to vote, or have a referendum on the of the forcing of the Tableland Shires to one Regional Council, to unite on local government matters; as least we should be able to keep our State Government Local Member to ensure our issues from the whole community are heard by one voice, one focal point, who has the whole of the Tablelands progress and welfare at the fore, for all the right reasons.

We fail to see how Charters Towers can help the Southern Tablelands area move forward with the Northern Tablelands who will be under a completely different area to go forward together!

Should you need to contact us regarding our concerns, please do not hesitate to contact at the above address or phone numbers.

Yours faithfully,

Shirley & Vince Jeffrey
Dear Sir

PROPOSED ELECTORAL CHANGES : NICKLIN & GLASS HOUSE

It has come to our notice, that in a review of the State's electoral boundaries, the Commission has recommended that Eudlo be removed from the Nicklin Electorate and included in the Glass House Electorate.

We strongly object to this change on the following grounds:

1. Eudlo is part of the Sunshine Coast community and not the Glass House community.

2. Nambour, which is relatively close to Eudlo, is the centre of business for the area. And provides commercial and government support services. Many of these services are not even available in the Glass House district towns.

3. The Glass House is a lot further from Eudlo than the Sunshine Coast and is a different type of community. We consider, that the change would detrimentally affect political representation for the Eudlo area, and that we would not be as well represented politically from Glass House as we are being currently from Nambour.

Yours faithfully

William & Wendy Hodge

CC: Peter Wellington
Member for Nicklin
PO Box 265
Nambour Qld 4560
18 June 2008

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission of Queensland
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE Q 4001

Dear Sir/Madam

As you apparently have taken no notice of your Terms of Reference and seemed to have ignored common sense, I again call on you to look at the Lockyer Electorate.

I realised that you and your Department have probably been kept in the dark about major planning issues such as Flagstone in Logan Greenfield site for 50,000 people over the next ten years, the major jail in the Gatton area and expansion plans for the University of Queensland Gatton campus.

But all that aside, it seems almost incomprehensible that you would keep a small area of the Logan city in the Electorate of Lockyer, when their communities of interest are almost as far apart as President George Bush and Al Qaeda's Osama bin Laden.

Surely, the area of Greenhuck should be aligned with the Electorates of Logan and Algester, with the eastern boundary of Lockyer moving to the vicinity of the Ipswich Boonah Road. The boundary from Grandchester to Atkinson Dam Road should be moved further east to take in the areas from Tarampa, Marburg and Minden and bring the population numbers back to the required level.

The boundaries of Ipswich West, Bundamba, Algester, Ipswich and Logan would have to be moved just to equal up the number of people in each area.

Surely, your office realises that Undulla Road is a dirt bullock track and unpassable, isolating that eastern area of the Lockyer Electorate from the rest of the Electorate therefore having no community of interest whatsoever.

Your urgent attention to these matters that I have raised would be most appreciated as you appeared to have totally ignored my last correspondence except for your acknowledgement of receipt.

Yours faithfully,

Ray Hawley

Co: The Hon. Alan Demack, AO - Chairperson
Mr David Kerslake – Electoral Commissioner Qld.
DearSir,

I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed electoral re-distribution of Queensland.

They are nothing short of a tyranny. It is not the intention of Democracy to have the power of a plate in one small corner of a state. It is purely centralising power. Socialism is Communion.

I have heard many times from Politicians and others that the Country is not ultimately more important than the people. To have only 4 or 5 electorates to cover most of Queensland is a bad joke, especially to anyone looking at it from overseas.

Yours Faithfully,
D. Martin

[Stamp: 20 Jun 2005]
The Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE Q 4001

Dear Commissioners,

We wish to convey in the strongest possible terms our objection to the proposed abolition of the Electoral District of Tablelands in the recent redistribution proposals promulgated by the Commission for public consideration.

Our objection to these proposals is based on the following grounds:

1. We believe that the proposed redistribution is inconsistent with the guidelines for redistributions contained in the Electoral Act 1992 in that :-

(a) It does not take account of the strong community of interest that exists in the area currently covered by the Tablelands Electoral District which was a powerful factor in the State Government’s recent decision to amalgamate the four Tableland Shire Councils to form the new Tablelands Regional Council. We cannot see by any stretch of the imagination how it could be concluded that excising the Southern Tablelands community and linking it to a range of quite different scattered communities in the vast inland Macrossan Electorate, with different geographical, climatic and industry factors satisfies the “community of interest” criterion.

(b) It fails to recognise the efficient and effective communication, travel and service networks which currently serve the community of the Tablelands Electoral District. We depend on our main service centres which are located in Atherton, Mareeba and Cairns which is a natural outcome of planned Regional Development and which is recognised in both the 2010 and 2025 FNQ Regional Plans. Our current political representation recognises these linkages. Splitting the area and joining it to an electorate whose primary service centres are likely to be Townsville and Charters Towers will complicate communication and pose difficulties for effective interaction with our political representative whoever that may be. At a time when all indications are that we should be moving to more efficient travel arrangements we could be faced with a situation where we will have to travel hundreds of kilometres if we want to have a face to face meeting with our “local” Member of Parliament.
(c) Alternative alterations to existing boundaries of the Tablelands and neighbouring electorates have not been adequately explored to achieve compliance with the elector number tolerances set out in the Act. We are aware of the proposals put forward by the four former Tableland Shire Councils which envisaged changes to the boundaries of Tablelands, Cook, Mulgrave and Cairns Electorates and the abolition of the Electorate of Barron River which in our opinion would have achieved a far more acceptable outcome. These proposals took into account current and projected trends in population growth in this region, were in line with the 2025 regional Plan and met the guidelines for redistributions set out in the Act. We fully support these proposals and ask that they be adopted in preference to the abolition of the Tablelands Electorate.

And further, we believe that the proposal to abolish the Tablelands Electoral District and join parts of it to Cook and the proposed Electorate of Macrossan will adversely affect our Parliamentary representation because we will no longer have a Member who represents the whole of our community and the unique circumstances and issues which attach to this area.

On the basis of the information presented, we request that the abolition of the Tablelands Electoral District not proceed.

Yours sincerely,

[Signatures]

(Mr K Byrnes, Mrs D I Byrnes)
16 June 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
BRISBANE  4001

Dear Sir,

I wish to submit an objection to the proposed new boundaries for the State electorate of Logan.

I have studied the proposal and am of the opinion that under this new distribution key infrastructure for the area has been isolated from the residential portion by the new boundary. Surely the residents and community and business facilities of this area should be represented by the same person to achieve true representation.

The Police, Fire and Ambulance Stations are all in the suburb of Boronia Heights as are the new Health Centre currently under construction, the retirement village and nursing homes like the Logan Nursing Home and St Paul de Chartres, plus the new park and ride that is being built to service the area.

Perhaps instead of excluding Boronia Heights and Hillcrest, the boundary could be pushed west to include these suburbs and ensure that the residents and infrastructure in the Logan area are united under one representation.

Hoping you will take my letter into consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Townend
Chairman
St Paul de Chartres
17 June 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Locked Bag 3304,
BRISBANE 4001

Dear Sir,

I am writing regarding the suggested new boundaries for the electorate of Logan.

With these new boundaries there is an obvious glaring error that the major infrastructure of the electorate has been cut off from the residents who use these services. As it stands the residents will have one State representative and the community facilities and businesses that they use will have another. Surely it would make more sense to have one representative for this community of interest?

I would ask that you reconsider these new boundaries and include Hillcrest and Boronia Heights in the Logan Electorate once again.

Yours faithfully,

Sister Teresa Lau
Sisters of St Paul de Chartres Australia
Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of
the active and effective community representative group Montville Village
Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which
the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn
would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and
community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed
redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from
the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those
residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its
continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place
as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic
community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present.
Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising
the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived
community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through
gymnasiums to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as
well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based
associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly
cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly
valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if
not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with
two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be
grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east
and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of
historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and
transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically
deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially,
culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The
topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being
practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin
electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging,
contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of
interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to
strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully

Name:  
Address:  

[Signature]  
M.K.O.  

[Handwritten signature]
To,  
Qld. Redistribution Commission.  

I wish to object to the new Federal boundaries. Do you not know in Brisbane that Mt Morgan, Boulderoome, Stanwell, + Westwood, are south of Rockhampton and to get to them, one has to go around Rockhampton+, and Gracemere.

We have just voted in representatives into the Regional Council of Rockhampton, on a forced amalgamation, so we belong to Rockhampton. Now you are going to tell us that we belong to McKay. How stupid are you in the Queensland Government.

At least 95% of the people living in these areas, use Rockhampton for their shopping, sport, entertainment, place of work, or business, schools and all other education. Also, lots of people represent Rockhampton in sporting areas, but they do not live in Rockhampton. So if the boundaries are left like they are proposed, all these people will not be able to participate in their chosen sport. It will be like living in one country and belonging to another, with one too far away to travel to, and the other not wanting people from another electorate in their activities.

How are the children of these areas going to get on? All the High schools, and Private schools, are in Rockhampton, and they travel into school by Rockhampton Council buses. Do the Commission think that the Rockhampton Regional Council are going to worry about us, when we do not belong in the same Federal area.

These areas that you propose to link up with the Mirani electorate, have always belonged to Fitzroy and now that the new Council are governing them, common sense says that they should belong to the Rockhampton electorate. If these boundaries go ahead, we will be a forgotten back wood.

Come on, have another look at the map and see just where these areas are situated, and leave us with Rockhampton.

Patricia Ward, Boulderoome.
QRC/0801-40
12 ALVARA ST
FLAXTON
QLD 4560

TO QLD ELECTORAL COMMISSION,
LOCKED BAG 3304,
BRISBANE, QLD 4001,

WE THE UNDER SIGNED ARE VERY
"ANTI" FLAXTON, MONTVILLE, EUDLO, PAMMORAD
9 CHEVALIUM BEING REMOVED FROM THE
"NIWAI ELECTORATE" AND BECOMING PART
OF GLASSHOUSE ELECTORATE!! WHY MOVE US
FROM NIWAI WHEN WE HAVE AN EXCELLENT
MP IN PETER WELLINGTON & COULD NEVER
HAVE A BETTER REP. YOU WILL FIND THIS
IS THE WAY 99.9% OF PEOPLE IN THIS
AREA FEEL. I WONDER WHY SUCH A TOTALLY
STUPID MOVE IS BEING CONSIDERED
FOR OUR AREA, PETER DOESN'T JUST "TALK
THE TALK" HE CARRIES OUT THE ACTION!!
WE WANT TO STAY IN "NIWAI ELECTORATE"
PLEASE!!

Janet & Brian West
29/11/90
Dear Commissioners,

RE: Submission on Renaming of the proposed Samsonvale Electorate and boundary changes.

With reference to the Queensland Electoral Redistribution and the proposal to establish a state electorate named Samsonvale, I make the following submission.

Firstly, that the Upper Caboolture area in the proposed Samsonvale electorate i.e. CCDs 3121809 and 3121815 be transferred to either the Glasshouse or Morayfield electorates.

Secondly, that the proposed Samsonvale electorate be renamed "Pine River".

In support of this submission I advise as follows:

1. Movement of Upper Caboolture from Samsonvale

The proposed Samsonvale electorate is based almost entirely on the existing electorate of Kurwongbah. In order to account for the growth in electors, the Queensland Redistribution Commission (QRC) has proposed the transfer of areas from the existing Kurwongbah into the proposed electorates of Everton and Kallangur. A small adjustment is also made to transfer voters from Ferny Grove to Samsonvale. I support these changes.

I submit, however, it would reinforce the community of interest within the proposed Samsonvale electorate and the neighbouring electorates if the Upper Caboolture area is transferred into either Glasshouse or Morayfield.

The Upper Caboolture area was added to the Kurwongbah electorate in 1999. The area is small in population comprising 543 voters in CCDs 3121809 and 3121815. Projections for 2014 indicate the increase in enrolments for these two (2) CCDs is very small, with CCD 3121809 moving from 414 to 483 electors and CCD 3121815 moving from 139 to 169 electors. These voters could be accommodated in either the proposed Morayfield or Glasshouse electorates without moving either electorate outside the quota. Equally, the loss of this small number of electors does not affect the quota of the proposed Samsonvale.

The case for moving Upper Caboolture from Samsonvale is based on Section 46(1) of the Act as follows:

- The community of interest of Upper Caboolture rests with the Caboolture and Morayfield commercial and service districts;
- The Samsonvale community, other than for Upper Caboolture, looks to the Strathpine area for retail, commercial and government support functions;
- The lines of communication, principally the road system, focus Upper Caboolture towards Moreyfield and erens to the north. The rail service to the area is located in the Moreyfield electorate;

- To service the area, the local State Parliamentarian drives through two other State electorates from the principal district of Samsonvale (Strathpine/Gray Park) to reach Upper Caboolture;

- The D'Aguilera Mountain Range provides a distinct and natural barrier between Upper Caboolture and the balance of the Samsonvale electorate.

It is submitted that the former shire boundary between the shires of Pine Rivers and Caboolture is an obvious and recognised dividing line between the balance of the Samsonvale electorate and Upper Caboolture, and should be used as a new boundary for State electorate purposes.

2. **Change of Name from Samsonvale to Pine Rivers**

In March 2008 the Moreton Bay Regional Council was formally created through the amalgamation of the former Pine Rivers and Caboolture shires and Redcliffe City. With the creation of the Moreton Bay Regional Council, the "Pine Rivers" name is no longer recognised in official terms. This is not the case with the other amalgamated entities, with Redcliffe recognised through the State electorate and the suburb name, and Caboolture through the suburb name. "Pine Rivers" is not a suburb name within the Moreton Bay Council area.

The name "Pine Rivers" is well known throughout the former shire area and more broadly in South East Queensland. The name is used extensively in public buildings and services, e.g.

- Pine Rivers Neighbourhood Centre
- Pine Rivers High School and Special School
- Pine Rivers Police District
- Pine Rivers Community Health Centre.

It is also used in identifying sporting clubs, community organisations and chambers of commerce. In short, it is a well-recognised name which locates the buildings, services, clubs and organisations to the particular geographic area of the former Pine Rivers Shire.

It is my submission that the local community wishes to see the "Pine Rivers" name formally continued and that recognition as the name of a State electorate would be a highly appropriate way to achieve this goal. A State electorate of Pine Rivers existed from the 1972 election until the abolition of the name following the 1991 redistribution. It is recognised that entities bearing the Pine Rivers name exist across a range of State electorates i.e. Ferno Grove, Everton, proposed Samsonvale, Kallangur and Murumba. It would be appropriate to rename Samsonvale as "Pine Rivers" for the following reasons:

- Each of the other electorates, even if altered in the proposed redistribution, retain their essential character and the names are well-established and recognised by electors;

- "Samsonvale" is a new proposed name and as such is not as yet recognised by electors as having any significance for electoral purposes, and has never before been used as a State electorate name;

- The previous "Pine Rivers" State electorates each contained the former Pine Rivers Shire Chambers and principal Council administrative headquarters and these facilities are located in the proposed Samsonvale;
• Many of the most significant State public buildings bearing the Pine Rivers name are located within the proposed Samsonvale and the newly-commissioned Pine Rivers Magistrates’ Court, the most substantial public building in the district, is located within Samsonvale;

• A review of the boundaries of the seats which were previously named “Pine Rivers” reveals that the centre of these electorates was Strathpine/Bray Park and this area is located primarily within the proposed Samsonvale.

It is acknowledged that the name Samsonvale is legitimate; however it is also noted that locally Lake Samsonvale, from which the Commission has drawn the name, is commonly referred to as the “North Pine Dam” rather than Lake Samsonvale.

For these reasons, it is my submission that the proposed Samsonvale be renamed “Pine Rivers”.

Yours Faithfully

Linda Laurich MP
Member for Kurwongbah

20th June 2008
From: Ben F Wash (mailto:bwe97047@bigpond.net.au)
Sent: Friday, 20 June 2008 2:21 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Objection to Redistribution Proposal - Tablelands Region

20 June 2008

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane QLD 4001

Dear Sir/Madam:

Re: Redistribution Proposal Affecting Tablelands Electorate

We are against the proposed redistribution of the Tablelands electorate which will remove the Tablelands electorate in order to create another electorate in South East Queensland.

The State Government found it appropriate to amalgamate the shires of the Atherton Tablelands at a Local Government level to create the Tablelands Regional Council because of the many points of common interest of these areas across the Atherton Tablelands. It is for this very reason that the Tablelands electorate should not be divided.

The proposed redistribution would place us in the seat of Macrossan. It is not a good fit. Our region fits better within the existing framework of the Tablelands electorate. The Charters Towers region is vastly different in so many aspects to the Tablelands region. We draw your attention in particular to the following aspects.

- **Tourism** - Many tourist attractions in local area-infrastructure in place-variety of eco tours available not found in other areas of proposed redistribution, the Tableland representative is familiar with these and works well for the tourist operators.

- **Water infrastructure** - Redistribution would split present infrastructure and distribution into the domain of two MPs, a source of conflict. Tinaroo Dam and the irrigation channel supplying water would be split between two electoral boundaries.

- **Agriculture** - Primary production on Tablelands includes production of mangoes, avocados, bananas, citrus fruits, coffee, potatoes, peanuts, and other vegetables as well as corn, sugar cane, and hay in addition to dairy products and beef cattle production. All, with exclusion of beef cattle production, are concentrated in the Tableland area.

- **Flora and fauna** - Much of Tableland area is covered in tropical rainforest and contains extensive world heritage areas. The fauna and flora contained in the area are unique to rainforest e.g. tree kangaroos, cassowary’s, scrub turkeys, scrub hens and lauri pine, quandongs, northern silky oak to name a few as well as a variety of orchids only found in the rainforest areas. The member from the area appreciates and is familiar with the diversification. Someone elected who is not local to the Tablelands would not be able to appreciate the difficulties in managing this unique ecosystem.

- **Regional** – Splitting the Tableland into two divisions is just not logical in that the infrastructure is combined under the Tableland Regional Council who would find it onerous to deal with two separate members in managing their responsibilities.

There are few common points of interest between the Tablelands and Charters Towers region.

With the rising cost of fuel the cost of travel for a representative covering such a large geographical region will be significant, if they are to adequately cover the region. In addition,
It is unfair to members of the community who require a face to face meeting with their representative as they will have to travel the long distances to meet with their representative and at significant personal cost. Consequently, it is highly unlikely that people from the Atherton Tablelands will have an opportunity to get to know or meet with their representative. It is likely that the only time we’d see our representative would be at election time.

From our viewpoint, it appears that Gerrymandering in the State of Queensland is alive and well. Our State representative, Rosa Lee Long is a member of the One Nation party. There is no question that the State Government would wish to remove the only One Nation party representative in Queensland. Rosa Lee Long is committed to our region and has provided this community with excellent representation. We believe that she would win this seat regardless of the party she represented because of her commitment and concern for her constituents.

We believe that the main purpose that the redistribution proposal will serve will be to provide our region with effectively no representation and will ensure that Tablelands issues are severely diminished at a State level due to inadequate representation.

The population within the Tablelands Electorate is growing. The Tablelands Electorate should not be eliminated.

Please reconsider your position and look at the alternative of redistributing the population increase of South East Queensland between existing electorates within the relevant geographical location. The issues faced by the community within these small geographical regions is much the same and would be better served by existing representatives within these regions.

Sincerely,
Ben & Lyn Wash
(18 Lindsay Road, Malanda Qld 4885)
The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/0  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission's attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong "community of interest", but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burrie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]

Name: PEARD, ELLEN

Address: 200 RIVER LOFT UNIT 37
12-20 BALLANTINE AVE CHERMSIDE 4030

June 2008
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecc@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
13 Alexander Dr
Lakeside
Gungabura

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and Identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands Into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of Interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

29 Jun 2008
20 Jun 2008
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

(M. Balas)
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 — Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters —

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district;

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district;

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district;

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;

(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100,000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of
the active and effective community representative group Montville Village Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through gymnastics to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially, culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Name
Address