

APPENDIX C

Suggestions Notice & Public Submissions

LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHANGE COMMISSION

Divisional Boundary Review of Redland City Council

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

Enrolment Requirements

Each division of the Council is required to have relatively the same number of voters (quota) to ensure each person's vote has the same value. The quota for each division of the Redland City local government area is 10,841 with a lower limit of 9,757 (-10%) and an upper limit of 11,925 (+10%).

For more information and enrolment statistics please see the Electoral Commission of Queensland's website: www.ecq.qld.gov.au/electoral-boundaries/lg-reviews/DBRs or phone 1300 881 665.

INVITATION FOR WRITTEN SUGGESTIONS

The Change Commission now invites suggestions regarding the divisional boundaries for the Redland City Council. Submissions will be accepted until 5pm on 20 May 2019. Late submissions cannot be considered.

Submissions can be lodged through:

- **Online Form (*preferred*)**

www.ecq.qld.gov.au/electoral-boundaries/lg-reviews/DBRs

- **Email**

LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au

- **Personal Delivery** (Mon - Fri 9.00am - 5.00pm)

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

- **Post**

Local Government Change Commission
GPO Box 1393
BRISBANE QLD 4001

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

Pat Vidgen PSM

Electoral Commissioner

Divisional Boundary Review of Redland City Council

List of Public Suggestions

Suggestion	Name / Organisation
1	Amanda Secomb
2	Councillor Julie Talty, Division 6, Redland City Council
3	Councillor Murray Elliott, Division 7, Redland City Council
4	Councillor Paul Bishop, Division 10, Redland City Council
5	Councillor Lance Hewlett, Deputy Mayor, Division 4, Redland City Council
6	Lynn Weston
7	William Weston
8	Amy Glade
9	Adelia & David Berridge
10	C. Wigan
11	Ross Spence
12	Redlands 2030
13	Pam Spence
14	Councillor Wendy Boglary, Division 1, Redland City Council
15	Anonymous
16	Councillor Paul Bishop, Division 10, Redland City Council
17	Margaret Hardy

Sent: Tuesday, 30 April 2019 4:12 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: (78664) Redland City Local Government Area - Amanda Secomb

Online submission for **Redland City Local Government Area** from **Amanda Secomb**

Submission Details

Name: Amanda Secomb

Submission Text: The SMBI islands should have there own councilor and divisionso the councilor can understand the true issues the Islanders have in day to day life.....

File Upload: No file uploaded ()

Sent: Friday, 3 May 2019 4:04 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Councillor submission Division 6 Redland City Council

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to make the following suggestions with regard to the planned realignment of boundaries for Division 6 Redland City. As the current serving city councillor I am most concerned with allowing the natural connections between communities within the division to be served while maintaining the integrity of the value system for the electorate.

Here in Division 6 we have experienced considerable population growth and that growth is set to continue with planned development in the south of Redland City. The boundary of Division 6 has been changed in every election cycle since at least 2008. There is currently an approval for a planned community development marketed as the Shoreline Development under Lendlease that will add 4000 new dwellings to Division 6. The first 200 lots are expected to be sealed by the middle of 2020 with rapid increases in population up to an extra 10,000 residents over the next 8 years. Further there is a planned development area which will add approximately 4000 new dwellings to Division 6 and Division 4 in the area bounded by Bunker, Cleveland Redland Bay, and Double Jump Roads. Applications for development are pending for the first 700 home sites in this area between Brendan Way Victoria Point and Double Jump Road Redland Bay (I have marked this area on the attached map in a red outline). It appears that the natural course for adjusting the population reflected for voting is to move the northern boundary of Division 6 to the south.

There are three fairly distinct cohorts of community that make up the northern boundary of the electorate and depending upon the numbers that the Commission finds need to be moved, one, two or three of these geographic areas could be moved into other council divisions without causing disruption to the natural connections of these communities to their fellow electors through shared local concern.

I will firstly mention what I will call area one, the commission may like to consider moving the residents of Sheldon from Division 6 to Division 9. There is a natural connection between the residents of Sheldon and those of the rest of Division 6 because of a shared rural lifestyle valued by all. However there is a similar rural community immediately to their north in Capalaba and the residents of most of Sheldon will follow the natural geography and road network and do most of their shopping and attend schools in Capalaba and to their north, so moving Sheldon into Division 9 would be a comfortable fit for those residents. Should this be considered by the Commission to be a positive fit, but with too many residents going into Division 9, the areas Schoeck Road, off West Mount Cotton Road could remain in Division 6.

Next, an area I will call area two is the area between Taylor Road, south to Woodlands Drive and east to the creek line which forms a boundary between Division 6 and Division 3. This area could easily be moved across to Division 7 and would maintain the natural flow of the boundaries while not adding to Division 3 which is over subscribed also.

The third possible area that the Commission may wish to look at is the area currently in Division 6 in Victoria Point West, this area, although including the only commercial retail of significance in Division 6 could be moved to Division 4 to allow all the residents of Victoria Point to be represented as one community.

I have attached a map of the electorate with the areas as suggested circled. I will attempt to do further work taking into consideration the elector numbers when the section maps become available to me. I hope that you will consider these concerns and suggestions in your assessment of the boundary realignment for Division 6 Redland City.

With thanks

Cr Julie Talty



Cr Julie Talty

Division 6 | Mount Cotton | Sheldon | Thornlands | Victoria Point | Redland Bay

Redland City Council

P [REDACTED]

M [REDACTED]

E : [REDACTED]

W [REDACTED]

F [REDACTED]

From: Cr Murray Elliott
Sent: Thursday, 9 May 2019 4:01 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Cc: Tracey Noonan; Cr Lance Hewlett; Cr Wendy Boglary; Cr Paul Bishop; Cr Tracey Huges; Cr Paul Golle
Subject: RCC divisional boundary redistribution proposal
Attachments: 20190509155819385.pdf

Dear Electoral Commissioner ,

With regard to the invitation for written suggestions for divisional boundary review in Redland City Council I wish to submit my recommendations :

Division 1 Add 3100804 from Division 8 .

As the population increases this is a logical progression as the division moves south.

Division 2 Add 3100706 , 3100705 , 3100709 and 3100719 from Division 3. Subtract 31100714 , 3110713 and 3110729 and add to Division 7 .

As the population increases this is a logical progression as the division moves south.

Division 3 Subtract 3100706 , 3100705 , 3100709 and 3100710 to Division 2 .

As the population increases this is a logical progression as the division moves south.

Division 4 No change

Division 5 No change

Division 6 Subtract 3101107 , 3101106 , 3101105 , 3101112 , 3101202 , 3101234 , 3101108 , 3101109 , 3101103 and 3101102 and add to Division 9 .

This division is where the population is increasing significantly in the coming years. Positioning of the division in the lower percentile allows that increase to be addressed.

Division 7 Add 31100714 , 3100713 , and 3100729 from Division 2 .

To address the population as it increases this division needs to progressively realign itself to address this. The expansion to the east has its eastern boundary of Wellington street in Cleveland and also aligns with the existing south eastern boundary of the division.

Division 8 Add 3100407 , 3100408 , 3100409 , 3100410 from Division 9 . Subtract 3100804 and add to Division 1. Subtract 3100324 and 3100325 and add to Division 10.

As population increases this division and needs to realign itself for the future shift south . The progression to the west facilitates this at this point in time.

Division 9 Add 31011107 , 3101106 , 3100105 , 3101112 , 3101202 , 3101234 , 3101108 , 3101109 , 3101103 and 3101102 from Division 6 . Subtract 3100407 , 3100408 , 3100409 and 3100410 and add to division 8. Subtract 3100326 and add to Division 10.

As population increases this division needs to move south and realign itself significantly to address the population increases in Division 6.

Division 10 Add 3100324 and 3100325 from Division 8 and add 3100326 from Division 9.

As the population increases this is a logical progression as the division moves south. It also resets the southern boundary to before the last redistribution.

--

DISCLAIMER:

This email is intended for the named recipients only. Information in this email and any attachments may be confidential, privileged or subject to copyright. Any reproduction, disclosure, distribution, or other dissemination is strictly prohibited. Use of this email, or any reliance on the information contained in it or its attachments, other than by the addressee, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies of the message and attachments. Neither Redland City Council nor the sender warrant that this email does not contain any viruses or other unsolicited items.

Please consider the environment before you print this e-mail or any attachments.

Redland City Council
Divisional Boundaries 2016



Produced by Spatial
Business Intelligence
September 2016

Division 1

THORNESIDE
Division 10

WELLINGTON
POINT

BIRKDALE

ORMISTON

Division 8

Division 2

Division 2 includes
North Stradbroke Island
See Overview

PEEL
ISLAND

Division 9

INSET

ALEXANDRA
HILLS

Division 7

CLEVELAND

CAPALABA

Division 3

THORNLANDS

Division 4

COOCHIEMUDLO
ISLAND

SHELDON

VICTORIA
POINT

Division 5 includes
Southern Moreton Bay Islands
See Overview

Division
9

MOUNT
COTTON

MACLEAY
ISLAND

DIV 6

Division 5

KARRAGARRA
ISLAND

REDLAND
BAY

OVERVIEW



INSET



Redland City Council
Council or its agents have prepared this map in accordance with the provisions of the Survey Act 1958 and the Survey Act 1974.
to the satisfaction of the Survey Act 1958 and the Survey Act 1974 and agree that the State gives no warranty in relation
to the data contained in this map, including any errors, omissions, or inaccuracies, and accepts no liability (including without limitation
liability in negligence) for any loss, damage or costs (including consequential damages) arising from any use of the data.
This map may not be used for other purposes without the written consent of the Council.

Sent: Thursday, 9 May 2019 5:42 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Cc: Cr Tracey Huges; Cr Murray Elliott
Subject: Re: RCC divisional boundary redistribution proposal

Dear Electoral Commissioner,

In so far as I am concerned with Division 10 and matters relating to changes between Divisions 8, 9 and 10 proposed by this submission, I offer my support and endorsement for this preferred solution.

I will subsequently make a full submission regarding matters relating to the strange and concerning anomaly from 2016 that removed the area known as the Birkdale Commonwealth Lands (area 3100326) which has historically been associated with Division 10. The last minute shift seems to have been based on a number of elected representatives submissions requesting the area be redistributed area to Division 9.

This has caused much confusion and consternation for local residents, since it appears to have taken place as an adjustment after the initial consultation and was only discovered by citizens and stakeholders at the final report phase.

This vast area of land that Redland City Council has subsequently proceeded to purchase from the Commonwealth government deserves to be reinstated as part of Division 10, particularly because the historic association with Birkdale.

It is noteworthy that the area in question only represents the voting interests of 5 resident citizens (and their family owned Howeston Golf Course) which is located in Birkdale and their association with Capalaba appears to be erroneous and inaccurate.

It is odd and somewhat fascinating that this area was included as part of Capalaba in the last electoral boundary review process.

Thank you Councillor Elliott for your considered analysis of matters, particularly in regards to the proposal for boundary realignment between Divisions 8, 9 & 10.

I offer my full support for these proposed changes.

Paul Bishop

Councillor Division 10 (Birkdale/Thorneside)

Redland City Council

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Supporting Local Community Action

Local Councillor Updates on Facebook:

<https://www.facebook.com/CrPaulBishop>

On 9 May 2019, at 4:01 pm, Cr Murray Elliott wrote:

Dear Electoral Commissioner ,

With regard to the invitation for written suggestions for divisional boundary review in Redland City Council I wish to submit my recommendations :

Division 1 Add 3100804 from Division 8 .

As the population increases this is a logical progression as the division moves south.

Division 2 Add 3100706 , 3100705 , 3100709 and 3100719 from Division 3. Subtract 31100714 , 3110713 and 3110729 and add to Division 7 .

As the population increases this is a logical progression as the division moves south.

Division 3 Subtract 3100706 , 3100705 , 3100709 and 3100710 to Division 2 .

As the population increases this is a logical progression as the division moves south.

Division 4 No change

Division 5 No change

Division 6 Subtract 3101107 , 3101106 , 3101105 , 3101112 , 3101202 , 3101234 , 3101108 , 3101109 , 3101103 and 3101102 and add to Division 9 .

This division is where the population is increasing significantly in the coming years. Positioning of the division in the lower percentile allows that increase to be addressed.

Division 7 Add 31100714 , 3100713 , and 3100729 from Division 2 .

To address the population as it increases this division needs to progressively realign itself to address this. The expansion to the east has its eastern boundary of Wellington street in Cleveland and also aligns with the existing south eastern boundary of the division.

Division 8 Add 3100407, 3100408 , 3100409 , 3100410 from Division 9 . Subtract 3100804 and add to Division 1. Subtract 3100324 and 3100325 and add to Division 10.

As population increases this division and needs to realign itself for the future shift south . The progression to the west facilitates this at this point in time.

Division 9 Add 31011107 , 3101106 , 3100105 , 3101112 , 3101202 , 3101234 , 3101108 , 3101109 , 3101103 and 3101102 from Division 6 . Subtract 3100407 , 3100408 , 3100409 and 3100410 and add to division 8. Subtract 3100326 and add to Division 10.

As population increases this division needs to move south and realign itself significantly to address the population increases in Division 6.

Division 10 Add 3100324 and 3100325 from Division 8 and add 3100326 from Division 9.

As the population increases this is a logical progression as the division moves south. It also resets the southern boundary to before the last redistribution.

<20190509155819385.pdf>

--

DISCLAIMER:

This email is intended for the named recipients only. Information in this email and any attachments may be confidential, privileged or subject to copyright. Any reproduction, disclosure, distribution, or other dissemination is strictly prohibited. Use of this email, or any reliance on the information contained in it or its attachments, other than by the addressee, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies of the message and attachments. Neither Redland City Council nor the sender warrant that this email does not contain any viruses or other unsolicited items.

Please consider the environment before you print this e-mail or any attachments.

Sent: Thursday, 16 May 2019 11:40 AM
To: LG CC Submissions
Cc: Division 4 Support
Subject: Division 4

Dear Electoral Commissioner,

I write in regards to the divisional boundary review of the Redland City Council electoral area, Division 4.

I request that no change be made to the current boundaries as the division is currently within quota, however in the short to medium term, in fill development and green field development in the south western part of the division between Clay Gully Road and Brendan Way which see population growth increase in line with growth in other divisions across the City. Additionally, from a community representative point of view, the division encompasses most the suburb of Victoria Point and all of Coochiemudlo Island which simplifies resident's understanding of who their Councillor is. Representing an Island community also has its challenges, so to add to the current population of the Division would be difficult to manage efficiently and effectively. Thank you for your consideration.

Kind Regards,

Cr Lance Hewlett

Deputy Mayor

Division 4 | Victoria Point | Redland Bay | Coochiemudlo Island
Redland City Council

P [REDACTED]
M [REDACTED]
W [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]



Redlands
c o a s t

I acknowledge the traditional custodians of the
lands and seas where I work. I pay my respects
to Elders, past, present and future.

Mrs Lynn Weston



17th May 2019

Electoral Commission of Queensland
Level 20, 1 Eagle Street
BRISBANE QLD 4001

RE: Divisional Boundary Review – Redland City

Dear Sir,


Having read in the local Redland City Bulletin, inviting citizens to have their say in regards to any changes to Council Divisional Boundaries, I have look at the current boundaries between Division 9 and 10.

The suggestion I wish to put forward as part of Creek Road Division 10. It seems to me that all of creek road should be of that division. Having looked at the map and taking in the fact that there is only 3 people residing here. The added 3 people would not change the number to the extreme.

Once again looking at the map it seems that our property should be in Division 10 and maybe the boundary should extend to creek off Daveson Road along Old Cleveland Road East.

Please Sir, will you consider this when making your views.

Yours faithfully,



Mrs Lynn Weston

Mr William Weston

17TH May 2019

Electoral Commission of Queensland
Level 20, 1 Eagle Street
BRISBANE QLD 4001

RE: Divisional Boundary Review – Redland City

Dear Sir,

The Howeston Golf Course is in Division 9.

The top of Creek Road is in Division 10.

Our family has been residents at [REDACTED] since 1953. We have property at [REDACTED] We also have business interest [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and also a grandson living in [REDACTED] In earlier times we were aligned with Division 10.

Tingalpa Creek is our boundary and as it runs to the Bay it seems better to align in the Bayside area.

Voter wise it would only number 3 extra voters.

It has been asked to make submissions,

We ask you to include us in Division 10.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Mr William Weston

Sent: Monday, 20 May 2019 12:41 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Boundary change Commonwealth land from Birkdale to Capalaba

Following is my submission on the subject land, requesting boundary change be changed back to where it always has been: Division 10, under Cr Paul Bishop's representation at present time.

[REDACTED]

I've lived adjacent to the Commonwealth land since mid-1986, seeing intensive growth as of 1987 in the area and resulting road traffic gridlock we see here today. Councillors who offered reasons to transfer the above land from Div 10 to 9, who don't live anywhere near Capalaba or Birkdale, apart from Div 9 Cr Gleeson, are:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

By Electoral Commission having approved transfer of FIVE citizens from Div 10 to 9, proves a problem in the office as no one, *repeat, no one with common sense, would have allowed it.*

Please rightly restore boundary back to Div 10, ASAP.

Sincerely,

Amy E Glade

From: adelia.berridge
To: [LG CC Submissions](#)
Subject: Fwd: Submission on RCC electoral boundaries
Date: Monday, 20 May 2019 2:11:43 PM

Please accept my email as my submissions re electoral boundary changes in Redland City which dur by 5pm today.

-

Birkdale Progress Association is requesting the boundary between Division 9 and Division 10 to be returned to how it used to be and we support this.

Restoring the area from Jones Rd north back to Division 10 is very important as It was moved in 2015 to Division 9, by some councillors and individuals prior to the last local government election and only affected 5 people. We have never undetstood why the councillor pushed to have voting properties moved, as made little to no difference to the quota's

Adelia and David Berridge

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, 19 May 2019 4:13 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Submission to the Redland City Local Government Area Divisional Boundary Review 2019
Attachments: Attachment to online Submission 19052019.JPG

Submission from C Wigan [REDACTED]


My submission seeks to address the over-quota situation of Division 6 in Redland City. This involves reducing the area of Division 6 initially by implementing Part 1 (below) and if that is insufficient to correct the over-quota to then further reduce the area of Division 6 by Part 2 below.

Part 1

Extend Division 9 to the south into the current division 6. As a result Division 6's western boundary would become Mount Cotton Road (in Sheldon/Mt. Cotton). - Please see attachment to this submission

Part 2

Extend Division 4 to the south and west into the current division 6. As a result the new division 4 southern boundary becomes Double Jump Road as far as its intersection with Bunker Road. Thereafter its boundary travels to the north east for a short distance along Bunker Road and then north along Kingfisher Road until intersecting with Eprapah Creek.



Sent: Monday, 20 May 2019 2:04 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: (78792) Redland City Local Government Area - Ross Spence

Online submission for **Redland City Local Government Area** from **Ross Spence**

Submission Details

Name: Ross Spence

Submission Text: I request that the boundary between Division 9 and Division 10 in Redland City be returned to where it used to be before the last fiddle was made in 2015. That is, restoring the area from Jones Rd north back to Division 10. Its move in 2015 to Division 9, was sponsored by several councillors and individuals in time for the last local government election. The change affected only 5 properties and was clearly not made to re-balance voting numbers. Division 10 always had an historical attachment to the properties north of Jones Rd, and they are in keeping with adjacent non-urban properties in Division 10. The original boundary was a logical boundary between urban and non-urban. That demarcation was blurred in the 2015 change. I strongly urge that the boundary between Division 9 and Division 10 in be returned to Jones Rd, where it used to be before the 2015 redistribution.

File Upload: No file uploaded ()



Our Ref: 18/1905

Redlands2030 published an article 2 May 2019 (<https://redlands2030.net/electoral-redistribution-redlands-2020/>) to prompt members of the Redlands community to engage in the electoral redistribution for Redland City's ten divisions.

We identified that boundary changes are needed because divisions 3 and 6 currently have too many voters. The Local Government Electoral Act requires that Redland City's electoral divisions have no more than a 10% variation from the average number of voters in a division. Division 3 has 11.6% more than the average and Division 6 has 14.12% above the average.

Details of current and projected voter numbers for all ten divisions are shown:

Number of voters in Redland City divisions

Council Electoral Division	Number of voters in 2019	Number above/below average	% Deviation from average in 2019	% Deviation from average by 2024
1	10,590	-251	-2.31%	-2.81%
2	10,408	-433	-3.99%	-0.12%
3	12,098	+1,257	+11.60%	+11.97%
4	10,793	-48	-0.44%	-1.48%
5	11,164	+323	+2.98%	+9.87%
6	12,371	+1,530	+14.12%	+15.24%
7	10,336	-505	-4.66%	-7.76%
8	13,313	-528	-4.87%	-7.92%
9	10,103	-739	-6.81%	-9.50%
10	10,232	-609	-5.61%	-7.49%
Total	108,407			
Average	10,841			

Electoral redistribution process

The **electoral redistribution process** managed by the **Change Commission** involves the following steps:

- Submissions invited from the public,
- Change Commission proposes new electoral boundaries
- Submissions invited from the public on the Change Commission's proposal
- Change Commission publishes its final determination

The 2015 electoral redistribution was very interesting

Howeston Golf Course – moved from Division 10 to Division 9 during the last electoral redistribution. Sadly, it seems the electoral redistribution before the 2016

local government elections showed that a small number of people making submissions can very effectively influence decisions by the Change Commission.

In 2015 a handful of councillors, a couple of their relatives and a few people connected with the LNP made remarkably similar submissions that Howeston Golf Course, the Birkdale Commonwealth lands and just five voters should be moved from Division 10 to Division 9. This was discussed in some detail by Redlands2030 in our March 2016 post ie [A murky tale about land development and electoral redistribution in Redland City](#). The process of redistribution has a shadow of doubt over it given the minimal number of voters (5) involved in this change but there were (and still are) speculations about the use of the affected land which the Divisional Councillor would be a party to but not all Councillors. Although those arrangements have changed it is not certain those arrangements could not re-emerge. The redistribution process should not have been used for those outcomes.


Submission to the 2019 redistribution

Suggested 2019 electoral redistribution

The proposed boundaries of the Redland City were prepared having regard to the views of our members and supporters who showed interest in the detail of the re-distribution and criteria of:

- **Communities of interest –**
- **Means of communication and serviceability**
- **Creating sensible and definable boundaries.**
- **Specific enrolment requirements for Divisional Boundary Reviews.**

Our suggested re-distribution is shown in the diagram marked Attachment C



Summary of proposed changes and enrolments


The numerical redistribution suggested for Redland City Council is shown below.

The goal being minimal disruption to existing communities of interest


And even re-establishing some recent break down to a number of long established community of interest. Overall, we think the approach and the recommendations are self evident.

Играчи и


Mapped suggested changes Division 1




Mapped suggested changes Division 2



Mapped suggested changes Division 3



Mapped suggested changes Division 4



[illegible][illegible]

[illegible]

2018 Local Government Areas
City of San Antonio
 10/1/2017

Division 1
 10111 10617
 EXTENDING 10113 10617
 EXTENSION 4.0% - 7.5%

Division 2
 10111 10617
 EXTENDING 10113 10617
 EXTENSION 4.0% - 7.5%

Division 3
 10111 10617
 EXTENDING 10113 10617
 EXTENSION 4.0% - 7.5%

Division 4
 10111 10617
 EXTENDING 10113 10617
 EXTENSION 4.0% - 7.5%


Division 5
 10111 10617
 EXTENDING 10113 10617
 EXTENSION 4.0% - 7.5%

LEGEND
 10111 10617
 EXTENDING 10113 10617
 EXTENSION 4.0% - 7.5%


Scale
 0 10 Miles

North Arrow

Mapped suggested changes Division 9



Mapped suggested changes Division 10



This submission is made by Redlands2030 Incorporated in the interests of a more balanced the elector distribution among the ten divisions of Redland city and having regard to established units that share a community of interest.

We are happy to discuss any aspect of this submission'

Regards

Steve MacDonald

President
Redlands2030 Inc



Sent: Monday, 20 May 2019 4:51 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Electoral Boundary change for Redland City

I wish to submit my request that the boundary between Division 10 and Division 9 be restored to how it used to be before it was changed last time, in 2015.

In 2015, before the local government election of 2016 the boundary between Division 10 and Division 9 was moved. Previously, the land north of Jones Road which included the Birkdale Commonwealth land, the Howeston Golf Club, the Baptist Church and the old Willard house resided in Division 10. Only 5 people were affected. In 2015 all of this land and the 5 people were suddenly in Division 9. This smacked of a political manoeuvre by some individuals.

I request that this boundary reverts to how it used to be so that the land and 5 people north of Jones Road reside, once again, in Division 10. Most of Birkdale resides in Division 10 and I wish to have this boundary change restored.

Regards,

Pam Spence



Sent: Saturday, 18 May 2019 11:43 AM
To: LG CC Submissions
Cc: Cr Wendy Boglary
Subject: Electoral boundary submission 2019
Attachments: Electoral boundary submission 2019.docx

Dear Electoral Commissioner,

With regard to the invitation for a written suggestions for the Redland City Council Divisional Boundary review I submit my recommendations as per attached maps.

Division 1 changes

Division 1's western boundary remain the same. To accommodate extra growth the area as per map 3100804 and 3100813 be realigned within Division 1 from Division 8. These areas were changed at the last boundary review however that area is within Ormiston and there is a natural geographical creek boundary from Division 8 on the south western side. This would allow Ormiston to as a suburb to more totally included within one Division and reduce current confusion while accommodating the correct population ratios required.

Division 10 changes

Areas 3100326 and 3100407 to be realigned back into Division 10 as was they were previously to the last boundary change. The reasons for the change last time require verification as based on population there was no justification and I would suggest these areas be placed back into division 10.

I thank you for the opportunity to have local Councillor input into proposed boundary changes,

**Warm regards,
Cr Wendy Boglary**

Division 1 – Wellington Point and Ormiston

Redland City Council

P [REDACTED]

M [REDACTED]

Local Councillor Updates on Facebook:

An independent community voice

Keeping Redlands Redlands



I acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands and seas where I work. I pay my respects to Elders, past, present and future.



Areas from Division 9 to Division 10

3100326	4
3100407	263

These areas were historically within the boundaries of division 10. At the last boundary change in the second round when told there would be no major changes these areas were changes due to minimal email submissions. These changes electoral boundary changes should be based on population ratios required to ensure equal numbers per division. Based on this and that I strongly disagree with the previous process involved with this change I recommend these areas are realigned back to Division 10. Perhaps the previous reasons could be investigated for validity of reason for the change and this could assist in the decision with this realignment.

REDLAND CITY COUNCIL

DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW

SUBMISSION

As at January 2019, enrolments in two electoral divisions within Redland City fell outside of the allowable 10% tolerance of the quota. This has triggered a review process which will lead to the determination of revised divisional boundaries by the Change Commission. This submission is made in response to the Change Commission's invitation of 27 April 2019.

OVERVIEW

Over the last decade residential development patterns in Redland City have resulted in the "centre of gravity" of the population continuously drifting towards the south eastern areas of the City. This trend would be expected to continue with the adoption of City Plan 2018 which opens up further land for greenfield residential development in the southern areas of the City and with limited scope for further larger scale residential development in the northern areas

Consequently this drift has created some of the existing and projected enrolment disparities between divisions for which boundaries were fixed about 4 years ago prior to the 2016 Local Government Elections. It was the Commission's stated endeavour that the 2015 divisional boundary review would devise boundaries that *"not only meet the (then) current quota requirements but are sustainable for at least two quadrennial elections and are in the public interest"*. While the 2019 enrolment projections made at the time have turned out to be remarkably reliable for most Divisions, the growth in Divisions 3, 5 & 6 all located towards the southern eastern region of the City was significantly underestimated.

The effects of the above observations are illustrated in Attachments A & B which show the enrolment deviations from quota as at January 2019 & also on projected March 2024 enrolments. Taking a broad view, the existing northernmost divisions (1,2,7,8, 9 & 10) are currently in enrolment deficit of about 3100 in aggregate. Based on the Commission's projections this deficit would increase to about 4100 by March 2024. There is obviously a corresponding aggregate enrolment quota excess in the southern divisions (3,4,5 & 6).

While the 2015 review was also triggered by enrolments in just two divisions falling outside of the quota +or- 10% band, the Commission undertook a holistic review of all the City's divisional boundaries resulting in a determination where enrolments for every division fell approximately within the band of quota +or- 5%. For the current review it is presumed that the Commission will follow this precedent rather than just "tweak" the boundaries immediately around the two divisions with excess enrolments so they fall within the 10% tolerance allowable. eg the transfer of SA1's 3101222, 3101214 & 3101215 from Div 3 to Div 7 and DA1's 3101106, 3101107 & 3101108 from Div 6 to Div 9 alone would just about result in all divisional enrolments falling within the acceptable band of quota +or- 10%.

The following is a proposal to redraft the divisional boundaries holistically, without wholesale changes, to achieve enrolment quota parity between Divisions within the regulatory framework enunciated by the Commission while at the same time recognising and endeavouring to maintain or enhance communities of common interest. By necessity there will be consequential "shunting" or "ripple" effects to the addressed. Divisions 7 and 8 which have no external boundaries will be the most affected with Divisions 3, 6 and 9 also significantly affected.

METHODOLOGY & PRESENTATION OF PROPOSALS

Each of the Divisions has been considered both individually and, where they interface, with adjoining divisions

The current ECQ divisional Maps have been used as base plans to graphically illustrate the proposed changes. Areas proposed for transfer to or from each Division correspond to aggregated SA1's and have been coded alphabetically and highlighted by colour depending on the movement into, or out, of a Division. A table of the enrolment statistics including proposed transfers is included as an inset within each divisional Map.

Attachment C depicts an overall view of the proposed new divisional boundaries superimposed on the Citywide map of current Divisions published by the Commission.

Attachment D is a tabulation of the alphabetically coded areas of aggregated SA1 designations and corresponding enrolment numbers.

Attachment E is a summary table of proposed enrolment numbers for transfer between divisions and the resultant enrolments.

COMMENTARY ON PROPOSED CHANGES IN EACH DIVISION

The following is an outline of the rationale behind the proposed changes to the boundaries of each Division.

Division 1:- The proposal is to transfer Area "A" to Div 8 and Area "I" from Div 8 to Div 1 resulting in enrolments in both divisions practically on quota.

There is a strong community common interest to support the inclusion of the area between the Cleveland Railway line & Hilliards Creek within Div 1. The proposed transfer of Area "I" would move the eastern boundary with Div 8 from the Cleveland Railway Line westwards to Hilliards Creek. With no internal crossings, Hilliards Creek acts as a significant barrier to east-west connectivity. In contrast there is reasonable connectivity between both sides of the railway by way of two internal grade separations on internal roads. Inter alia, this transfer would result in the retention of all of the Ormiston suburb within Div 1 including Ormiston College and the Hilliards Creek and Fellmonger Parks which contain significant sporting facilities.

Area "A", proposed to be transferred from Div 1 to Div 8, has direct connectivity to the south with the main areas of Div 8.

The proposed transfers effectively reverse the 2015 changes made by the Commission as part of its Final Determination. The 2015 changes were not included in the Commission's original proposals and as such were not subject to public review and submissions. The proposed changes would return the divisional boundaries to close to the historical boundaries for the north eastern area of the City.

Division 2:- The enrolment numbers fall well within the allowable range and the existing boundaries reasonably contain the areas of common interest. Accordingly no change is proposed.

Division 3:- This division has experienced relatively high residential growth since 2015 and current & projected enrolments exceed the allowable numbers. In conjunction the need to increase the enrolments in neighbouring Div 7 will need to be considered in determining new boundaries.

The proposal is to transfer Area "B" into Div 7, partially offset by the transfer of Area "D" to Div 7, resulting in a net reduction in enrolment and current & projected enrolments close to quota.

There are some consequential changes to the community of common interest in that both the Thornlands & Bayview State Schools would both lie just within Div 7, albeit on the border with Div 3.

Division 4:- While both existing & forecast enrolments fall well within allowable limits, as a contribution to the overall divisional balance in the City and to contain all of the Victoria Point Major Centre and immediately adjoining residential areas within a single division, the proposal is to transfer Area "E" from Div 6 into Div 4.

Division 5:- Under the existing boundaries the current enrolments lie comfortably within the allowable limits. However the projected 2024 enrolment almost exceeds the upper tolerance limit. In order to comfortably maintain future enrolments within tolerance, a relatively moderate transfer of Area "C" to Div 6 is proposed.

Division 6:- Both the existing and forecast enrolments significantly exceed the upper tolerance limits, even more so with the proposed transfer of Area "C" from Div 5.

Areas "D", "E" and "F" have been selected for transfers to other Divisions in order to achieve enrolment parity at the same time as maintaining communities of interest in this largest in area and most diverse mainland division. In addition, Div 6 includes the largest proportion of greenfield areas currently designated for residential development in the City with the propensity to increase enrolments sooner than forecast. Accordingly, to compensate the changes proposed would result in enrolments somewhat less than the quotas but still within tolerance.

The Commission, in its final determination of the 2015 review, accepted a submission to include at least part of the Victoria Point Centre within Div 6 on the basis that it was *"the only commercial, retail and employment hub within the area and an area which is central to the community"*. This proposition flies in the face of

reality - the following centres and major employment facilities lie within the current and proposed Div 6 boundaries:-

Mt Cotton Local Centre
Red Edge School of Arts Road, Redland Bay Neighbourhood Centre
Donald Road, Redland Bay Neighbourhood Centre
Redland Business Park, Redland Bay
Sirromet Winery, Mount Cotton
Darwalla Group Chicken Processing Plant, Mount Cotton
Karreman's Quarry, Sheldon.

It is further suggested that if the 2015 rationale were to be accepted and retained it would consequentially require wholesale divisional boundary changes and disruption of communities of interest in neighbouring divisions in order to achieve enrolment parity.

It is noted that this proposal intends that only the part of SA1 3101306 located north of Bunker Road is included in Area "D" for transfer to Div 3. (It was belatedly discovered that SA1 3101306 appears to extend to the south of Bunker Road as well). Accordingly the enrolments reported in the Commission's information for SA1 3101306 within the existing Div 6 boundaries would need to be split - as a first estimate as follows:-

	January 2019	March 2024
North of Bunker Road	300	450
South of Bunker Road	122	170

A corresponding adjustment to the enrolments within the proposed changed boundaries for Div 3 and Div 6 would have no material effect.

It is further noted that:-

- It appears that SA1 3101306 has already been split on the common boundary between Div 4 & Div 7.
- In the event that current applications for residential development within SA1 3101306 were all approved and constructed, the Commission's enrolment projections for 2024 may be significantly underestimated for this area.

Division 7:- The proposal is to transfer Area "G" to Div 8 in order to increase enrolments in that division; also Area "H" to Div 9 which will move the divisional boundary to coincide with the suburban boundary between Capalaba & Alexandra Hills along the major Redland Bay Road. These losses and existing quota shortfalls would be offset by a significant expansion into Div 3 east of Panorama Drive (Area "B").

The proposed changes would result in the transfer out of Div7 of the Vienna Woods State School and the Redlands IndigiScapes Centre while the Thornlands & Bayview State Schools would transfer into Div 7, albeit on the border with Div 3.

Division 8:- The proposal is to transfer Area "J" into Div 10 to increase the enrolments in that division and Area "I" into Div 1 – see the Division 1 commentary

for the rationale. These losses and existing quota shortfalls would be offset by the expansion into Div 7 (Area "G") and into Div 9 (Area "K")

Division 9:- The proposal is to transfer Area "K" to Div 8 to increase the enrolments in that division and to Transfer Area "L" (with just 6 enrolments) to Div 10 on the grounds of strong community common interest considerations.

Area "L" contains the Howeston Golf Course in Birkdale (established in 1972) and the Birkdale "Commonwealth Lands", a large tract of historically and environmentally significant undeveloped land which has very recently been purchased by Redland City from the Australian Government after more than a decade of dialogue between the two authorities. Both of the properties have traditionally been considered as part of the fabric of suburban Birkdale and have been continuously included within Division 10.

This proposed transfer would effectively reverse the 2015 change made by the Commission as part of its Final Determination in response to what appears to have been the orchestrated lodgement of submissions from a bloc of Councillors who held the majority of votes in Council in concert with some State political party operatives and their associates. The reason proffered for the change was that it *"will deliver and more natural and identifiable boundary of community open space"* and *"this open space area naturally extends naturally extends south into community open space currently in Division 9."* This rationale is a "furphy". An analysis of the circumstances surrounding those submissions is described in the attached copy of a paper prepared by others – Attachment F.. The 2015 change was not included in the Commission's original proposals and as such were not subject to public review and submissions.

To increase the enrolment in Div 9 to achieve parity, the proposal is to transfer :-


- Area "H" from Div 7. This area lies entirely within the suburb of Capalaba and results in a very well delineated boundary between Div 7 & Div 9 along Redland Bay Road, a major arterial road, and
- Area "F" from Div 6. This area is a natural extension southwards from the existing southern boundary of Div 9 formed by Mount Cotton and Boundary Roads into the suburb of Sheldon. It takes in lands serviced by Avalon Road. The Capalaba Centre on which Div 9 is based is the closest and most convenient centre that services this area.

Division 10:- The proposal to increase the enrolment in Div 10 to parity, is to transfer Area "A" from Div 8 into Div 10. Also for the rationale described in the Division 9 commentary above, it is proposed to also transfer area "L" from Div 9 into Div 10.

2019
Local Government Area
Review
REDLAND CITY
DIVISION 1
Current Division and SA1
Boundaries



DIVISION 1
Locality Map





LEGEND



DISCLAIMER

Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) data used during compilation sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
SA1s are spatial units defined in the 2016 ASGS Australian Statistical Geography Standard.
© The State of Queensland - 2019
(Government of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)
© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019





2019 Local Government Area Review

REDLAND CITY DIVISION 2

Current Division and SA1 Boundaries



DIVISION 2 Locality Map




LEGEND

- Division Boundary
- Suburb Boundary
- SA1 Boundary
- Adjacent Division
- Adjacent Council
- Reserve, Parkland
- Waterbody
- Railway
- Main Road
- Wetland

DISCLAIMER

Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) data used during compilation sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. SA1s are spatial units defined in the 2016 Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS).

© The State of Queensland - 2019. (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)
© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019



2019	
Local Government Area	
Review	
REDLAND CITY	
DIVISION 3	
Current Division and SA1	
Boundaries	
=====	
DIVISION 3	<ENROLMENT->
SA1	31/01/19 31/03/24
EXISTING	12098
DEVIATION	11.6%
12976	12.0%
LESS AREA "B" TO DIV 7	
3101210	-400
3101213	-398
3101214	-239
3101215	-193
3101216	-183
3101218	-184
3101219	-306
3101222	-205
3101227	-202
3101228	-265
3101229	-302
-2877	-2959
PLUS AREA "D" FROM DIV 6	
3101306	422
3101234	92
3101202	282
3101318	374
3101322	351
1521	1752
PROPOSED 10742 11769	
DEVIATION -0.9% 1.6%	


DISCLAIMER

Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) data used during compilation sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
SA1s are spatial units defined in the 2016 ASGS (Australian Statistical Geography Standard).
© The State of Queensland - 2019
(Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)
© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019

2019
Local Government Area
Review
REDLAND CITY
DIVISION 4
Current Division and SA1
Boundaries



DIVISION 4
Locality Map



DIVISION 4 <-ENROLMENT->
SA1 31/01/19 31/03/24

EXISTING 10793 11417
DEVIATION -0.4% -1.5%

PLUS AREA "E" FROM DM6
3101303 280 299

280 299

PROPOSED 11073 11716
DEVIATION 2.1% 1.1%

DISCLAIMER

Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) data used during compilation sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

SA1s are spatial units defined in the 2016 ASGS (Australian Statistical Geography Standard).

The State of Queensland, 2019
Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy

© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019

DIVISION 2


DIVISION 3



DIVISION 5

DIVISION 6





2019 Local Government Area Review

REDLAND CITY DIVISION 5

Current Division and SA1 Boundaries



DIVISION 5 Locality Map




LEGEND

- Division Boundary
- Suburb Boundary
- SA1 Boundary
- Adjacent Division
- Adjacent Council
- Reserve, Parkland
- Waterbody
- Railway
- Main Road
- Wetland

DISCLAIMER

Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) data used during compilation sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. SA1s are spatial units defined in the 2016 Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS).

© The State of Queensland - 2019 (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)
© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019



DIVISION 6 <-ENROLMENT->
SA1 31/01/19 31/03/24

EXISTING	12371	13355
DEVIATION	14.1%	15.2%

LESS AREA "D" TO DIV 3		
3101202	-282	-286
3101234	-92	-101
3101306	-422	-620
3101318	-374	-386
3101322	-351	-359
	-1521	-1752

LESS AREA "E" TO DIV 4		
3101303	-280	-299
	-280	-299

LESS AREA "F" TO DIV 9		
3101105	-203	-211
3101106	-149	-152
3101107	-331	-337
3101108	-262	-268
3101112	-161	-163
	-1106	-1131

PLUS AREA "C" FROM DIV 5		
3100908	330	397
3100922	400	412
	780	809

PROPOSED	10244	10982
DEVIATION	-5.5%	-5.2%

2019 Local Government
REDLAND C DIVISION
Current Division and S
ECC
ELECTORAL COMMISSION
QUEENSLAND

LEGEND

- Division Boundary
- Suburb Boundary
- SA1 Boundary
- Adjacent Division
- Adjacent Council
- Reserve, Parkland
- Waterbody
- Railway
- Main Road
- Wetland

DISCLAIMER
Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) data used during compilation sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. SA1s are spatial units defined in the 2016 Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS).
© The State of Queensland - 2019 (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)
© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019

2019

Local Government Area
Review
REDLAND CITY
DIVISION 7

Cur DIVISION 7 <-ENROLMENT-->
SA1 31/01/19 31/03/24

EXISTING 10336 10690
DEVIATION -4.7% -7.8%

LESS AREA "G" TO DIV 8

3100105	-140	-136
3100130	-387	-382
3100131	-311	-303
3100132	-126	-123
3100133	-305	-298

DIV:
Local



LESS AREA "J" TO DIV 9

3100401	-302	-305
3100402	-397	-399
3100411	-167	-168

-866 -872

PLUS AREA "B" FROM DIV 3


3101210	400	413
3101213	398	414
3101214	239	244
3101215	193	198
3101216	183	189
3101218	184	190
3101219	306	314
3101222	205	212
3101227	202	205
3101228	265	271
3101229	302	309

2877 2959

PROPOSED 11078 11535
DEVIATION 2.2% -0.5%

DISCLAIMER
Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) data used during compilation sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

SA1s are spatial units defined in the 2016 ASGS (Australian Statistical Geography Standard).
© The State of Queensland - 2019
Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy
Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019



2019

Local Government Area

Review

DIVISION 8 <-ENROLMENT->
SA1 31/01/19 31/03/24

EXISTING 10313 10671
DEVIATION -4.9% -7.9%

LESS AREA "I" TO DIV 1

3100804 -357 -394
3100805 -459 -485
3100808 -494 -518
3100813 -255 -255

-1565 -1652

LESS AREA "J" TO DIV 10

3100312 -177 -180
3100313 -319 -332
3100316 -193 -200
3100324 -33 -34
3100325 -334 -341

-1056 -1087

PLUS AREA "A" FROM DIV 1

3100324 355 366
3100602 141 143
3100619 487 530
3100620 295 301

1278 1340

LE PLUS AREA "G" FROM DIV 7

3100105 140 136
3100130 387 382
3100131 311 303
3100132 126 123
3100133 305 298

1268 1242

PLUS AREA "K" FROM DIV 9


3100408 335 347
3100409 380 407
3100410 275 289


990 1043

PROPOSED 11229 11557
DEVIATION 3.6% -0.3%

Sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

SA1 are statistical units defined in the 2016 ASGS (Australian Statistical Geography Standard)
© The State of Queensland - 2019
Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy
© Electoral Commission Queensland 2019





DIVISION 9 <-ENROLMENT->
SA1 31/01/19 31/03/24

EXISTING 10102 10488
DEVIATION -6.8% -9.5%

LESS AREA "K" TO DIV 8
3100408 -335 -347
3100409 -380 -407
3100410 -275 -289

-990 -1043
LESS AREA "L" TO DIV 10
3100437 -6 -6

PLUS AREA "F" FROM DIV 6
3101105 203 211
3101106 149 152
3101107 331 337
3101108 262 268
3101112 161 163


1106 1131
PLUS AREA "H" FROM DIV 7
3100401 302 305
3100402 397 399
3100411 167 168
866 872

PROPOSED 11078 11442
DEVIATION 2.2% -1.3%



2019 Local Government Area Review
REDLAND CITY
DIVISION 9
Current Division and SA1 Boundaries


ECCQ
ELECTORAL COMMISSION
QUEENSLAND



- LEGEND**
- Division Boundary
 - Suburb Boundary
 - SA1 Boundary
 - Adjacent Division
 - Adjacent Council
 - Reserve, Parkland
 - Waterbody
 - Railway
 - Main Road
 - Wetland

DISCLAIMER
Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) data used during compilation sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. SA1s are spatial units defined in the 2016 Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS).
© The State of Queensland - 2019 (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)
© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019

DIV 9



2019 Local Government Area Review

REDLAND CITY DIVISION 10

Current Division and SA1 Boundaries



DIVISION 10 Locality Map



PROPOSED
DEVIATION 4.2% 1.9%

PLUS AREA "L" FROM DIV 9
3100437 6 6

PLUS AREA "J" FROM DIV 8
1053 1087

PLUS AREA "J" FROM DIV 8
3100312 177 180
3100313 319 332
3100316 193 200
3100324 33 34
3100325 34 341

- Reserve, Parkland
- Waterbody
- Railway
- Main Road
- Wetland


Information sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics 2016 Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS) (Australian Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)

JAN 19 ENROLMENT

Current Redland City Divisions

DEVIATION OF CURRENT BOUNDARIES

Attachment 1




Current Redland City Divisions

MAR 24 ESTIMATED ENROLMENT


DEVIATIONS (CURRENT BOUNDARIES)

Attachment B



Current Redland City Divisions WITH PROPOSED BOUNDARIES SUPERIMPOSED


Attachment C



May 15, 2019

Current_Divisions_region

1:144,448



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

REDLAND CITY COUNCIL - DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGE AREAS FROM SA1 ENROLMENT DATA

NOMINATED TRANSFER AREAS

Division	SA1	Enrolment at 31 Jan 2019	Enrolment at 31 Mar 2024
----------	-----	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

AREA "A" (TRANSFER DIV 1 TO DIV 8)

Division 1	3100324	-355	-366
Division 1	3100602	-141	-143
Division 1	3100619	-487	-530
Division 1	3100620	-295	-301
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-1278	-1340

AREA "B" (TRANSFER DIV 3 TO DIV 7)

Division 3	3101210	-400	-413
Division 3	3101213	-398	-414
Division 3	3101214	-239	-244
Division 3	3101215	-193	-198
Division 3	3101216	-183	-189
Division 3	3101218	-184	-190
Division 3	3101219	-306	-314
Division 3	3101222	-205	-212
Division 3	3101227	-202	-205
Division 3	3101228	-265	-271
Division 3	3101229	-302	-309
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-2877	-2959

AREA "C" (TRANSFER DIV 5 TO DIV 6)

Division 5	3100908	-380	-397
Division 5	3100922	-400	-412
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-780	-809

AREA "D" (TRANSFER DIV 6 TO DIV 3)

Division 6	3101202	-282	-286
Division 6	3101234	-92	-101
Division 6	3101306	-422	-620
Division 6	3101318	-374	-386
Division 6	3101322	-351	-359
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-1521	-1752

AREA "E" (TRANSFER DIV 6 TO DIV 4)

Division 6	3101303	-280	-299
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-280	-299

AREA "F" (TRANSFER DIV 6 TO DIV 9)

Division 6	3101105	-203	-211
Division 6	3101106	-149	-152
Division 6	3101107	-331	-337
Division 6	3101108	-262	-268
Division 6	3101112	-161	-163
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-1106	-1131

::

NOMINATED TRANSFER AREAS

Division	SA1	Enrolment at 31 Jan 2019	Enrolment at 31 Mar 2024
----------	-----	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

AREA "G" (TRANSFER DIV 7 TO DIV 8)

Division 7	3100105	-140	-136
Division 7	3100130	-387	-382
Division 7	3100131	-311	-303
Division 7	3100132	-126	-123
Division 7	3100133	-305	-298
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-1269	-1242

AREA "H" (TRANSFER DIV 7 TO DIV 9)

Division 7	3100401	-302	-305
Division 7	3100402	-397	-399
Division 7	3100411	-167	-168
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-866	-872

AREA "I" (TRANSFER DIV 8 TO DIV 1)

Division 8	3100804	-357	-394
Division 8	3100805	-459	-485
Division 8	3100808	-494	-518
Division 8	3100813	-255	-255
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-1565	-1652

AREA "J" (TRANSFER DIV 8 TO DIV 10)

Division 8	3100312	-177	-180
Division 8	3100313	-319	-332
Division 8	3100316	-193	-200
Division 8	3100324	-33	-34
Division 8	3100325	-334	-341
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-1056	-1087

AREA "K" (TRANSFER DIV 9 TO DIV 8)

Division 9	3100408	-335	-347
Division 9	3100409	-380	-407
Division 9	3100410	-275	-289
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		-990	-1043

AREA "L" (TRANSFER DIV 9 TO DIV 10)

Division 9	3100437	-6	-6
------------	---------	----	----

REDLAND CITY COUNCIL - DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES & ENROLMENTS

	DIVISION										TOTAL QUOTA
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
ENROLMENT AS AT 31/01/2019 DEVIATION FROM QUOTA	10590	10408	12098	10793	11164	12371	10336	10313	10102	10232	108407
	-251	-433	1257	-48	323	1530	-505	-528	-739	-609	
	-2.3%	-4.0%	11.6%	-0.4%	3.0%	14.1%	-4.7%	-4.9%	-6.8%	-5.6%	
WITH PROPOSED CHANGES AREA "A" (DIV 1 TO DIV 8) AREA "B" (DIV 3 TO DIV 7) AREA "C" (DIV 5 TO DIV 6) AREA "D" (DIV 6 TO DIV 3) AREA "E" (DIV 6 TO DIV 4) AREA "F" (DIV 6 TO DIV 9) AREA "G" (DIV 7 TO DIV 8) AREA "H" (DIV 7 TO DIV 9) AREA "I" (DIV 8 TO DIV 1) AREA "J" (DIV 8 TO DIV 10) AREA "K" (DIV 9 TO DIV 8) AREA "L" (DIV 9 TO DIV 10)	-1278		-2877		-780	780	2877	1278			
			1521	280	-1521	-280	-1106		1106		
							-1269	1269			
							-866	866			
	1565						-1565				
							-1056			1056	
							990		-990		
									-6	6	
PROPOSED ENROLMENT DEVIATION FROM QUOTA	10877	10408	10742	11073	10384	10244	11078	11229	11078	11294	108407
	36	-433	-99	232	-457	-597	237	388	237	453	
	0.3%	-4.0%	-0.9%	2.1%	-4.2%	-5.5%	2.2%	3.6%	2.2%	4.2%	
FORECAST 2024 ENROLMENTS											
FORECAST ENROLMENT 31/03/2024 DEVIATION FROM QUOTA	11263	11575	12976	11417	12733	13355	10690	10671	10488	10721	115889
	-326	-14	1387	-172	1144	1766	-899	-918	-1101	-868	
	-2.8%	-0.1%	12.0%	-1.5%	9.9%	15.2%	-7.8%	-7.9%	-9.5%	-7.5%	
WITH PROPOSED CHANGES AREA "A" (DIV 1 TO DIV 8) AREA "B" (DIV 3 TO DIV 7) AREA "C" (DIV 5 TO DIV 6) AREA "D" (DIV 6 TO DIV 3) AREA "E" (DIV 6 TO DIV 4) AREA "F" (DIV 6 TO DIV 9) AREA "G" (DIV 7 TO DIV 8) AREA "H" (DIV 7 TO DIV 9) AREA "I" (DIV 8 TO DIV 1) AREA "J" (DIV 8 TO DIV 10) AREA "K" (DIV 9 TO DIV 8) AREA "L" (DIV 9 TO DIV 10)	-1340		-2959		-809	809	2959	1340			
			1752	299		-1752	-299				
						-1131			1131		
							-1242	1242			
							-872		872		
	1652							-1652			
							-1087			1087	
							1043		-1043		
									-6	6	
PROPOSED ENROLMENT DEVIATION FROM QUOTA	11575	11575	11769	11716	11924	10982	11535	11557	11442	11814	115889
	-14	-14	180	127	335	-607	-54	-32	-147	225	
	-0.1%	-0.1%	1.6%	1.1%	2.9%	-5.2%	-0.5%	-0.3%	-1.3%	1.9%	

Dear Change Commissioner,

I am the duly elected Councillor for Division 10 area of Redland City Council 2012-2020. I intend to recontest in the 2020 local government election, however my submission is made in the public interest, regardless of my future prospects.

Recommendations:

- A) Ensure that Division 10 has an equitable portion of voters in this election and to make sure that foreseeable trends for future changes are addressed as part of this review of jurisdictional boundaries and is based on electoral requirements, that are generally contained within the suburb and delineated by established and recognised geographic parameters.
- B) Conduct an investigation into the odd circumstances and the involvement of certain elected officials and their supporters making submissions that radically altered the [Final Determination Report 2015](#), which saw the portion of land known as 3100326, coming into the Division 9, outside of the broad community consultation process.
- c) Reinstate area 3100326, which is known as 'The Birkdale Lands', an area that has always been associated with Birkdale and which has a long standing historic connection with Division 10 area of Redland City Council.

A: Equity in Future Changes- Division 10 is generally within quota, however in order not to confuse electors with major changes, any proposed changes should align with natural boundaries, and historic association with Birkdale and Thorneside. Should changes be necessary to increase elector numbers, I believe consideration should appropriately be given to include the areas 3100316, 3100313, 3100312 and 3100325 which divide Division 8 and 10 of Redland City Council.

These seem to provide a natural line, extending along Old Cleveland Road East if required.

B: Past Decision called into question

Background

The Final Determination Report 2015 transferred a significant parcel of land in Birkdale (area 3100326) to Capalaba/Division 9.

(Point C) Relating to the historic association with Birkdale, I recommend that this area be returned to Division 10 as part of the current review and as shown in Image 1.

Image 1. Map from Final Determination Report 2015 shows 3100326 as part of Division 9.




Image 2 shows the historic area for Division 10 which has remained relatively consistent for decades, inclusive of the area north of Jones Road, known as 'The Birkdale Lands'. This map is the 2012-2016 Division 10 boundary, which appropriately contained this area for decades.

Image 2: Division 10 Map 2012-2016 – (Birkdale Lands Marked in Red as area 3100326)





Image 2 map shows that West of Jones Road, Tingalpa creek is the natural boundary. To the North is Birkdale. To the south, lies Capalaba. Old Cleveland Road East (to the east) is the other significant boundary. This area 3100326 should be returned to Division 10.

Image 3: The proposed map for Division 10 which went to community consultation.




When the map in image 3 (above) was taken to consultation, inclusive of Birkdale Lands, many residents found it odd that Wellington Point's isthmus was proposed to be included as part of Division 10. Most submitters naturally responded on this oddly strange proposal. The 2015 Final Determination Report Outcome responded to this aberration (as seen in image 4), to the North Division 10 remained located within the Birkdale suburban area, as a good response to the majority of submissions.

In reference to area 3100326, known as 'The Birkdale Lands', a small band of elected council representatives and people associated with prior staffers of a former elected state representative all seemed to have a different agenda.

Their focus was on the Birkdale Lands, which council was interested in acquiring at the time. I believe the change resulting from 10 submissions moving area 3100326 from Division 10 to Division 9 is an anomaly, that needs your attention and which should be reviewed.

Image 4 (below): The Final Determination Map for Division 10 retains Birkdale/Thorneside, but removes the Birkdale Lands, without consultation. This came as a huge shock to many.



C: Grounds for reinstatement of this area to Division 10.

Questionable political motivation regarding area 3100326

The 2015 submissions made to contest the removal of this land from Birkdale to Capalaba appear to be politically motivated, based on some kind of agenda, rather than based on a requirement for equitable distribution of electors.

- The area 3100326 only involves 5 electors whom live within Birkdale's highly regarded, privately owned Howeston Golf Course. These residents were not consulted.

- It is worth noting that the area has endured immense political conjecture about its future since 2015, after Commonwealth Departments who own 'The Birkdale Lands' decided to dispose of the balance of the site.
- Councillors were aware of RCC's interest in acquiring the site at the time. However, no submitter councillors ever publicly expressed an interest to council in changing the land to Division 9 (nor did they inform or involve Division 10 representative in their deliberation or decision).
- [REDACTED]
- At the time of the review, council functioned under a 'Committee' System. This meant Divisional Councillors and Portfolio Chair leaders had extra access to information regarding council matters. Under the portfolio system, after the change to the divisional boundary, the Division 10 Councillor would not necessarily have had access to the same information regarding area 3100326, which was no longer within their jurisdiction.
- Proforma submissions provided by elected councillors (and closely linked by aligned interests) were at odds with the general community perception and feedback, which suggests there may be a degree of bias from submitters. This potential should be called into question to assess the public interest resulting from the 2015 decision.
- Once the Final Determination Report was delivered, there were no further rights for citizens to appeal or amend the decision.
- No community consultation or public oversight informed the recommendations in the Final Determination Report 2015, despite the site being an area of massive local and historical significance for Birkdale residents.

Historical association

- Historic Willard/Cottons Farmhouse 'The Pines' and associated dwellings adjoin Birkdale Baptist Church. The Willards are a greatly respected pioneering family, having been identified as important in many Birkdale residents' lives for over 150 years.
- The former Willard/Cotton pastureland, comprising hundreds of acres of undeveloped land to the north (aka 'Birkdale Commonwealth Lands') still holds important cultural, historical, geographical, demographic and political connection to Birkdale, ever since selection by James and Margaret Willard in 1863.

Civic Planning implications

- Birkdale's Baptist Church is an important divisional landmark to residents as they are entering Birkdale, travelling north from Capalaba. The church is on the northern corner of Jones Road & Old Cleveland Road East. This site is well signed and is locally known that this property denotes the south-western perimeter line of Birkdale.
- Open space is of equal value across the city and movement/transfer of Divisional land without the substance of a town planning strategy or based on the opinion of a small number of individuals should not determine oversight of electoral boundaries. Please review the submissions in the Determination made on this basis from 2015.

Public concern

- Associated impacts and subterfuge continues to ripple in the area and throughout the region as a matter of concern affecting members of community and myself.
- In the last review, it was also proposed that Wellington Point's isthmus would become part of Division 10, which was illogical. As such, it received many letters of concern, calling for more sensible changes.
- The Change Commissioner has the opportunity to clarify any anomalies and give certainty to community with a review of the 2015 decision to change the boundary.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the large area of land, has featured in many political media press releases since 2015. The land is a matter of immense community concern of special interest.

Citizen journalism analysis relating to concerns about the 2015 Final Determination were reported in March 2016: <https://redlands2030.net/a-murky-tale-about-land-development-and-electoral-redistribution-in-redland-city/>

Summation

Submissions made prior to the Final Determination Report 2015 were not open to community oversight, and the concerted effort by 10 submitters was significantly at odds with general opinions, community consensus and relevant principles.

As such, the changes have caused many questions to be asked about how and why this decision and these persons were motivated to propose this change.

I urge you to clarify any issues and to return the Birkdale Lands back to Division 10 in future.

As the currently elected representative for the Division 10 (Birkdale/Thorneside) area, I have persistently and consistently asked many questions about the importance, significance and strategic priority needed to make sure this site is managed and assessed in accordance with best practice and in line with relevant planning instruments and community expectations.

I would urge you to review this area in an objective manner and base your findings upon the need to balance voter numbers in ways that allow a consistent co-location of associated lands to be contained within the boundaries that share the name of the suburb/area to remain intact. Naturally, I will accept your considered recommendations and I thank you for considering these matters.

Kind regards,

Paul Bishop
Councillor Division 10
Redland City Council

M:

E:

Supporting Local Community Action

Sent: Monday, 20 May 2019 6:38 AM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Redland City Council Divisions 9 and 10
Attachments: ECQ COMPLAINT - Final.pdf; ECQ submission analysis.pdf

Dear Sir

I understand that some Local Government divisions of Redland City Council are under review so I request that ECQ look once again at the most recent change of boundary between Divisions 9 and 10.

Late in the process of the last changes the boundary between the divisions of Capalaba (Div 9) and Birkdale (Div 10) was moved. The land involved had no more than a handful of voters and is largely undeveloped Commonwealth land.

The change was orchestrated by a group of councillors after community responses were closed and the intent was political and somewhat vindictive.

It is strongly in the public interest that the previous boundary between the divisions is reinstated to reflect the suburban boundary of Capalaba and Birkdale.

As the change was made under the since [REDACTED] I respectfully request that the original boundary be reinstated to reflect the suburb boundaries of Capalaba and Birkdale.

I have attached my original complaint plus supporting information that was submitted at the time.

Regards

Margaret Hardy
[REDACTED]