

# **APPENDIX D**

## **Comments on Proposal Notice & Public Submissions**

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHANGE COMMISSION

## Divisional Boundary Review of Rockhampton Regional Council

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

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

### **INVITATION FOR COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL**

Comments on the Change Commission's proposal will be accepted until 5pm on 30 September 2019. Late submissions cannot be considered.

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

When making a comment, please remember each division must have relatively the same number of voters (quota) to ensure each person's vote has the same value. The quota for the Rockhampton Regional Council is 7,734 with a lower limit of 6,961 (-10%) and an upper limit of 8,507 (+10%).

#### **Comments can be lodged through:**

**- Online Form**

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

**- Email**

[LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au](mailto:LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au)

**- Personal Delivery**

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

**- Post**

Local Government Change Commission  
GPO Box 1393, BRISBANE QLD 4001

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

Pat Vidgen PSM  
**Electoral Commissioner**

# Divisional Boundary Review of Rockhampton Regional Council

## List of Public Comments on the Proposal

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Name / Organisation</b>
<b>1</b>	Rockhampton Regional Council	<b>18</b>	Natasha Filer & Chris Chappell
<b>2</b>	Jordan Mogg	<b>19</b>	Lesley Stubbings
<b>3</b>	Caroline Breadsell	<b>20</b>	Ruth Tracey
<b>4</b>	Josephine Reoch	<b>21</b>	None provided
<b>5</b>	Jill Hinchliffe	<b>22</b>	Tanya Flamank
<b>6</b>	Noeleen Horan	<b>23</b>	Peter
<b>7</b>	Bob Pleash	<b>24</b>	Miranda Broadbent
<b>8</b>	Lex & Janet Lawrie	<b>25</b>	Catherine George
<b>9</b>	Debbie Williams	<b>26</b>	Noel Ghea
<b>10</b>	Lenore Lindsay	<b>27</b>	Darren Broadbent
<b>11</b>	Jo	<b>28</b>	Cr Cherie Rutherford, Division 5, Rockhampton Regional Council
<b>12</b>	Daniel Oram	<b>29</b>	Anna Beasley
<b>13</b>	Valda Berzins & Delphine Braddon	<b>30</b>	Cr Ellen Smith, Division 4, Rockhampton Regional Council
<b>14</b>	Morley Property Pty Ltd	<b>31</b>	Cr Drew Wickerson, Division 6, Rockhampton Regional Council
<b>15</b>	Ewen and Meredith Sutherland		
<b>16</b>	Gordon & Robyn Kelsey		
<b>17</b>	Christian Shepherd		



**Rockhampton Office**  
232 Bolsover St, Rockhampton  
**Gracemere Office**  
1 Ranger St, Gracemere  
**Mount Morgan Office**  
32 Hall St, Mount Morgan

17 September 2019

Mr Pat Vidgen PSM  
Local Government Change Commission  
Electoral Commission Queensland  
GPO Box 1393  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Mr Vidgen

**Internal Boundary Review**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission on the proposed divisional boundaries for the Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area.

The proposed changes to Divisions 4, 5 and 6 are significantly different from the current and are likely to lead to confusion amongst voters and in particular the change for the town of Mount Morgan. The proposed boundary of Division 7 that has moved to be along Lion Creek Road will lead to confusion amongst voters.

With an external boundary review between Livingstone Shire Council and Rockhampton Regional Council pending, Council again respectfully requests that any major changes as proposed be considered after the external boundary review for implementation for the 2024 quadrennial Local Government Elections.

Council respectfully requests that its submission of 9 May 2019 (attached) be considered for the 2020 quadrennial Local Government Elections.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you wish to discuss this further on [REDACTED]

Regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "E. Pardon", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Evan Pardon  
Chief Executive Officer

09 May 2019

Mr Pat Vidgen PSM  
Local Government Change Commission  
Electoral Commission Queensland  
GPO Box 1393  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Mr Vidgen

**Re: Internal Boundary Review**

I write with reference to the above matter. It is important to note that Councillors from Rockhampton Regional Council have delegated this review to myself so as to maintain an arm's length position from any perception their submission could influence yourself to their benefit.

That being said Council also resolved that my submission should be based on the premise that while there is a need for some major realignment of the internal boundaries this should wait until the completion of the external boundary review. Subsequently my submission should be based on minimum disruption for the electorate until such time the external review is complete.

On this basis and acknowledging that there will still be some disparity between divisions potentially until the 2024 local government elections I recommend the following:

- SA1 3122004 transfer from division 4 to division 5
- SA1 3121018 transfer from division 4 to division 6
- SA1 3121611 transfer from division 6 to division 5
- SA1 3121605 transfer from division 6 to division 5
- SA1 3121606 transfer from division 6 to division 5
- SA1 3121308 transfer from division 1 to division 2

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this review. Should you wish to discuss this submission please contact Deputy CEO, Ross Cheesman.

Pursuant to Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2009, Council has reviewed each of its electoral divisions to assess the reasonable proportion of electors in each division. This review has concluded that divisions 2 and 4 are both out of quota.

Whilst not a requirement of this review, Council resolved that it will retain divisional boundaries.

Should you require any further information please feel free to contact Deputy CEO, Ross Cheesman on [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'EP' followed by a long horizontal stroke.

Evan Pardon  
Chief Executive Officer  
Rockhampton Region Council

**Sent:** Monday, 23 September 2019 8:26 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6038) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Jordan Mogg

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Jordan Mogg**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Jordan Mogg

**Submission Text :** The realignments have been proposed by statistics/head counts and not by logic. The community matters of those in The Range are vastly different from those in Mount Morgan and Bouldercombe. It would make more sense for ECQ to work with the Rockhampton Regional Council and Livingstone Shire Council to reassign the suburbs north of Rockhampton (e.g. Rockyview, Glenlee) from Livingstone to Rockhampton. The residents of this location utilise the services of Rockhampton Regional Council, and are forgotten about by Livingstone. Why should Rockyview/Glenlee residents pay a higher amount of rates, when the refuse station (Yeppoon landfill) is double (30km) away, vs 14km away at Lakes Creek Landfill, when to get to the Yeppoon landfill you need to drive through the RRC zone. RRC residents should have had the change to vote in deamalgamation too as it did affect them.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Monday, 23 September 2019 9:21 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6040) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Caroline Breadsell

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Caroline Breadsell**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Caroline Breadsell

**Submission Text :** There is currently disputes as to the currently divisions in the area I live. I unfortunately fall under the Livingstone Shire Council although I along with a lot of others in my suburb do not understand why and feel we should fall under the Rockhampton Council boundaries. I understand that this long dispute of boundaries which effect the area I live in is about to be reviewed higher up the chain. I do not feel these boundary changes should take place until ALL possible changes are reviewed and decided. Considering the considerable time and money wasted on the issue in my are to date by the local authorities, it would be great if the issue could be reviewed quickly and a final decision made and incorporated with currently reviews, which if changes occur in my area, would mean more work and wasted money down that track that could be better utilised in other areas and not wasted on rework.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Monday, 23 September 2019 9:52 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6041) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Josephine Reoch

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Josephine Reoch**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Josephine Reoch

**Submission Text :** Please note my objection to the changes proposed to Division 6 in the Rockhampton Region. Rural communities and urban communities have entirely different priorities and to meld them together (as proposed with The Range and the Bouldercombe, Mt Morgan communities) will be a disservice to both areas.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Monday, 23 September 2019 10:57 AM  
**To:** LG Boundaries  
**Subject:** [ECQ] (ECQ-38043) Re boundary changes for Rockhampton

[Assist / ECQ-38043](#)

## Re boundary changes for Rockhampton

Hi

I do not want the proposed boundary changes for the Rockhampton area to go ahead. They are just so stupid. The areas that are proposed to be joined have no connection to each other and are unfair on the residents of these areas. We will have no representation from a councillor who knows the area. Dividing Wandal in two and putting half of it over the river in the next suburb is ridiculous. Each Suburb fight for its own identity and needs, how is that fair on Wandal when the other suburb needs the same thing and they get it over Wandal.

It is iust too stupid to contemplate.

Regards

Jill Hinchliffe  
Concerned Voter

**Sent:** Monday, 23 September 2019 7:38 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6055) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Noeleen Horan

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Noeleen Horan**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Noeleen Horan

**Submission Text :** I see no real benefit, particularly when a lot of councillors will have worked hard to build relationships in their areas. Please don't change unless it will bring benefits to the community.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

---

**From:** Bob Pleash  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 24 September 2019 4:10 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Proposed boundary changes to Rockhampton Regional Council LGA  
**Attachments:** attachment 1.docx

To whom it may concern

I reside at [REDACTED].

If the object of the exercise re above was to cause bewilderment/confusion in the community, then one could say quite confidently you have achieved your objective.

The proposed changes in Division 5 to incorporate a small part of Wandal into Division 7 make no sense at all and bear no relevance/similarities to the north side Division - the two are separated by the Fitzroy River and where I live forms an integral hub of the Wandal and CBD business, sporting, community and cultural precincts in Rockhampton. One would question the advice on which the ECQ has come up with the proposals.

On a broader matter if we had an undivided council in Rockhampton there would be no need to be conducting such boundary reviews and I suspect save the the rate payer a lot of money into the bargain.

It seems ironic that all of a sudden the local Council can suddenly burst into community consultation mode when it suits and advise of the proposed changes to divisional boundaries and yet on the broader and more fundamental issue of allowing the community a say on the merits of non divisional voting it was overwhelming rejected by the majority of local Councillors late last year.

A copy of a related press article and a letter I sent to the Minister at the time are attached for your background.

Whilst it is all well and good to receive the dutiful advice from our local divisional Councillor ( a rare communication commodity) advising of these proposed changes, it is an unnecessary luxury we as rate payers are again asked to stand.

My advice for what it is worth is to leave the status quo in place and in the meantime lobby for the abolishment of divisions and move to a more equitable and representative system of non divisional voting.

Regards

Bob Pleash

[REDACTED]

# Your say

The best reader comments from print and online

## Leave divisions alone



MY SAY  
FRAZER PEARCE  
Editor

THE debate over voting divisions in Rockhampton Regional Council has been flaring up from time to time since I arrived here in 1998.

When the super shire amalgamation for Rockhampton Livingstone, Fitzroy and Mount Morgan happened in 2008, emotions on divisional voting ran high.

I copped a bit of flak for supporting divisional voting and I stand by that today.

I think it is the best system of proving representation across a council, particularly one as large and diverse as Rockhampton.

The issue is back on the table as a regular item to be discussed as part of local government procedure.

What sets this one apart from previous council discussions is the move to put it out for community consultation.

Council officers had recommended the matter be put forward for public consultation, but that proposal was voted down by a majority of councillors.

Only Cr Margaret Strelow and Cr Stephen Schwarten recorded votes in favour of public consultation.

Cr Strelow said she was "disappointed" councillors who voted against the recommendation were "not open to seeking the community view on such a significant matter before we formally respond to the Commissioner".

"I don't think that we have ever actually asked the community what they think on this topic before, at least not formally," she said.

But where would that get us?

There has to be a compelling reason to move to public consultation. If it ain't broke don't fix it.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Enormous pat on the back

CONGRATULATIONS to all of the emergency services people on your hard work and contribution towards saving property and lives at Gracemere, Stanwell and Kabra, in the most extreme conditions.

The 44-degree heat from the wind was blistering without adding the heat radiation from the fires, it must have been the closest to hell on Earth.

I understand the seriousness of this catastrophic event and the potential for things to get right out of hand. I helped property owners back in 1991 fight a bushfire in 42-degree heat at Baralaba while I was working on a station called "Baranga".

I witnessed mini tornadoes pick up embers and small sticks and spread the fire over fire breaks, creating more problems.

We only had water tanks mounted on the back of four-wheel-drive Toyotas but we had dozers to cut fire breaks and were able to back-burn from the fire breaks to starve the fire

of fuel and control it.

We were on alert for a couple of days after to make sure the fire didn't flare up again.

The heat of the wind blowing us was intensified by the radiation from the fire, our slacks and trousers were soaked in sweat. Fortunately we followed our supervisor's order to drink heaps of water and keep hydrated.

The smoke was thick in places you had to ensure vehicle windows were protected area, the main emphasis about maintaining communications.

This is an experience I will never forget and I sincerely hope what our emergency services are going through.

Stay safe, keep up good communications and make decisions as extreme weather can be unpredictable.

This is an extended occurrence, unlike most fires, so you are in

### No place for name calling on opinion pages

DURING my time I have always had an opinion on a lot of matters, sometimes right and other times wrong, but have never reverted to name calling when holding a conversation on certain matters with another who was not of the same opinion or not on the same page as I am.

But then you have others like GTF PAVE who use the English language in the most gifted ways when trying to get their point of view across. I am sure that the Bully would publish more of your texts now that they are aware of your excellent knowledge of how to use the English language.

There are many Manly supporters here in Central Queensland, who are proud to put their names out there when showing their allegiance to the Sea Eagles.

Am not sure what GTF stands for, but Gutless To Face comes to mind if this (name calling) was just to get a reaction from me. Well, you have achieved your aim. I have been called a lot of names over the years from certain individuals, but they at least had the guts to say so to my face, and not

hide behind some name.

Jack Lewis

Berserker

'Nothing but hard to swallow'  
WORLD record weather events, no need to worry theory. Hundreds of theorists around this conspiracy ing just to rants. It's all "burger."

World-leading nations such as America's NASA would tens of scientists with full-time education know

Listen in people such as state commentators not forget telling lies also controversial shock joke scientific explanation. These

# Banl

## Community Deserves a Say on Divisions

Re The Morning Bulletin editorial 1/12/18, Leave Divisions Alone

It appears the old issue about divided v undivided councils has reared its head yet again with the majority of Rockhampton Regional Councillors recently taking the unusual step of voting down a recommendation from Council Officers to put the matter out for public consultation.

To their credit, only two Councillors, Strelow and Schwarten, thought the issue important enough and warranted enough public interest to actually allow the community to have a say on the matter and voted in favour of the proposal.

This is quite extraordinary, when as the editor asserts, this issue “flares up from time to time”, there must be more than a passing interest in the matter and I would have thought it both fair and reasonable to allow the community some opportunity to make comment.

After all, the corner stone of a modern day democracy is where you have a well-informed community being afforded the opportunity to make comment on and have input into matters of public interest.

In expressing her disappointment in the actions of her fellow Councillors, Mayor Margaret Strelow quite rightly points out that the community has never been asked what they felt about divisions.

There are 77 Councils areas in Queensland, around 20 of which are divided like Rockhampton. In our immediate vicinity there is Livingstone Shire Council, Central Highlands Regional Council and Gladstone Regional Council all of which are undivided Councils, so I question the notion of divisions being the best form of representation for a council, “particularly one as large and diverse as Rockhampton”.

The good editor argues the case for retaining divisions based on an apparent belief that they are the best form of representation, however it can also be argued that having an undivided council provides a sharper focus from elected officials on the overall operations of the Council, a concept that will be all the more important as this region gets set to enjoy some much needed economic uplift with numerous major projects set to come on line in the next few years.

So having been denied the opportunity to have our say on this matter, what happens next?

Does the issue sit on the shelf gathering dust until it again comes to light or will sanity somehow prevail?

I don't believe sending a submission back to the Electoral Commission where the fundamental principle of seeking community input has not been addressed is a terribly good look.

It is both disappointing and frankly bewildering that the very elected officials who are supposed to uphold the community's interests, have arrived at this decision, particularly when it could be said there appears a perceived vested interest in maintaining the status quo.

As the Minister responsible for Local Government, I seek your intervention on this issue to at least afford the community of Rockhampton a democratic say on an issue that is very much in the public interest.

Yours sincerely

Bob Pleash

**From:** Janet Lawrie  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 25 September 2019 3:20 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Rockhampton Regional Council proposed boundaries

Dear Sir,

It would seem that common sense is not prevailing when it comes to some of these proposed new boundaries. To transfer Mt Morgan and Bouldercombe areas to Division 6 creates such a large diverse area for one councillor to be able to adequately see to the needs of their constituents. Mt Morgan's ratepayers encounter far different problems to people who live in other areas of the proposed Division (namely the Allenstown/Range area).

I thought it was stated that natural boundaries such as creeks, rivers, mountain ranges etc were to be taken into account. It seems not so, especially as Wandal residents are to share Division 7 despite being on the southern side of the river.

What hope will they have of equal representation?

Why are these decisions, which affect so many people, made by Public Servants who are not familiar with the ratepayers who live and work in these areas? If it all comes down to numbers, I guess that is how we are seen, just numbers!

Lex and Janet Lawrie

**From:** Debbie Williams  
**Sent:** Thursday, 26 September 2019 10:30 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGE

I have lived in Wandal literally all my life and cannot see why these changes need to be made. We have a river splitting Park Avenue (North Rockhampton) and Wandal (South Rockhampton).

Does this mean I now have to travel to the other side of town to vote, when I can go around the corner 3mins to vote?

Does this now mean I need to change all my details to read Park Avenue ?

This proposal sounds absolutely ridiculous, we never hear or see our local councillor now as it is, I cannot see how this is going to benefit anyone.

Regards,

**DEBBIE WILLIAMS**

**SUBMISSION RE PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES,  
ROCKHAMPTON REGIONAL COUNCIL.**

I do not believe that the proposed boundary changes take into account whether or not a community of interest exists within these proposed areas, whether or not there are deeply held community ideas which are utterly at variance with the changes ECQ is proposing, or even the physical difficulties they are creating for both residents and their elected representatives. It appears that only one criteria has been applied – numbers.

Mt Morgan as a community has very little in common with The Range, for example. The Range is an affluent city suburb, whose population tends to be business and professional. Mt Morgan is a small rural town with a low socio-economic profile. Pity the Councillor trying to balance these disparate communities in the same division, and imagine the strife and discontent that almost any Council decision will cause. WHY would you bundle them together?

Then there is that odd shape on the south side of the Fitzroy which seems to be part of the city residential suburb of Wandal, which has been allocated to the extremely large rural division 5 across the river and stretching far to the north and west. Just what do these areas have in common apart from being within the jurisdiction of the RRC (not from choice), being well north of the SE Corner, and speaking English? Many Southside residents, particularly in older suburbs, still refuse to cross the river for any reason, so this is a huge blunder which could have been avoided by some local consultation.

We are still hopeful that the boundary changes between RRC and Livingstone to the north of the city will be resolved, with the geographically adjoining suburbs currently in Livingstone being moved to Rockhampton, in spite of the Mayor's not wanting to lose the rates income. Surely it makes more sense to wait until this is sorted out before making such huge changes to the Local Government Divisions? It is bad enough that our suburb has been excised from the state seat of Rockhampton and lumped in with the Capricorn Coast, without creating more confusion and discontent.

**Sent:** Thursday, 26 September 2019 9:42 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6150) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Jo

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Jo**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Jo

**Submission Text :** Makes no sense to move part of The Range into division 5. We don't have the same concerns as someone out in Ridgeland or Mount Morgan, which is proposed to be part of the Rockhampton city division 6 now (it's a half hour drive away!). Our location, only a 10min walk from the CBD, is really a part of Rockhampton city and all our issues, facilities, parks and businesses we use are in division 6. We don't head out anywhere in division 5 - there's nothing there for us (as someone who is essentially a city dweller). What would I know of the issues of more rural areas and vice versa. It's crazy that our rep would be expected to unite such disparate concerns.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Friday, 27 September 2019 8:01 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6152) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - daniel oram

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **daniel oram**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** daniel oram

**Submission Text :** I wish to object to the boundary changes in division 5 to division 7 . I find that the normal process was to use the river as a boundary . it is not that the boundary is the distance of across the road . now people could travel up to 22 klm to see their member

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**From:** valda berzins  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 September 2019 9:27 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Our OBJECTION TO BOUNDARY CHANGES

We are the owners of [REDACTED].

WE STRONGLY OBJECT to the realignment of boundary changes being proposed by the ECQ for the Rockhampton Region.

It will cause confusion, disruption and instability.

The opinions of sitting Councillors need to be considered.

The Range, our division, should certainly not be included in Division 5 but remain in Division 6.

Valda Berzins  
[REDACTED]

Delphine Braddon  
[REDACTED]

**Sent:** Friday, 27 September 2019 3:11 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6158) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - MORLEY PROPERTY PTY LTD

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **MORLEY PROPERTY PTY LTD**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** MORLEY PROPERTY PTY LTD

**Submission Text :** I am writing to express my non agreement with the realignment of boundaries in Rockhampton. Why there needs to be a realignment of the divisions is a quandary, let alone the costing of such a change. There does not seem to be any reasoning to change our area to be incorporated into Division 7 which is on the northern side of the river, and we are against this and would prefer to stay with the current Division 5.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**From:** Meredith Sutherland  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 September 2019 5:40 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Divisional boundary review

Dear Sir,

I object to my property at [REDACTED] being transferred from Division 5 to Division 7.

There is no good reason to select a group of houses with no direct access to the other side of the river, and link them as a division. A study of the map will show there is no river crossing between Division 7 and the proposed addition.

The demographics of both sides of the river are historically different, and would make it a very hard task for a Councillor to administer both sections fairly.

There is a prohibitive distance from Lion Ck Rd to the northern tip of the current Division 7 - and one could understand a Councillor ignoring the added on bit - because there is no direct access between the 2 Divisions.

There is no bridge between Division 5 and Division 7 .

Leave the area between Lion Ck Rd and the river in Division 5.

I request that the area between Lion Ck Rd and the Fitzroy River remain in Division 5.

Kind regards,

Ewen and Meredith Sutherland

---

**From:** Meredith Sutherland  
**Sent:** Friday, 27 September 2019 7:34 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Fwd: Divisional boundary review

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded

**Subject: Divisional boundary review**

Dear Sir,

I object to my property at [REDACTED] being transferred from Division 5 to Division 7. There is no good reason to transfer a small group of houses from one side of the river to the other. The demographics of either side of the river are very different – in age of population, housing and interests.

Wandal is being promoted as the sporting hub of Rockhampton, so it is logical to keep the facilities in the same division – Division 5.

The distance from the proposed new southern boundary of Division 7 to the northern boundary is ridiculously long, and I can envisage services would be concentrated on the original Division 7 not the new tacked on bit.

Although the line on the map links the proposed addition to Division 7, in reality, there is no direct access between the proposed addition to Division 7 and the original Division 7.

Leave the area between Lion Ck Rd and the Fitzroy River in Division 5.

I request that the area between Lion Creek road and the Fitzroy River remain in Division 5.

Kind regards,

Ewen and Meredith Sutherland

---

**From:** Meredith and Ewen Sutherland  
**Sent:** Sunday, 29 September 2019 9:18 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** FW: Divisional boundary review

---

**Subject:** Divisional boundary review

Dear Sir,

I object to my property at [REDACTED] transferred from Division 5 to Division 7.

There is no good reason to transfer a small group of houses from one side of the river to the other.

The demographics of either side of the river are very different – in age of population, housing and interests.

Wandal is being promoted as the sporting hub of Rockhampton, so it is logical to keep the facilities in the same division – Division 5.

The distance from the proposed new southern boundary of Division 7 to the northern boundary is ridiculously long, and I can envisage services would be concentrated on the original Division 7 not the new tacked on bit.

Although the line on the map links the proposed addition to Division 7, in reality, there is no direct access between the proposed addition to Division 7 and the original Division 7. There is no bridge between Division 5 and Division 7, so they should stay separate.

Leave the area between Lion Ck Rd and the Fitzroy River in Division 5.

I request that the area between Lion Creek road and the Fitzroy River remain in Division 5.

Kind regards,

Ewen and Meredith Sutherland

---

**From:** Ewen  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 September 2019 7:11 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Fwd: Divisional boundary review

**Subject: Divisional boundary review**

Dear Sir,

I object to my property at [REDACTED] being transferred from Division 5 to Division 7.

There is no good reason to transfer a small group of houses from one side of the river to the other.

The demographics of either side of the river are very different – in age of population, housing and interests.

Wandal is being promoted as the sporting hub of Rockhampton, so it is logical to keep the facilities in the same division – Division 5.

The distance from the proposed new southern boundary of Division 7 to the northern boundary is ridiculously long, and I can envisage services would be concentrated on the original Division 7 not the new tacked on bit.

Although the line on the map links the proposed addition to Division 7, in reality, there is no direct access between the proposed addition to Division 7 and the original Division 7.

There is no river crossing between Division 5 and Division 7. Northside and Southside in Rockhampton are very different places

Leave the area between Lion Ck Rd and the Fitzroy River in Division 5.

I request that the area between Lion Creek road and the Fitzroy River remain in Division 5.

Kind regards,  
Ewen Sutherland

---

**From:** gordon.kelsey  
**Sent:** Saturday, 28 September 2019 4:27 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Cc:** drew.wickerson  
**Subject:** Rockhampton Division 6 boundary review

Dear Sir / Madam,

Although we acknowledge your genuine attempt to establish similar numbers within electoral divisions, we wish to record our dismay over your proposal to relocate the existing Division 6 boundary in Rockhampton for the following reasons:

1. The existing Division 6 incorporates the suburbs of The Range, Allenstown and Rockhampton City. We live in The Range and the proposed change will separate us from Allenstown and the City – suburbs we identify strongly with as it is where we shop, entertain and conduct our business.
2. The proposal will sever the suburb of The Range. This will create a situation where residents in the same suburb will be located in different Divisions and with separate representation. This would be nonsensical and counterproductive.
3. The proposal would actually divide residential streets in The Range into separate Divisions. This would result in neighbours in [REDACTED] and others being in different Divisions while sharing identical interests.
4. Residents of Division 6 have traditionally identified strongly with the Rockhampton Botanical Gardens. We are active supporters of The Gardens as is our present Councillor. It would be unacceptable to lose our voice to a Division that is more geographically isolated.
5. Division 5 presently includes Mount Morgan and surrounding rural areas. The socioeconomic differences between the two Divisions are considerable. Our needs and interests and often very different and are best served by separate representation.
6. We are concerned that proposals on the location of Division boundaries are being made based on numbers rather than the public interest. We are also concerned that although anecdotally there is strong opposition to the proposed change, public apathy may result in little written opposition.

We support our Division 6 Councillor Drew Wickerson who has years of experience in Local Government and has voiced his opposition to the proposed change. We urge you to reconsider this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Gordon & Robyn Kelsey  
[REDACTED]

**Sent:** Saturday, 28 September 2019 6:21 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6166) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Christian Shepherd

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Christian Shepherd**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Christian Shepherd

**Submission Text :** Rockhampton border should be expanded to include Parkhurst, Glenlee, Glendale, Olive Estate, Frenchville, Norman Gardens, Lakes Creek, Nerimbera and perhaps other areas encompassed in Rockhampton Regional Council

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Sunday, 29 September 2019 12:12 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6168) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Natasha Filer and Chris Chappell

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Natasha Filer and Chris Chappell**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Natasha Filer and Chris Chappell

**Submission Text :** We object to the proposed electoral boundary changes to Mount Morgan area. This area has had far too many changes over the years. It should stay in Division 5 with somebody that actually cares about the area and its people.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**From:** Lesley Stubs  
**Sent:** Sunday, 29 September 2019 5:01 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Divisional Boundary Realignment

In regard to the ECQ changing Division 5 to Division 7 in Rockhampton.

I find it strange to change boundaries to include part of South Rockhampton in a North Rockhampton area.

Having one street included makes no sense to me unless it's only being done for political reasons

Wandal is a South Rockhampton suburb & has always been so why change it now.

Regards

Lesley Stubbings

**From:** keriandruth  
**Sent:** Sunday, 29 September 2019 11:16 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Division 5/7 Electoral Boundary Proposal

Dear Local Government Change Commission, I have concerns about the proposal to transfer my home in Wandal from Division 5 south of the river to Division 7, north of the river.

1. Neither I, nor my husband and four children, have links to Division 7 services, shops and amenities and can not see how the interests of our small area would be considered alongside the interests of Division 7 residents.
2. I am concerned that it is a political move that looks to split a long established community, suburb and children's sporting precinct in order to build a highway and bridge between it.
3. The Fitzroy River running between our area and Division 7, contravenes the nature of the proposed transfer, which is required to be established by geographical features.
4. I have concerns that should council have future development plans for the sporting precinct in our area, that they would not be in our best interests and that the transfer dilutes our voice and community needs.

Thank you for your attention and please consider the above points seriously.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Tracey

Wandal resident.

**From:** Pourtoi <cherylzieth>  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 September 2019 8:46 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Proposal to transfer from div 5 to div 7

Definitely a big fat NO to the transfer from Division 5 to division 7.  
If we wanted to live on the north side we would be, but obviously we don't.  
You do know that there is a river in between.  
NO NO NO NO NO NO trillion times over



**Sent:** Monday, 30 September 2019 11:37 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6179) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Tanya Flamank

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Tanya Flamank**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Tanya Flamank

**Submission Text :** I live on Southside. I have more in common with the residents a block away rather the Northside and it's outskirts.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Monday, 30 September 2019 11:41 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6180) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Peter

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Peter**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Peter

**Submission Text :** I live in [REDACTED], which is currently in Division 5 and is being proposed to be transferred to Division 7. The proposed boundary change for the area of Wandal moving to Division 7 is concerning and hard to comprehend as the remaining parts of Wandal Suburb are staying in Division 5. To split a suburb across divisions will only make it harder for this suburb to access required funding or support for future council projects or upgrades that may be required on roads and other facilities in the Suburb. For myself and many others in this area, we resignate with the Wandal Suburb, and most of our day to day dealings are done in Wandal, or close area including using local shops, clubs, pubs, schools, and many of the other major facilities that are located in Wandal and Division 5. To be joined with suburbs that are located across the north side of the river, doesn't make to much sense, as the facilities and issues they have in these suburbs will rarely effect the residents in the nominated Wandal area. I hardly ever cross the river to utilise any council facilities in division 7, and would be concerned that the remaining residents of Wandal will now miss out on opportunities in their suburb due to this support being moved to another division that really doesn't matter to them.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Monday, 30 September 2019 11:49 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6185) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Miranda Broadbent

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Miranda Broadbent**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Miranda Broadbent

**Submission Text :** Thank you for the opportunity to express an opinion about proposed changes to electoral divisions in Rockhampton. As a resident in Wandal in division 5, I reject the proposed changes to our division. Proposed changes are largely based on numbers, not considering the social, economic, environmental or cultural needs of the community. We share a similarity in needs with those residents in our division with its current boundaries. The proposed changes have no relevance to the community, but are just about equalising numbers of voters. This will simply create confusion, disruption and instability in our long established electoral division.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

## Submission to the Local Government Change Commission

### Proposed Boundary Changes to the Rockhampton Regional Council Local Government Boundaries

Name: Catherine M George

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

#### Communities of interest

– areas that share  
a common interest, i.e. economic, social or cultural.

I object to the proposal of removing a significant portion of The Range from Division 6 and including it in Division 5.

This is based on the following: There are many rate paying residents in Division 6 whose family & business connections are firmly part of the Division and share common interests with the businesses located in the CBD and traditionally see themselves as having a strong interest in the cultural, economic and social development of the Central Business District. Many residents of the Range are in fact operators of CBD businesses and, for more than 160 years, have invested money, resources and a great deal of time and effort into maintaining, developing and enhancing the viability and economic future of the whole of the current Division 6. Such connections are evident to the extent that Division 6 is an area where there is a unique community identity that has evolved since the time of the first settlement of Rockhampton.

Current boundaries of Division 6 include major heritage assets both in the CBD and in the residential areas. The whole of this Division encompasses some of Rockhampton's most significant historical landmarks and it is vital to their preservation and tourism offering that the entire area remain in the current Division 6.

The proposed boundary changes reflect a complete lack of understanding of the cultural, social and economic factors as they affect and influence the Rockhampton Region Local Government area.

#### Means of communication and serviceability

– access to political representatives and local services.

Geographically the proposed inclusion of the Range voters into division 5 does not sit well with me as the priorities, needs and issues of the current Division 5 are substantially different to those of the current Division 6 residents & business operators Range and the proposed changes would add to the demands of securing adequate representation of the diversity of the Division

#### Creating sensible and definable boundaries

It is my understanding that there is currently a review of the external boundary of the Rockhampton Regional Council Local Government area underway and to amend the internal divisions before the outcome of that review would be premature and indeed a waste of time, resources and taxpayer's money.

#### Specific enrolment requirements for

**Divisional Boundary Reviews** – Considering the above, there is no point in looking at numbers until the external Boundary Review has been finalised.

I would like to add that while it is commendable that requests for comment and suggestions have been invited, the timeframe for comment is inadequate considering the nature of the proposed changes and the need to fully recognise the implications that may arise from this.

**Respectfully submitted for your consideration**

**Catherine M George 29.09.19**

**Sent:** Monday, 30 September 2019 12:08 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6188) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Noel Ghea

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Noel Ghea**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Noel Ghea

**Submission Text :** As a resident of The Range Division 6 I strongly reject the proposed changes to the electoral boundary. Your suggestions are misinformed and should not be considered. Yet another case of Brisbane being out of touch with the needs of regions outside the SE corner causing confusion, disruption and instability. Rockhampton Region should be making its own decisions based on residents sharing common, social, economic and cultural interests. Divisions and boundaries should not be determined by voter numbers or physical features eg. highways, rivers and mountain ranges. Noel

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Monday, 30 September 2019 12:10 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6189) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Darren Broadbent

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Darren Broadbent**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Darren Broadbent

**Submission Text :** As a resident in Wandal in division 5, I strongly reject the proposed changes to the electoral boundary for my division. The proposed changes are merely based on numbers, not actually considering the social, economic, environmental or cultural needs of the residents in the community. Our needs align with the residents in our division with its current boundaries, not with those included in the changes. The proposed changes have no relevance to the community, but are just about equalising numbers of voters. These changes will create confusion, disruption and instability in our long established electoral division. Brisbane, you need to be more in touch with the needs of regions outside the south-east corner.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

Mr Pat Vidgen, Electoral Commissioner,  
 Mr Wade Lewis, Casual Commissioner,  
 Mr Peter McGraw, Casual Commissioner,

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Rockhampton Regional Council's divisional boundaries.

I begin by raising my concerns regarding the limited consultation and time allowed for community response. I note that an advertisement appeared in The Morning Bulletin 14<sup>th</sup> September, with responses required in just two weeks by 5.00pm 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2019. I note also that it is currently school holidays and many families are away.

The Rockhampton Regional Council area is very diverse with numerous localities which do not have access to The Morning Bulletin and some areas do not have mobile service let alone internet. Council has tried to get the message out with limited success. You should also be aware that there is considerable misunderstanding about the boundary changes. Many people are confusing the internal boundary changes with the northern boundary realignment between Rockhampton and Livingstone as can be confirmed via some of the comments on your Facebook post.

With that in mind, I make the following submission on behalf of the residents of **DIVISION FIVE**.

1. The Change Commission is proposing the following change. The Division:

*d. Transfers Moongan, Leydens Hill, Struck Oil, Limestone, Johnsons Hill, Baree, Walterhall, The Mine, Mount Morgan, Horse Creek, Hamilton Creek, Boulder Creek, Trotter Creek, Nine Mile Creek, Walmul, Oakey Creek, Wura, Fletcher Creek and it's portion of the Bouldercombe locality to Division 6.*

I note that the Change Commission appears to have made this change on the basis of one individual submission. Mr Steve Ensby submitted, "Mt Morgan should not be lumped with Parkhurst. Its (sic) crazy our rep is so far away!"

The Commission has interpreted this submission as follows;

*One submitter stated that Mount Morgan should not be in the same division as Parkhurst. It should be noted that these localities are currently separated, with Mount Morgan in Division 5 and Parkhurst in Division 1. However, the Change Commission acknowledged the possibility that this request was more generally commenting on the large distances between Mount Morgan and other localities within Division 5.*

With respect I provide the following information. The submitter's statement is not referring to Mt Morgan being in the same Division as Parkhurst or the large distances; he is referring entirely to the fact that I, as their elected representative, live in Parkhurst. There will always be some people that want their Councillor to live in their locality; whether that's Mount Morgan, Gogango, Bajool, Alton Downs or Mt Archer, but with such geographically diverse Divisions this just isn't possible.

Any constituent not impressed with their representation has the opportunity to cast their vote accordingly at election time. Such significant change should not be made on the basis of one submission. Please do not allow a personal agenda to drive needless disruption to a community desperately needing stability.

The Commission went on to say;

*The proposed changes maintain the separation of Mount Morgan and Parkhurst and have transferred Mount Morgan and the surrounding localities into Division 6, where they have connectivity via the Burnett Highway. To accommodate this change, an additional portion of urban Rockhampton is proposed to move into Division 5.*

Mount Morgan and surrounding localities already share connectivity with Division 5 through the heavily utilised Razorback Rd to Capricorn Highway or Burnett Highway. Furthermore Mount Morgan's surrounding localities are made up of large cattle properties which share boundaries and a community of interest with Bushley, Stanwell and Kabra. In fact a number of property owners from this area attend the Western Area Ratepayers Meeting at Wycarbah.

The Mount Morgan and surrounding area is essentially a self-contained community. It has its own primary and secondary schools, hospital, ambulance, police and fire stations. It has a CBD, pool and sporting facilities as well as water and sewerage infrastructure and until recent times it had its own local government. In essence it is more autonomous than Gracemere.

However, it does have its own unique and significant problems which have required the coming together of organisations and resources to begin to address these issues and build a level of trust within the community.

The Mount Morgan district has been subjected to significant change every election since the unpopular, forced local government amalgamations. 2008 saw the area allocated to Division Four in the new Rockhampton Regional Council. In 2012, a line was drawn through the town and one side was Division Four and the other side Division Five. 2016 the locality was bought back together as Division Five and now it is proposed that in 2020 the area will be changed once again to be reallocated to Division 6.

One of the challenges the Mount Morgan community has faced is transient community leaders. We have started to overcome this issue but it is important that where possible continuity and stability is maintained. At the risk of coming across

too emotive the Mount Morgan community need to feel considered and valued and not pushed from pillar to post just because it is easy or convenient to do so.

The Change Commission has stated the in order for Mount Morgan and surrounds to change from Division 5 to 6 the following change is suggested:

***b. Gains Fairy Bower and a portion of West Rockhampton, The Range and Allenstown from Division 6.***

While there is connectivity and community of interest with Fairy Bower and West Rockhampton with existing areas in Division 5 (the transfer of these two areas would cause little concern); The Range and Allenstown are distinctly different suburbs.

The Change Commission states; *The Change Commission has made a concerted effort to unite suburbs within individual divisions.* Proposal ***b.*** actually divides the suburbs of The Range and Allenstown and takes them away from their community of interest.

The corresponding proposed changes ***d.*** and ***b.*** for Division Five would unnecessarily create confusion and disruption for approximately 4 500 Division 5 & 6 residents in the Mount Morgan and surrounding areas, The Range and Allenstown.

**It appears that the Change Commission have proposed this change on the basis of one (1) individual submission. In the absence of any compelling reason and due to the considerable disruption and significant impacts this change would have on a large section of the community; it is respectfully requested that the Change Commission's proposals *d.* and *b.* NOT be implemented and these areas maintain their status quo; Mount Morgan and surrounds in Division 5 and The Range and Allenstown in Division Six.**

2. The Change Commission is proposing the following change. The Division:

***c. Transfers a portion of West Rockhampton and Wandal bounded by Lion Creek, Lion Creek Road and the rail line to Division 7.***

I once again direct you to the following statement from the change commission which is at total odds with proposal ***c.***

*The Change Commission has made a concerted effort to unite suburbs within individual divisions and follow natural or geographic features such as roads and waterways where possible.*

The transference of these areas to Division Seven means that not only are both of the areas separated from their suburbs but they also jump a natural boundary being the Fitzroy River.

The following points are offered for your consideration:

- Wandal and West Rockhampton are among the older, historic suburbs in the region. They are well-established communities serviced by schools, shops, sporting clubs and medical services. The areas proposed to be transferred have no community of interest with the northern side of the river.
- The proposed new boundary of Lion Creek Road splits the vital sporting and entertainment precinct of Victoria Park and the Rockhampton Showgrounds which is home to a number of sporting groups, Speedway, the Show, Beef Expos and other major events. This precinct and associated activities along with the surrounding residential area is proposed to be split over two Divisions which has the potential to become very messy.
- There are a large number of elderly residents in the area who may be confused and upset by this change.

There is a high probability that those areas proposed to be transferred to Division Seven for the 2020 Election will need to be returned to Division Five (southside of the River) for 2024 due to increased population in Division Seven.

The following information is provided for justification of the above statement;

- External boundary review with Livingstone Shire Council to be completed by 2024 Local Government Election. (An external boundary redraw will have a major impact on the population of the northside of the River particularly for Divisions 1 & 7).
- Division Seven encompasses 3 significant residential developments, Riverside, Edenbrook and Ellida which represent a total residential catchment of 3550 properties.  
Riverside and Edenbrook have seen significant growth and development over the past few years with a further 160 properties either ready or getting ready for sale.

There is concern that the data used by the Change Commission does not accurately represent the considerable growth that has taken place in new subdivisions located in Division 7 and Division 1 or the projected growth of these areas.

It is felt that proposal **c.** is a short term solution which will cause considerable confusion and community angst and in all probability will need to be corrected in 2024.

**Due to the rapid growth of Division 7 and the adjoining Division 1 and the anticipated external boundary review it is felt that this change would be temporary in nature. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Change Commission's proposal c. NOT be implemented and that the status quo remain for this portion of Wandal and West Rockhampton.**

3. The Change Commission is proposing the following change. The Division:

*a. Gains the Kabra locality and the remainder of Stanwell from Division 4.*

**These areas share connectivity and a community of interest with the rural areas of Division 5. The Change Commission's proposal a. for Stanwell and Kabra is supported.**

I note the Rockhampton Regional Council submission and support the suggestions made in regard to Division 5 in particular:

- Transfer of SA1 3121605, SA1 3121606 and SA1 3121611 from Division Six to Division 5. These areas are in West Rockhampton and have connectivity and community of interest with the adjoining Division Five area. This change also tidies up a boundary which is confusing for residents.

**It is respectfully requested the Change Commission consider this change with a view to simplifying this boundary.**

- Transfer of SA1 3122004 (Stanwell township)

This suggestion was included in the Change Commission's proposal **a.**

There is community of interest and connectivity between rural statistical areas from Fairy Bower west so transfer of any of these areas from Division 4/6 to Division 5 would cause minimal disruption and would be supported.

Each term Council considers the issue of divisional versus non-divisional representation for the Rockhampton Regional local government area. For most Councillors, constituents have given a very clear message that they value and support divisional representation. Some of the reasons for this include the desire for individual communities to build a relationship and level of trust in their elected representative and have someone they can hold accountable. They want to ensure that their representative understands their community and its issues and will speak on their behalf and ensure their locality is not forgotten. Every time there is a redraw of boundaries these relationships and values are undermined.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to present this submission and your consideration of its content. In finishing, I appeal to you to please consider carefully and only implement that which you think is absolutely necessary.

Kind regards,

Cherie Rutherford  
Councillor Division 5  
Rockhampton Regional Council

**Sent:** Monday, 30 September 2019 4:13 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (6223) Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area - Anna Beasley

Online submission for **Rockhampton Regional Local Government Area** from **Anna Beasley**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Anna Beasley

**Submission Text :** I don't understand why you put just a couple of streets from a suburb and include in an area across the river it is ridiculous. We should stay in the division we are in. Not happy for the change!

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**From:** Ellen Smith  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 September 2019 4:17 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Divisional Boundary Review of Rockhampton Regional Council

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

As a divisional Councillor for Division 4, I strongly object to the proposed changes. Instead, I would ask that you seriously consider the submission of Rockhampton Regional Council to leave the status quo, bearing in mind that there is the potential to be a northern boundary review after the election, which could put all the divisions out of quota again.

Our residents are used to their Councillors, and know who to expect to attend ratepayer meetings, events such as Anzac Day, other events in the area, inspect problem areas, as well as put forward projects to be considered in future budgets.

At present we have 3 rural Councillors who look after the huge rural area. If your proposal is going to happen, there will be only 2 rural Councillors in Division 5 and 6. Three Councillors give a good voice for the rural areas, which encompasses a huge geographical area. I have lived in the rural area for a long time, and I fully understand rural issues. When Rockhampton Regional Council came into being with Amalgamation in 2008, the ECQ were careful to ensure that the 3 divisions of 4,5,and 6 comprised some rural and some town/city. I believe this trend should continue.

Yours Sincerely,

CATHERINE ELLEN SMITH (Cr. Ellen Smith, Councillor for Division 4 RRC)

[REDACTED]

# Councillor Drew Wickerson

Division 6

Chair Environment & Sustainability Portfolio



C-31

29 September, 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would be appreciate if you would receive and consider my submission in response to proposed Rockhampton Regional Council divisional boundaries. I have represented Division 6 since 2016 Local Government elections. In addition to this, I have resided in the Division since 1982, and believe I have a sound understanding and relationship with our community.

In support of Rockhampton Regional Council's submission prepared by Acting CEO, Mr Ross Cheeseman, that effectively addressed divisional quota anomalies, I put to you the following arguments for review:

1. Given that Divisions 6 and 5 have similar population, and both are only marginally above the average quota, it is unwarranted and illogical to remove Mount Morgan and surrounding electoral catchments from Division 5 into Division 6, that then necessitates reallocating The Range area from Division 6 back into Division 5 to return quota to within acceptable deviation.
2. Limited response (one submitter) was received to justify any review of the Mount Morgan reallocation. The single respondent's suggestion that 'Mount Morgan should not be in the same Division as Parkhurst' has no validity, is a political and personal comment alluding to the Division 5 encumbant residing at parkhurst, and should be disregarded.
3. **Communities of Interest:** The Range and Allenstown communities identify very strongly with the Central Business District with many long term and multi-generational families, CBD Business owners and professionals residing in these well established areas. In addition, residents share a connection with features such as the Rockhampton Botanic Gardens and have made it very clear that they wish to remain in the same Division. Conversely, Range residents believe that they do not share common interests, either economic, social or cultural, with rural western communities.
4. **Communication and serviceability:** Division 6 includes Bajool and Marmor communities some 30-40min drive to the south. I endeavour to frequently make myself available within the community fortnightly and also at Ratepayer Association meetings each month.

Although by simply glancing at a map, these rural community would appear to be readily accessible to Mount Morgan, they are in fact separated by an insurmountable mountain range, making servicing all rural areas impractical and inefficient.

The community of Mount Morgan have suffered many historical boundary changes and are finally prospering from a sense of stability and unity. Mount Morgan is currently very effectively and efficiently represented and this has translated into a number of exceptional development and social outcomes with many more in final planning stages.

5. **Sensible and definable boundaries:** An extremely steep and impassable Range creates a very effective natural boundary between Mount Morgan and the rural communities of Bajool and Marmor. The Fitzroy River now divides the proposed Division 7 area and a large part of Wandal. This proposal not only creates a difficult and inefficient servicing and representation issue, but also artificially unites communities with vastly different social and economic interests. The Range community is geographically united, and with only a minor exception are naturally bounded by expanses of rural property to the west. This community have always and desire to be connected with the City Centre.
6. **Divisional Boundary Change Impacts:** Revision to boundaries are of course necessary to maintain quotas. They are also potentially disruptive, confusing and destabilising particularly for residents who have been associated with a particular division for an extended time. This is particularly true for more mature residents. I believe that with major external northern boundary reviews currently under consideration, any significant realignments to internal boundaries should be deferred or minimised until such matters are resolved.

Thank you for considering these comments and recommendations. In conclusion may I add that to ensure that all Range residents were aware of proposed changes to their area, I personally walked the area, speaking to residents and delivering an information letter. The positive support I received during this period strongly in favour of keeping The Range community in Division 6 was overwhelming.

Yours sincerely,  
Drew Wickerson  
Councillor Division 6, Rockhampton Regional Council

