APPENDIX D

Comments on Proposal Notice &

Public Submissions

LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHANGE COMMISSION
Divisional Boundary Review of Fraser Coast Regional Council

The Fraser Coast 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 8 July 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/frasercoast 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 Fraser Coast Regional Council is 7,634 with a lower limit of 6,871 (-10%) and an upper limit of 8,398 (+10%).

Comments can be lodged through:

- **Online Form *(preferred)***
  https://ecq.qld.gov.au/lgr/frasercoast

- **Email**
  LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au

- **Personal Delivery**
  Electoral Commission of Queensland
  Level 20, 1 Eagle Street, BRISBANE QLD 4000

- **Post**
  Local Government Change Commission
  GPO Box 1393, BRISBANE QLD 4001

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

Pat Vidgen PSM
Electoral Commissioner

List of Public Comments on the Proposal
Divisional Boundary Review of Fraser Coast Regional Council

Suggestion	Name / Organisation
1a	Mark Spencer
1b	Mark Spencer
1c	Mark Spencer
1d	Mark Spencer
2	Peter Patrick
3	Jacinta Edwards
4	Ron Fossen
5	Maureen Spelman
6	Sue Brooks
7	Kylie

C-1a

Mark Spencer

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Saturday 22 June 2019

ECQ

GPO Box 1393

Brisbane 4001

To whom it may concern,

My submission is in relation to the proposed boundary changes to Division 5.

The exclusion of Burrum Heads and surrounding area from Division 5 will be detrimental to those ratepayers.

Including them with Division 1 will not work because that division is already entirely rural except for the area south of the City of Maryborough.

Division 5 will become even more conservative than it already is if you exclude Burrum Heads and its surrounds.

You can exclude the rural sections of the existing Division 5 and retain Burrum Heads and surrounds and get close enough to the quota.

The villages of Burrum Heads, Howard, Burrum, Torbanlea, Toogoom, Craignish, Dundowran and Dundowran Beach should form the bulk of any revised Division 5.

Regards,

Mark Spencer.

C-1b

Mark Spencer

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Monday 24 June 2019

ECQ

GPO Box 1393

Brisbane 4001

To whom it may concern,

My submission is in relation to the proposed boundary changes to Division 1.

The inclusion of Burrum Heads and surrounding area from Division 5 to Division 1 makes no sense.

Under the proposed changes Division 1 will stretch from south of Maryborough to Burrum Heads.

Division 1 will become a very large and unworkable division because ratepayers from one end will have little or nothing in common with ratepayers from the other end.

You can include the adjacent rural sections of the proposed Division 5 (Burgowan and Takura) into Division 1 to make up the quota and leave Burrum Heads and surrounds in Division 5.

In this way Division 1 maintains a largely rural makeup of ratepayers.

Regards,

Mark Spencer.

C-1c

Mark Spencer

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Thursday 27 June 2019

ECQ

GPO Box 1393

Brisbane 4001

To whom it may concern,

My submission is in relation to the proposed boundary changes to Division 8.

The continued inclusion of Eli Waters and the adjacent area of Urraween in Division 8 will be detrimental to those ratepayers.

Including those areas with Division 5 will work because that division already covers most of the area west of the Maryborough Hervey Bay Rd.

Division 5 will have the smallest number of electors according to the ECQ proposed changes.

You can exclude the rural sections of the proposed Division 5 and by including the area of Eli Waters and the adjacent area of Urraween (west of the Maryborough Hervey Bay Rd), get close enough to the quota.

Extend Division 8 southwards to include more of the newly developing areas of Nikenbah.

Regards,

Mark Spencer.

C-1d

Mark Spencer

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Thursday 4 July 2019

ECQ

GPO Box 1393

Brisbane 4001

To whom it may concern,

My submission is in relation to the proposed boundary changes to Division 5 and 8.

The continued inclusion of the section of Eli Waters south of the Pialba Burrum Heads Rd and the adjacent area of Urraween west of the Maryborough Hervey Bay Rd in Division 8, will not be helpful for those ratepayers.

Including those above-mentioned areas within Division 5 will work because that division already covers most of the area west of the Maryborough Hervey Bay Rd.

Also, the boundary of the State Electorate of Maryborough follows Maryborough Hervey Bay Rd until the Pialba Burrum Heads Rd.

Division 5 will have the smallest number of electors according to the ECQ proposed changes.

You can exclude the rural sections of the proposed Division 5 and by including that area of Eli Waters (south of the Pialba Burrum Heads Rd) and the adjacent area of Urraween (west of the Maryborough Hervey Bay Rd), get close enough to the quota.

Extend Division 8 southwards to include more of the newly developing areas of Nikenbah. That is more in line with the previous boundaries.

Regards,

Mark Spencer.

From: Peter Patrick
Sent: Tuesday, 2 July 2019 10:14 AM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: Fraser Coast Division Review & Boundaries in general
Attachments: info.vcf

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I have just now reviewed briefly the proposed new divisional boundaries for the Fraser Coast Regional Council. (FCRC)

As an ancient member of the PMG/Telecom Australia/Telstra workforce until 1999 I recall that the boundaries used for telephone books were related to "Communities of Interest".

That methodology served very well in it's day.

I'm having great difficulty seeing any form of that approach in the regional boundaries for the FCRC.

I'm also aware that you are doing your best to ensure that there is a similar number of voters in each division.

I ask firstly ... Is this a fair thing ?

Regional areas consist of farmlands where a great deal of the communities wealth is generated.

Cities have a large turnover but how much wealth do they bring into the community.?

I submit that a review of rates income might be interesting and ... a review of the mix of property zoning assessments might also prove interesting.

To look at Division 2 ....

We have rural and urban rural as well as a portion of Maryborough city.

What community of interest do the people on farms and in farming townships have with folks who live in the city ?

About the only common interest I can see is that they do some of their shopping there.

Things that are important in the day to day lives of rural / regional folks are of little or no interest to folks in the city and vice versa.

Is it fair to expect a councillor to represent such diverse sets of needs and aspirations?

We have, here in Bauple, an example of just how badly such a situation can develop.

We have a tiny township with a large urban rural development, Forrest View, some 6Km outside the township.

The whole lot is served as a single community.

But folks in the township live there for a totally different set of reasons to those who live in the urban rural community.

The local Progress Association has [redacted]

In fact the town has had a very sadly divided recent past on account [redacted]

There were three open shops in the town in 2006. From about 2010 until this year there were none. .. [redacted]

So I submit there is a case to consider communities of interest more seriously than appears to be the case at the moment.

Yours Very Truly

Peter J Patrick

[redacted]

Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2019 7:33 AM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: (4325) Fraser Coast Regional Local Government Area - Jacinta Edwards

Online submission for **Fraser Coast Regional Local Government Area** from **Jacinta Edwards**

Submission Details

Name: Jacinta Edwards

Submission Text: I don't belive having a division that has large rural allotments combined with beachside town. Division 1 is wrong it shouldn't include Yengarie/Oakhurst amd Burrum Heads. The areas are so different in needs.
File Upload: No file uploaded ()

Ron Fossen

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

To whom it may concern,

Please consider my submission to boundary changes to Division 5 and 8.

For equity it would be better with quota and size of the divisions if the Division 5 eastern boarder was to be the Maryborough-Hervey bay Road, taking in Augustus Estate and section of Eli Waters to the northern boundary commencing at the roundabout of Old Maryborough Rd and Boat Harbour Drv and continuing west as indicated on the proposed Division 8 boundary.

This would allow both sides of a major road infrastructure, Pialba-Burrum Heads Roads to be consolidated on this very important shared infrastructure.

This would allow Division 8 to have a more defined boundary with the Maryborough-Hervey Bay Rd and bring Sunshine acres into this Division which shares vital access roads into Hervey Bay e.g. Woods Road and Main Street, they are also closely associated with the Sports prescient.

Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2019 3:55 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: (4425) Fraser Coast Regional Local Government Area - Maureen Spelman

Online submission for **Fraser Coast Regional Local Government Area** from **Maureen Spelman**

Submission Details

Name: Maureen Spelman

Submission Text : I and my husband Arthur James Spelman do not wish to lose Cr James Hansen from Electoral Division 1 Tinana. We are also involved with the Community Assocatin in Aldershot and do not wish to lose James here either Maureen Spelman
File Upload: No file uploaded ()

Sent: Thursday, 4 July 2019 11:09 PM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: (4431) Fraser Coast Regional Local Government Area - Sue Brooks

Online submission for **Fraser Coast Regional Local Government Area** from **Sue Brooks**

Submission Details

Name: Sue Brooks

Submission Text : I reside in the Division 5 area and fully support the proposed changes to the boundary for Division 5. Thank you.. Sue Brooks
File Upload: No file uploaded ()

Sent: Friday, 5 July 2019 7:59 AM
To: LG CC Submissions
Subject: (4432) Fraser Coast Regional Local Government Area - Kylie

Online submission for **Fraser Coast Regional Local Government Area** from **Kylie**

Submission Details

Name: Kylie

Submission Text : I think it looks great although I still cannot understand why Aldershot is not entirely with a local Maryborough division. It takes residents a good 45 minutes to drive to Hervey Bay Central yet 15 minutes to Maryborough. Most Aldershot residents will shop, attend schools and work in Maryborough City. The Maryborough Divisional Councillors affect the lives of Aldershot residents more so than those Hervey Bay located divisional Councillors. I am confused as to why a “disconnected” suburb is split between two divisions. I believe the entire of Aldershot should be within Division 3.
File Upload: No file uploaded ()
