

**Submission ID:** O-0031  
**Date Received:** 11/3/26, 1:51 pm  
**Name:** Aaron J Pillar  
**Submission Topic:** Electorate Boundaries  
**Electoral District:** Redbank (formerly Bundamba)

**Submission:**

See below

**Submission Attachments**

Email - Aaron J Pillar - Objection to Proposed Electoral Redistribution – Inclusion of White Rock within Redbank Electorate.pdf

**From:** [Aaron Pillar](#)  
**To:** [ORC Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Proposed Electoral Redistribution – Inclusion of White Rock within Redbank Electorate  
**Date:** Wednesday, 11 March 2026 1:51:24 PM

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Queensland Redistribution Commission,

I write to formally object to the proposed inclusion of the White Rock locality within the Redbank State Electoral District as outlined in the current redistribution proposal.

While I understand that electoral redistributions are necessary to ensure population balance across electorates, the proposed boundary fails to adequately consider the community of interest, geographic cohesion, and service alignment of the White Rock area.

White Rock forms part of the rapidly developing Ripley Valley growth corridor and is closely integrated with the broader Ipswich growth region, including Ripley, South Ripley and surrounding suburbs. The planning, infrastructure, schooling, transport networks and community services for this area are aligned with the Ripley Valley development and the wider Ipswich region, not with Redbank or Goodna.

Residents of White Rock have little to no practical connection to the Redbank area in terms of:

- community identity
- local infrastructure and planning
- schooling and health services
- transport networks
- commercial centres and employment hubs

The inclusion of White Rock within the Redbank electorate creates an electorate that is geographically and socially fragmented. The proposed boundaries combine established urban suburbs such as Redbank and Goodna with a rapidly expanding greenfield development corridor that has very different infrastructure needs, growth pressures and planning priorities.

Furthermore, residents of White Rock pay rates to Ipswich City Council, and the majority of local planning, infrastructure coordination and community engagement occurs within the Ipswich growth framework. As such, it would be far more appropriate for the area to remain aligned with electorates that reflect the Ipswich and Ripley Valley growth corridor, where there is a clear and identifiable community of interest.

The proposed arrangement risks leaving residents in emerging communities such as White Rock underrepresented in relation to the issues that directly affect them, including rapid population growth, infrastructure delivery, schooling capacity, road networks and public transport planning.

I respectfully request that the Commission reconsider the proposed boundary and give greater weight to the community of interest and growth corridor considerations when determining the appropriate electoral alignment for White Rock and the broader Ripley Valley area.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important matter.

Kind Regards

Aaron J Pillar

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]