

Submission ID: O-0002
Date Received: 10/3/26, 8:23 pm
Name: Kayne Harris
Submission Topic: Electorate Boundaries
Electoral District: Greenbank (formerly Jordan)

Submission:

Dear Queensland Redistribution Commission,

Plea find attached formal submission in regards to the new electorate of Greenbank. Please consider my objections and recommendations, which would serve the people of South Ripley to great benefit.

Kind regards,

Kayne Harris, BArch (Hons), MArch
Registered Architect – Queensland No. 6340

Submission Attachments

south_ripley_redistribution_objection.pdf

Objection to Proposed Electoral Redistribution – South Ripley (Greenbank Electorate)

Dear Queensland Redistribution Commission,

I am writing to lodge an objection to the proposed redistribution of electoral districts outlined in the Proposal for the Redistribution of the State's Electoral Districts (March 2026). I specifically object to the inclusion of South Ripley within the proposed Greenbank electorate.

After reviewing the proposed district maps for Springfield, Greenbank, Redbank, Ipswich and Ipswich West, I believe the current proposal separates South Ripley from the communities with which it shares the strongest planning, transport, and social connections.

1. Separation of the Ripley Priority Development Area

The proposed Greenbank boundary divides the Ripley Priority Development Area (PDA). As shown in the Springfield and Greenbank maps, suburbs within the PDA such as Ripley, Deebling Heights, White Rock and Springfield remain associated with Ipswich-focused electorates, while South Ripley is placed in Greenbank.

The Ripley PDA was specifically planned as a single major urban growth corridor for the Ipswich region. Planning decisions, infrastructure delivery, and community facilities are coordinated across the entire PDA. Dividing this area between electorates risks weakening representation for a unified growth corridor that will house tens of thousands of residents in the coming decades.

2. Stronger community of interest with Ipswich and Springfield

The maps clearly show that South Ripley is geographically and functionally integrated with the Ipswich and Springfield corridor. Residents rely heavily on Ipswich and Springfield Central for major services and employment.

- Employment and commercial centres
- Education and schooling catchments
- Healthcare services
- Retail and daily services
- Major transport routes such as the Centenary Highway corridor

These connections demonstrate a clear community of interest with neighbouring Ipswich suburbs rather than with the predominantly Logan-based communities forming the majority of the proposed Greenbank electorate.

3. Local government alignment

South Ripley sits within the Ipswich City Council local government area. However, the Greenbank electorate predominantly covers areas within Logan City Council.

Where practical, maintaining alignment between local government boundaries and electoral districts assists with clearer representation and advocacy. Including South Ripley in a Logan-oriented electorate risks diluting the representation of Ipswich residents within that district.

4. Representation of a high-growth corridor

The redistribution report acknowledges extremely high population growth occurring in the Ipswich–Logan corridor. South Ripley is one of Queensland’s fastest-growing communities and shares infrastructure needs with Ripley, Deebing Heights and Springfield.

Maintaining these suburbs within the same electorate would allow a Member of Parliament to advocate more effectively for transport infrastructure, schools, healthcare services and regional planning coordination.

5. A practical alternative boundary exists

A more coherent boundary could be achieved by aligning the electorate boundary along the White Rock / Ripley Valley ridgeline and surrounding natural features that already form a physical and planning separation between the Ipswich growth corridor and the rural areas further south.

This approach would allow South Ripley to remain grouped with neighbouring Ripley PDA suburbs while still maintaining logical boundaries and satisfying enrolment requirements. It would also avoid fragmenting the Ripley urban growth corridor between electorates.

Recommendation

I respectfully request the Commission reconsider the boundary affecting South Ripley so that it remains within an Ipswich-focused electorate. In particular, the suburb could reasonably be incorporated into:

- the proposed Springfield electorate, or
- another Ipswich-based electorate containing neighbouring Ripley PDA communities.

Maintaining these suburbs within a single electorate would better reflect the shared community of interest, urban planning framework, and infrastructure needs of this rapidly growing region.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

Kayne Harris, BArch (Hons), MArch

Registered Architect – Queensland No. 6340

South Ripley, Queensland