

Submission ID: CO-0055
Date Received: 30/4/26, 4:42 pm
Name: Ben Driscoll
Organisation Name: Australian Labor Party (State of Queensland)
Submission Topic: Electorate Boundaries
Electoral District: All
Related Submissions:

Submission:

See below

Submission Attachments

Email - Ben Driscoll - Comments on Objections.pdf

Comments on Objections to the Proposed Redistribution

A Submission by the
Australian Labor Party
(State of Queensland)





Please address correspondence to:

THE STATE SECRETARY, ALP (Qld.) PO Box 5032 West End Q 4101
1st Floor, TLC Building, 16 Peel Street, South Brisbane Q 4101

Tel: 07 3844 8101

Email: info@qld.alp.org.au

Mr Gregory Koppenol
Chairperson
Queensland Redistribution Commission

By email: QRCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Chairperson,


Thank you for the opportunity to make a final submission to comment on objections to the proposed state electorate districts by the Queensland Redistribution Commission (QRC).

The ALP has assessed the 754 published objections made against the proposed redistribution.

Across a number of submissions, there is significant public concern that statutory factors set out in sections 46(1) and 46(2) of the *Electoral Act 1992* have not been given appropriate consideration or applied consistently by the QRC in its determination of the proposed boundaries.

This submission focuses on reiterating objections made in the previous submission (O-724) and noting the substantial public support for several of the suggested adjustments.

If the QRC requires any further information or clarification of matters contained in this submission, please do not hesitate to contact me.



Ben Driscoll
STATE SECRETARY

BEENLEIGH & OXENFORD

Many published objections refer directly to the Logan and Gold Coast regions, citing the apparent lack of consideration to statutory factors set out in section 46(1)(a) in the proposed boundaries. There is considerable agreement that the distinctive boundary between the City of Logan and the City of the Gold Coast should form the border between the seat of Beenleigh and the Gold Coast seats.

Published objections: O-325, O-330, O-341, O-347, O-354, O-416, O-438, O-547, O-556, O-582, O-604, O-608, O-621, O-695, O-752; each support the ALP submission that creating Beenleigh as an electorate that straddles the Logan and Gold Coast local government areas results in an electorate that defies communities of interest.

Published objection O-162 further supports the ALP submission regarding the inclusion of Bethania into the Beenleigh electorate, facilitating enrolment requirements as a result of reprofiling Beenleigh to a Logan based seat.

The ALP rejects objection O-719 that proposes introducing a further state electorate, Beaudesert, into the Gold Coast local government area on the basis that the Gold Coast retains an entitlement to 11 distinct electorates and maintains a unique and distinct community as set out in our previous submission. The ALP also rejects objections: O-432, O-514; suggesting Beenleigh remain partly within the Gold Coast local government area for the same reason.

GOLD COAST AREA

Independent to any considerations that must be made in consequence to restoring the Logan and Gold Coast local government area boundary as the southern border for Beenleigh, several objections were made to the proposed boundary for Gaven based on the poorly defined communities of interest.

Published objections: O-062, O-166, O-273, O-325, O-341, O-556, O-604, O-608, O-621, O-627, O-695; each support the ALP submission that recognises Nerang as the central hub of the electorate that connects Pacific Pines, Highland Park and surrounding localities through shared schools, sporting facilities, shopping districts and transport hubs.

In addition, published objections: O-273, O-482, O-556, O-582, O-604, O-608, O-621, O-627, O-695; all support the ALP submission that outlined the lack of communities of interest between Merrimac and Carrara with the rest of the Gaven electorate, and instead acknowledging the already established community of interest with the rest of Mudgeeraba.

LOGAN AREA

Several objections were made to the proposed boundaries for Logan based electorates as a result of proposed boundaries that did not sufficiently “limit voter confusion and promote continuity in electoral administration” as stated in the *Proposal for the Redistribution of the State’s Electoral Districts*.

Published objections: O-482, O-547, O-593, O-676, O-752; are in support of the ALP submission suggesting a reconfigured Marsden and Woodridge that better reflect the established communities of interest – and more effectively “limit voter confusion” – such that most electors would remain in their current electorate. Furthermore, published objections: O-547, O-719, O-752; support the ALP

submission that point out the disregard from the QRC to statutory factors set out in section 46(1)(b) in proposing the community of Tygum be included in the electorate of Logan.

Published objections: *O-547, O-719, O-752*; are also in support of the ALP submission suggesting Logan retain the majority of its northern boundary, citing the established community of interest with Park Ridge to the rest of the electorate, and reluctance to contribute to further unnecessary voter disruption.

The ALP, however, refutes the suggestion from objection *O-719* that localities of Woodhill and Cedar Vale be transferred to Logan on the basis that the inclusion of other high growth localities within the Logan electorate results in unnecessary enrolment pressures Logan is unable to sustain. Logan would be projected to grow to +17.80% over quota by 2032 if all changes to the electorate from submission *O-719* were adopted. Beaudesert would also violate quota requirement at -11.43% under quota, forcing it to extend into a third local government area undermining the statutory factors for consideration set out in sections 46(1)(d) and 46(2).

The ALP further notes that this change to Logan undermines the accepted southern boundary of the electorate on Scrubby Creek, and the connection these localities have with the greater Beaudesert area as part of the historic Beaudesert Shire and with students from Woodhill State School overwhelmingly attending Beaudesert State High School.

IPSWICH WEST & GREENBANK

There is near unanimity in the overwhelming number of public objections received regarding the Greater Ipswich area that support the previous ALP submission that South Ripley be included in the Ipswich based electorate in adherence with statutory factors set out in section 46(2).

Published objections: *O-002, O-005, O-011, O-014, O-017, O-018, O-019, O-020, O-022, O-025, O-027, O-029, O-032, O-041, O-045, O-051, O-055, O-060, O-063, O-065, O-087, O-088, O-090, O-096, O-107, O-116, O-131, O-180, O-226, O-365, O-370, O-459, O-482, O-522, O-546, O-752*; are in support of the ALP submission suggesting that moving the South Ripley area into Ipswich West would ensure the communities of interest within both electorates are better reflected citing statutory factors set out in sections 46(1)(a) and (b). Furthermore, objection *O-459* from the Ipswich City Council includes a resolution of Council unanimously passed detailing why South Ripley should be included in an Ipswich based seat.

The ALP notes that several objections propose South Ripley be included in Redbank as the Ipswich based electorate. The ALP submits that due to significant enrolment pressures already present in Redbank, this would result in significant boundary changes to other electorates neighbouring Redbank. On this basis, the commission can only include South Ripley in Ipswich West.

Based on a presumption the QRC acts on the many submissions regarding the locality of South Ripley, the ALP refers to its previous submission suggesting that Greenbank's eastern boundary extend to include Glenlogan and parts of Jimboomba west of the Mount Lindesay Highway to satisfy legislative requirements in section 45(1)(a). The ALP also notes that published objection *O-547* serves as a reasonable alternative to resolve quota requirements in Greenbank, opting to instead cross the Mount Lindesay Highway to include localities Munruben and North Maclean.

The ALP rejects objection O-432 regarding the proposed adjustment to include Rosewood and surrounds into the Lockyer electorate on the grounds that statutory factors set out in section 46(1)(a) are not adequately considered. Rosewood and its surrounding suburbs share core community infrastructure and cultural functions with the rest of Ipswich West.

Rosewood and surrounds use services and assets such as Ipswich Hospital as part of the West Moreton Hospital and Health Service, and policing as part of the Southern Region that oversees the Ipswich area. Students in these localities fall within the catchment for Ipswich schools and play in Ipswich sporting competitions on Ipswich fields.

ASPLEY & NUDGE

The ALP submits that, having regard to the volume and consistency of public objections to the proposed boundary changes affecting Geebung, the QRC should retain the existing boundary between Aspley and Nudgee without amendment.

While the existing boundary cuts through the Geebung locality, it reflects the effective eastern boundary of Residential Geebung separated from the industrial areas in Nudgee. The boundary is made up of a rail line, an industrial estate, a major road and a large golf course noted in the previous ALP submission and in objection O-655.

Published objections: O-487, O-488, O-505, O-507, O-509, O-515, O-518, O-521, O-523, O-527, O-529, O-530, O-531, O-534, O-535, O-538, O-540, O-541, O-544, O-545, O-550, O-553, O-560, O-561, O-569, O-570, O-575, O-580, O-581, O-622, O-625, O-634, O-639, O-640, O-643, O-646, O-647, O-648, O-649, O-652, O-653, O-654, O-655, O-656, O-659, O-661, O-666, O-667, O-672, O-682, O-714, O-717, O-722, O-733, O-735, O-737; all support the ALP submission in opposing the division of Residential Geebung between Aspley and Nudgee electorates, either in principle or in direct opposition to the revised boundary proposed by the QRC.

This demonstrable community of interest in favour of retaining the existing boundaries is highlighted by published objections: O-575, O-717; from Geebung Kindergarten and Pre-School, and Geebung RSL respectively, and the numerous other objections (O-505, O-509, O-515, O-534, O-538, O-545, O-560, O-570, O-625, O-634, O-672, O-714, O-722, O-735) referencing these organisations directly as a reason to retain the existing Aspley-Nudgee boundary.

The ALP refutes published objection O-719 that seeks to excise all of Residential Geebung north of Ellison Road and east of Murphy Road out of Aspley and into Nudgee. The overwhelming majority of public objections do not support transferring any more of Residential Geebung into Nudgee.

The argument offered by the LNP that their proposal would unite all residents using Geebung Train Station wilfully ignores the fact that currently only 12 Geebung residents are currently in Nudgee with the remaining 2,884 Geebung residents currently in Aspley. Under current boundaries users of Geebung Train Station are virtually united in the Aspley electorate.

Geebung residents are more likely to use Gympie Road than Sandgate Road as their main north-south commuting route. This is another indication that Residential Geebung's community of interest faces west to Aspley and not east to Nudgee.

MORETON BAY AREA

The ALP rejects the suggestion contained in objection *O-719* that the localities of Rocksberg, Greenstone and Moorina be transferred to Caboolture. As the QRC is aware, these suburbs along with neighbouring localities to the north will be subject to mass population growth over the next few years given the Caboolture West development. The QRC has already sensibly drawn boundaries in this area to spread the load of high population growth – not completely accounted for in provided SA1 enrolment projections – between the Caboolture and Morayfield electorates. Transferring all this growth into a single electorate is unnecessary and avoidable under the current proposed boundary, and undermines the existing communities of interest these localities presently have with Morayfield.

Until the Caboolture West development is fully underway, the people of Moorina and Rocksberg frequent Morayfield Shopping Centre as their closest retail hub, directly accessed by Caboolture River Road. Their nearest train station is Morayfield Station, their catchment state school is Minimbah State School, and their catchment high school is Morayfield State High School. By suggesting that these localities be put into the new seat of Caboolture, the LNP ignores the very real barrier to access that the Caboolture River presents.

WIDE BAY & SUNSHINE COAST

Residents of the rural localities within the Gympie local government area proposed to be excised from the state electorate of Gympie have objected overwhelmingly to the QRC's proposal.

Published objections: *O-135, O-157, O-161, O-165, O-168, O-179, O-181, O-188, O-189, O-194, O-197, O-199, O-201, O-202, O-203, O-205, O-207, O-236, O-317, O-368, O-738, O-739, O-740*; all support the ALP submission regarding the unnecessary removal of rural localities from the Gympie local government area that have a long-standing association to the Gympie district. Submissions from residents cite the lack of communities of interest their localities have with the remainder of Nambour by referencing the critical health, education and business infrastructure on which they rely within Gympie local government area bounds.

The ALP refers the QRC to its previous submission in detailing how this adjustment could be facilitated with single exchanges between Gympie and Callide, and between Nambour and Coolum that meet statutory factors set out in sections 46(1)(a) and 46(2).

In addition, published objection *O-394* supports the ALP submission suggesting Federal and the southern portion of Cooran be returned to Nambour, citing continuity of boundaries and lack of community of interest with the rest of the Noosa electorate.

The ALP notes comments from objection *O-734* regarding the inclusion of only a portion of Eumundi into the Nambour electorate. The ALP supports the objection's sentiment of keeping the locality together and aligned with neighbouring localities that facilitate the suburb's economy. In the ALP submission, the seat of Nambour would now be an electorate defined by its connection of hinterland communities and could accommodate the balance of the localities of Eumundi, North Arm, Ninderry and Yandina.

BUNDABERG

The assertion in objection *O-719* that the current and/or proposed electorate of Bundaberg does not fulfil section 46 community of interest requirements is ridiculous. The most obvious communities of interest are regional provincial cities.

Post EARC, successive redistribution commissions have seen fit to keep regional urban areas in compact electorate districts with surrounding rural areas only included to bring such districts within enrolment requirements.

The unavoidable consequence of the alternative proposals for Bundaberg in *O-719* is that some urban areas of Bundaberg would be split from it and transferred to Burnett, fracturing the coherent community of interest that the Bundaberg electorate has represented over many decades.

The ALP urges the QRC to maintain its proposed draft boundaries for Bundaberg and reject any arguments about diluting the Bundaberg electorate's community of interest by extending towards the coast or into surrounding rural communities.

MULGRAVE

A number of published objections, including: *O-030*, *O-078*, *O-089*, *O-102*, *O-125*, *O-227*, *O-278*, *O-407*, *O-508*; all support the ALP submission regarding the lack of established community of interest between the Atherton area and established Mulgrave communities defined by southern Cairns and communities along Cairns' southern and coastal fringe.