

**Submission ID:** O-0096  
**Date Received:** 11/3/26, 5:18 pm  
**Name:** Kirsty Ingram  
**Submission Topic:** Electorate Boundaries  
**Electoral District:** Greenbank (formerly Jordan)

**Submission:**

See below

**Submission Attachments**

Email - Kirsty Ingram - Objection to Proposed Electoral Boundary Change\_  
South Ripley.pdf

**From:** [Kirsty Ingram](#)  
**To:** [ORC Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Proposed Electoral Boundary Change: South Ripley  
**Date:** Wednesday, 11 March 2026 5:17:16 PM

---

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

Commissioners,

## **Objection to Proposed Electoral Boundary Change: South Ripley**

I wish to formally object to the proposal to include South Ripley within an electorate aligned with Greenbank and Flagstone.

South Ripley is a central component of the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area and sits firmly within the Ipswich growth corridor. Its community, transport and service connections are strongly aligned with Ripley, Springfield, Yamanto and the broader Ipswich region. Placing South Ripley in an electorate oriented toward Greenbank and Flagstone (Logan) does not reflect the actual geographic, civic or infrastructure relationships that shape the area.

### **Reasons for Objection**

#### **Community Identity and Functional Community Links**

Residents of South Ripley and neighbouring suburbs such as Ripley, White Rock, and Springfield are integrated into the Ipswich community. Daily life, including schooling, employment, shopping, recreation and community participation, occurs largely within the Ipswich and Springfield areas. Aligning these suburbs with Greenbank and Flagstone separates them from the communities with which they have established and practical connections.

#### **Local Government and Planning Alignment**

South Ripley and surrounding suburbs fall under Ipswich City Council, which is responsible for planning, infrastructure delivery and local governance for the Ripley Valley growth area. The proposed electoral alignment with Logan-focused communities does not reflect the existing planning and governance framework guiding development in this corridor.

South Ripley has no practical relationship with Logan City Council

governance or representation. Logan-based local government representatives and Members of Parliament do not service, plan for, or represent the South Ripley community in any meaningful way. It is therefore difficult to see how effective representation could be provided by an electorate centred on Logan when the community's governance, services and planning are firmly aligned with Ipswich.

### Services, Infrastructure and Economic Links

Key services accessed by residents, including schools, health services, major retail centres and sporting facilities, are concentrated in the Ipswich and Springfield catchments. The community's service and economic links do not extend toward Greenbank or Flagstone in any meaningful way.

### Transport and Connectivity

Transport corridors and road networks connect South Ripley and surrounds primarily with Ipswich and the Springfield Central area. Commuting patterns, service access and daily travel reflect these established east–west connections rather than a southward orientation toward Greenbank.

### Growth Corridor Context

South Ripley forms part of one of South East Queensland's most significant planned urban growth areas within the Ipswich region. Infrastructure investment, population planning and long-term development strategies are being implemented as part of the Ipswich growth corridor. Aligning this area with communities outside that growth framework risks fragmenting representation for a rapidly expanding region.

For these reasons, South Ripley should remain within an electorate centred on Ipswich and the Ripley Valley, ensuring representation reflects the area's established community, governance and infrastructure relationships.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kirsty Ingram



Sent from my iPhone