

Submission ID: O-0620
Date Received: 8/4/26, 10:20 am
Name: Phil Peachey
Submission Topic: Electorate Boundaries
Electoral District: Hill

Submission:

See below

Submission Attachments

Letter - Phil Peachey.pdf

Tuesday 31 March 2026.

Queensland Redistribution Commission,
G. P. O. Box 1393,
Brisbane Queensland. 4001.

Dear Commission,

As a constituent within the state electorate of Hill, I am writing to object to the proposed redistribution by which the electorate will be abolished, as reported on page 7 of the Wednesday 25 March 2026 edition of The Express newspaper.

Last year, the Queensland Redistribution Commission (QRC) invited responses to the proposed redistributions of electorates in Queensland. On Monday 15 September 2025, I wrote by Registered Mail to express my opposition to the proposed abolition of the electorate of Hill, receipt of which was not acknowledged by QRC. 489 submissions were received by QRC, three of which were withdrawn. 92 submissions were in support of the retention of Hill. Thus, 18.93% of the total number of submissions that were not withdrawn, for all electorates in Queensland, were for the retention of Hill specifically. Almost one fifth of all submissions were in favour of this one electorate, which indicates the strength of feeling that this particular proposal has engendered amongst constituents.

This trend is supported by my own 'polling'. In recent days, I have doorknocked 62 residences in three Tablelands towns and one farming community due to be directly affected by the proposed abolition of Hill, to ask residents' thoughts about the matter. At four places, residents stated their resolute distrust of political persons and politicised matters. Only at one place did the resident decline to respond, on the grounds of not being on the electoral roll. I thus spoke with a total of 75 persons, 73 of whom, including those with a dim view of the prevailing political process, launched into a lengthy 10–15 minute (on average) speech about their disapproval of the abolition of Hill, in which they are all residents. Only one of the 75 persons was in favour of the abolition, and declined to comment any further. What I thought would be a quick 5 minute maximum 'visit' to each residence became extenuated over a few days, such was the willingness of people to speak spontaneously, which shows that the proposed abolition is a matter of great concern to them, including those who said they are 'not into politics'. Editing out colourful and unprintable words, the most common (very common) term used to describe the proposed abolition was 'ridiculous', and the most common (very common) comment related to how out of touch those 'pushing' this 'change' are with the needs of constituents where they live, including with their need for representation, which respondents perceived would diminish significantly if the abolition of their current electorate is proceeded with.

In the data presented in the two paragraphs above, clearly 'the locals' want the current state electorate of Hill to be retained and not abolished. QRC is obliged to recognise that its proposal is at serious odds with the needs and strength of feeling of these people who are directly concerned.

Yours sincerely,

Phil Peachey.