

**Submission ID:** O-0676  
**Date Received:** 8/4/26, 5:59 pm  
**Name:** Justin Marshall  
**Submission Topic:** Electorate Boundaries  
**Electoral District:** Moggill; Mount Ommaney; Ashgrove (formerly Cooper); Indooroopilly (formerly Maiwar)

**Submission:**

See below

**Submission Attachments**

Email - Justin Marshall - Feedback on Proposed Electoral Redistribution.pdf

**From:** [Justin Marshall](#)  
**To:** [QRC Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** Feedback on Proposed Electoral Redistribution  
**Date:** Wednesday, 8 April 2026 6:01:55 PM

---

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

This submission relates to the boundaries of the following electoral districts: Ashgrove, Indooroopilly, Moggill and Mount Ommaney.

I wish to raise several concerns with the proposed redistribution, organised below by electorate and the relevant provisions of the Electoral Act 1992.

#### Ashgrove - Section 46(1)(a) and (b)

The Commission's proposal classifies Ashgrove (formerly Cooper) as having "minimal or no changes." While the electorate may sit within quota, the redistribution has missed an opportunity to address a longstanding structural problem. This electorate stretches from Jolly's Lookout at Mt Nebo all the way down to Milton. Residents at either end of this corridor lead very different lives and have very different priorities. Including Mt Coot-tha has not resolved the underlying lack of cohesion. A better approach would be to reshape Ashgrove as a mid-ring suburban electorate by shifting the inner-urban areas of Milton and Petrie Terrace into the Indooroopilly Electorate, producing a more unified community of interest.

#### Indooroopilly - Section 46(1)(c)

Similarly classified as having "minimal or no changes," the Indooroopilly boundaries are mostly reasonable, but the loss of Mt Coot-tha appears to have created a population shortfall that has been addressed in a clumsy way. The boundary now crosses the highway to carve into Chapel Hill, then rather than following Russel Terrace back across, it drops to Moggill Road and pulls in a portion of what was the Moggill Electorate. The justification offered, a "strong argument for this area's connection to the rest of the district", could just as easily be applied to any suburb within a few kilometres of the Indooroopilly shopping centre, given its role as a major consumer hub. Rather than ignoring natural boundaries to plug the population gap, the commission should look northward and bring in Milton and Petrie Terrace instead. This would also address the cohesion issue raised above regarding Ashgrove.

#### Moggill - Section 46(1)(b), (c) and Section 46(2)

The existing Moggill electorate sits at 36,559 electors, 9.03% below the current quota average, and is projected to reach only 37,015 by 2032, which would place it 17.15% below the projected average and well outside the lower threshold of 40,212. The Commission was therefore right to identify that Moggill needs additional population.

However, the method chosen to address this shortfall raises serious concerns. Beyond the awkward eastern boundary adjustments, the electorate now crosses the Brisbane River in the south-west. The boundary drops over at the Bremer River, crosses back at Kholo Bridge, and absorbs Karalee along the Warrego Highway. Karalee falls under the Ipswich City Council, not the Brisbane City Council, and its residents have markedly different needs from those on the northern side of the river. Historically, communities on either

bank have preferred separation, and the continued operation of the Moggill Ferry is testament to that. While crossings like Kholo Bridge and Colleges Crossing exist, Karalee residents heading towards Brisbane tend to take the highway or rail routes further south, reinforcing their disconnection from Moggill. Karalee would be far better represented within an Ipswich-based electorate. Section 46(2) requires the Commission to consider local government area boundaries, and this proposal cuts across two separate LGAs without sufficient justification.

Moggill should remain on its own side of the river and could instead expand further west within the Brisbane City Council area if more population is needed.

#### Mount Ommaney - Section 46(1)(a)

Mount Ommaney sits at 37,122 electors, 7.63% below quota, and is projected to reach only 37,659 by 2032, falling to 15.71% below the projected average and well outside the projected lower threshold. Like Moggill, additional population is clearly needed.

Previously, the electorate's south-western boundary tracked natural lines down to the motorway, encompassing the Centenary suburbs along with areas east to Corinda and Oxley. The new proposal removes Darra and adds Chelmer. ABS 2021 Census data shows Darra has a median weekly household income of \$1,560, while Chelmer sits at \$3,402, a gap of \$1,842 per week. Swapping a working-class community for one of Brisbane's most affluent suburbs fundamentally alters the electorate's character and creates a sharp socio-economic divide within it.

If absorbing the Chelmer peninsula is desired, it should not come at the cost of losing Darra to Inala. Richlands is currently undergoing substantial medium-density residential development, which may allow Inala to meet its population target through natural growth without stripping Darra from Mount Ommaney. Should Inala still require additional numbers, an eastward expansion into Algester would be more appropriate. The Forest Lake community is presently split across the Algester and Inala electorates. Bringing it together would better satisfy Section 46(1)(a) and address Inala's population needs without breaking the established Darra/Mount Ommaney connection. The Commission's downloadable enrolment data by SA1 (available on the Enrolment Statistics page) could be used to verify that these alternative transfers remain within quota.

#### Summary

Population shifts inevitably require boundary adjustments, that is understood. The enrolment data confirms that both Moggill and Mount Ommaney genuinely need additional electors, and I am not disputing the need for change. However, this proposal appears to have resolved population targets in some electorates by making hasty, cascading changes to their neighbours with insufficient attention to the communities affected. In some cases, this manifests as small incursions into adjacent electorates (as between Indooroopilly and Moggill); in others, it means crossing major physical barriers like the Brisbane River (as in south-west Moggill). The result is disparate communities lumped together for the sake of arithmetic.

Beyond the electorates I know personally, similar issues are apparent elsewhere. Gaven, which was already 11.69% below quota, seems to have been stretched even further along its already excessive length with little respect for natural borders like highways and rivers, making effective representation near-impossible. The abolition of Hill appears to have

been carried out with minimal consideration for its community, and in Woodridge, a large portion of the former electorate now sits outside the redrawn boundaries.

Setting politics aside entirely, this redistribution raises a genuine question: were community interests meaningfully weighed, or were boundaries simply drawn to hit numerical targets? Some electorates have been demographically transformed while others remain virtually untouched.

While I recognise Section 45 requires electorates to fall within set population limits, I urge the Commission to give proper weight to the matters outlined in Section 46 of the Electoral Act 1992. The Brisbane River, major motorways, and local government boundaries should serve as firm dividing lines, and the lived experience of residents should carry real weight in these decisions, not be sacrificed for numerical convenience. Established communities should not be fragmented when alternatives exist, as this submission has endeavoured to demonstrate.

Regards

Justin P Marshall

#### Sources

All enrolment figures cited in this submission are sourced from:

Queensland Redistribution Commission, "Proposal for the Redistribution of the State's Electoral Districts," March 2026, pp. 4-5 (Executive Summary, current and projected enrolment tables).

Available at: <https://redistribution.ecq.qld.gov.au/public-consultation/the-commissions-proposed-redistribution>

Queensland Redistribution Commission, "Enrolment Statistics" page, including downloadable current and projected enrolment data by electoral district and SA1.

Available at: <https://redistribution.ecq.qld.gov.au/current-enrolment-and-boundaries/enrolment-statistics>

ABS 2021 Census of Population and Housing, QuickStats:

Darra: <https://abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL30812>

Chelmer: <https://abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/quickstats/2021/SAL30588>