



# Objection 380

B Gino Salvo - 2

1 page

4<sup>th</sup> May 2018

Redistribution Secretariat for Victoria  
Australian Electoral Commission  
GPO Box 768  
Melbourne VIC 3001

Dear Sir,

**Re: Objection to the redistribution of boundaries of the Electorate of Dunkley**

I wish to lodge an objection to the AEC's proposed boundaries for the Dunkley electorate.

The proposal would see all of Skye, Carrum Downs, and Sandhurst included in Dunkley, with Mornington and all of Baxter going to Flinders.

A better result would be for Skye all in Issacs or Holt, and Baxter all in Dunkley together with Mornington remaining.

With Mornington and Baxter no longer a part of the Dunkley electorate, this would be a huge loss of two communities in Dunkley and would mean that only Mount Eliza is left in the Dunkley electorate as the only Mornington Peninsula Shire Council locality. The rest of Dunkley would be Frankston City Council only.

I believe that Mornington, in particular, is a vital part of the Dunkley electorate and very much helps to support the electorate economically and providing the coastal village lifestyle. This is further supported by Mount Eliza, Mornington, and Mount Martha, as they are intrinsically connected to Frankston and Frankston South as a major community hub of the Peninsula.

This is evident when visiting relatives and friends residing in the southern part of electorate.

Mount Martha, Mount Eliza and Mornington are all in the one Ward and makes sense to keep them together under one electorate representing an inner regional and small agricultural producing district connected to Baxter and Moorooduc. There are many examples in regional Australia where areas of similar agricultural/horticultural sectors are under one electorate.

Socially and economically, the AEC's proposal would unfortunately make the Dunkley electorate into an outer-metro seat except for Mount Eliza.

Yours sincerely,

B. Gino Salvo