### TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

# PUBLIC INQUIRY OF THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR NEW SOUTH WALES

IN-PERSON INQUIRY HELD IN SYDNEY WEDNESDAY 14 AUGUST 2024

**RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY EPIQ** 

ONLINE INQUIRY
WEDNESDAY 21 AUGUST 2024

RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY LEGAL TRANSCRIPTS

#### TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

## PUBLIC INQUIRY OF THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR NEW SOUTH WALES

HELD AT THE SMITH ROOM, WESLEY CONFERENCE CENTRE, 220 PITT STREET, SYDNEY, NSW

ON WEDNESDAY 14 AUGUST 2024

#### Before:

The Hon. Susan Kenny AM KC (Chairperson of the Australian Electoral Commission)

Mr Tom Rogers (Electoral Commissioner, Australian Electoral Commission)

Ms Rebecca Main
(Australian Electoral Officer for New South Wales)

Mrs Narelle Underwood (Surveyor General of New South Wales)

Mr Bola Oyetunji (Auditor-General for New South Wales) CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. Could I have your attention. Welcome to this hearing of the augmented Electoral Commission for New South Wales. I'd like to begin by acknowledging the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today and pay my respects to their Elders both past and present. Let me introduce myself. I am Susan Kenny, and the chair-person of this augmented Electoral Commission.

The other members of the Electoral Commission are Dr David Gruen, the Australian Statistician, who is unable to participate today; Mr Tom Rogers on my left, who is the Commissioner; and the other members who make up the augmented Electoral Commission are Mr Bola Oyetunji, the Auditor-General for NSW on my right; and Ms Rebecca Main, the Australian Electoral Officer for New South Wales further to my right; and to my left is Mrs Narelle Underwood, the Surveyor General of NSW.

Now, Part IV of the Commonwealth Electoral Act of 1918 sets out what we must do in relation to Federal redistributions. This redistribution is required by law because New South Wales' entitlement to members of the House of Representatives has decreased from 47 to 46. In accordance with section 66 of the Electoral Act, the Redistribution Committee for New South Wales prepared a proposal for the redistribution of the State into 46 Federal electoral divisions. That proposal, together with some written reasons required by section 67 of the Electoral Act, was released by the Committee on 14 June this year.

In accordance with section 68 of the Act, interested individuals and organisations were invited to make written objections to this proposed redistribution and to provide written comments on those objections. A total of 738 objections and 235 comments on objections were received within the required time frame.

Now, the augmented Electoral Commission, that is, all of us sitting here now, are required by subsection 72(1) of the Electoral Act to consider all objections in relation to the redistribution proposal and all comments on objections. The inquiry today provides the opportunity for members of the public to make submissions about those objections. Now, as you're probably aware, the Electoral Act specifies how the redistribution process is conducted and which

factors are to be taken into account. Subsection 73(4) of the Electoral Act states that the primary consideration for the augmented Electoral Commission is that each electoral division meet certain numerical requirements. That is, the redistribution quota and the projected enrolment quota, subject to accepted tolerances or ranges around those with two quotas.

Subject to an electoral division or proposed electoral division satisfying those two numbers, subsection 73(4) also requires that we have regard to communities of interest within electoral divisions. This includes economic, social, regional interests. We also need to have regard to communication and means of travel within electoral divisions and physical features and the area of electoral divisions. The boundaries of existing electoral divisions are also considered but are subordinate to other factors because, of course, borders may change and we are in the process of a redistribution, and often there has to be compensating adjustments to boundaries to make sure the electoral divisions are within the required numerical numbers or tolerances for those numbers.

Now, the inquiry today will be recorded. Transcripts of proceedings will be made available as part of the electoral commission's report, and will be on the AEC website once the report has been tabled in Parliament.

Now, I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that we may have members of the media present at times during the day. They will be asked to focus on ensuring there is an opportunity for speakers to have their say and for proceedings to run smoothly. Should the media have a question, if they are here at this point, I would ask that they speak to the person currently waving their hand, and that any discussion take place outside the hearing room.

If there is an emergency, emergency exits and stairwells are located on the opposite ends of the room. In the case of a fire alarm, please wait for instructions from Wesley Centre staff. And please do not use the lift unless directed to do so. As a practical matter, we would ask anyone making a submission to come to the lectern. The lectern is fitted with a microphone, and we will hear you better and so will the transcript provider. There is a table in front of us, but it hasn't a fixed microphone, so I would ask you to go to the lectern unless you are

mobility-affected, in which case of course the table is there for your use, and you will have a microphone, much as I have, probably subject to the same hazards.

Now, when you come to the lectern, please state your name before you commence your submission. We will try and remind you if you don't, but you will find it easier as soon as you get up to say, "My name is," and then get into your presentation.

The other thing that's important is that all those present are able to make a submission if they wish. To have this happen, we would ask you to keep your remarks to no more than 5 minutes. A yellow card like that will be shown at the 4-minute mark, and a pink card at the 5-minute mark.

Now, subject to timing, there may be an opportunity to provide further remarks once everyone has had a chance to speak, so if you feel at the end of 5 minutes there's a point you'd like to make, you might let the secretariat know and we'll try and hear you before we go.

Now, if you haven't had an opportunity to register but are here today and wish to speak or decide during the course of listening to others that you would like to speak, please make sure that the secretariat is aware that you want to speak. What we will try to do is hear you at the end of those that are registered. If it should happen that we can't hear you today, because there's no guarantee we will hear you at the end, we might run out of time, if that should happen, we will still make sure that we do hear you but it will be by electronic means. It will be online. But everyone will be heard.

There is another thing I wanted to say to you, and that is please don't read out any objections or comments on objections, because we have read them already thoroughly.

The other thing I wanted to say was this week is a Parliamentary sitting, and the augmented commission recognises that it presents difficulties for some Federal MPs who would like to speak. In this circumstance, we have offered video conferencing for a limited number. The maximum speaking time for them is also 5 minutes.

Now, after - one further matter that I will say is as

.14/08/2024 4
Transcript produced by Epig

usual in this kind of inquiry, we will listen to you carefully and we will not interrupt, unless of course we can't hear, in which case we will let you know. After the inquiry, we will deliberate on what we have heard and received, and endeavour to make a public announcement as soon as we are able.

The time has come to call the first speaker, and the first speaker I would invite to come to the lectern is Rowena Dillon.

#### <ROWENA DILLON

MS DILLON: Good morning, augmented Electoral Commission panel. I am very honoured to be here. My name is Rowena Mary Dillon. I am actually here as an individual, here also as the president of the Newport Chamber of Commerce, and as a candidate for the independent team, the Northern Beaches independent team for Pittwater for the upcoming council election.

So I am here to support the current redistribution proposal for Mackellar and oppose the objections 671 and 686 in respect to Mackellar. I say this, and this is based on the grounds that the business communities of interest on the Northern Beaches and St Ives are two totally separate business regions. They have differing community needs and they also have different communities. In fact, us on the Northern Beaches in particular, we are completely different to St Ives, for Pittwater particularly. The various business chambers on the beaches are also linked through their LGAs, and St Ives is linked directly with Ku-ring-gai and its Ku-ring-gai. So the business chambers of the Northern Beaches are all linked through our council as well, and support each other without place-making support through counselling.

May I remind you, although we are on a rainy day today, we aspire to, on the Northern Beaches, shop local and support local and dine local. We have small villages with very small retail businesses that focus on the community supporting local. The people of St Ives don't shop in Mona Vale, Newport, Avalon, Warriewood, Collaroy. So, the people of Newport, Avalon, Collaroy and Mona Vale shop in Mona Vale, Collaroy, Newport and Avalon.

We also are distinctly different in demographic.

Without sounding like it would happen today, because it's a very rainy day, but it's not a rare - you actually - we go - sometimes we go shopping in our swimmers and our towels and with no shoes. In St Ives, I would deem that totally inappropriate. Therefore, the demographic is very, very totally different. The natures of the communities are very, very different.

St Ives is part of the Ku-ring-gai Chamber of Commerce that includes Gordon, Hornsby, Killara, Lindfield, Turramurra, Wahroonga, Pymble, Waitara, Warriewood and Thornleigh. These suburbs, as a demographic and from a foliage kind of perspective of their treescape, is entirely different from Terrey Hills onwards right through to Palm Beach and across the front of the Northern Beaches, with different people with different needs and different communities and smaller communities, and that is why I actually oppose the objection in respect to 671 and 686 in respect to Mackellar. Let's keep Mackellar beautiful. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Sam Ngai.

<SAM NGAI

 SPEAKER: My name is Sam Ngai, and I am the mayor of Ku-ring-gai Council, which starts from Roseville in the south to Wahroonga in the north, from West Pymble in the west to St Ives in the east. I've been a resident of these suburbs for the last 37 years and attended schools in Roseville and St Ives. I've also been a resident of the electorate of Bradfield for these last 37 years, and it's a great community.

One thing that really defines us as a community is our proximity to both the Pacific Highway and the North Shore train line, which serves as our connection to the outside world. Whether we live right on the transport line in suburbs like Lindfield, Gordon or Wahroonga, or whether we live on the outskirts, like East Lindfield, West Pymble or St Ives Chase, we always flock to the North Shore line to connect to the outside world.

Geographically, our community is also defined by the Lane Cove National Park to the west, which separates us from Bennelong and Ryde Council, as well as the Garigal

National Park to the east, which separates us from the Northern Beaches Council and Mackellar. The geographic features physically and psychologically separate us from the residents and shops of the other electorates.

When I speak to the residents in St Ives, their connection is with the North Shore line and its nearby suburbs. They will go to Pymble, Gordon, Killara and Turramurra to park their cars and commute to work or weekend activities. They will also flock to our town centres along the North Shore line for goods and services and community events. St Ives residents consider themselves part of the North Shore and have little connection with the Northern Beaches, and to seek Federal representation they aren't going to travel all the way to Narrabeen. They would rather keep it local.

If you look at our local community service organisations such as Rotary and Lions, they also have a strong history together. The Rotary club of St Ives regularly supports other Rotary clubs or Ku-ring-gai, Turramurra, Wahroonga and Chatswood on jointly run events such as the Bobbin Head Cycle Classic, Wahroonga Village Fair and the Lindfield Fun Run. I have never heard of them jointly running events with Rotary clubs from beyond the geographic divide. Likewise, when I assist the St Ives Lions club with their youth of the year program, the students who apply are ones within east and west geographic boundaries. They are from North Turramurra, Wahroonga, Killara and Roseville. We don't have applicants from the Northern Beaches.

When you look at social media, St Ives has a strong connection to our local Ku-ring-gai and Bradfield suburbs. We have the St Ives community page, as well as the Gordon, Killara and St Ives community group, and when you look at the posts, they all relate to activities and events that occur in the Ku-ring-gai LGA and Bradfield electorate. They hardly mention the Northern Beaches or Mackellar at all. At Bradfield, we embrace our connection to the world via the North Shore line, whereas those people in the Northern Beaches and Mackellar are a completely different tribe. They value their seclusion and geographic inaccessibility from the rest of Sydney.

As mayor, I also see the benefits of having LGAs that align with State and Federal seats where possible. When it

comes to resident queries, I often receive questions that relate to Federal matters and I will refer them to the Member for Bradfield, but unfortunately with State matters I have to check the resident's address to confirm whether they are the 85 per cent that belong to Davidson or whether they should go to Wahroonga. I also appreciate the AEC's proposed redistribution, because when it comes to the North Shore, it respects LGA boundaries and makes a lot of sense. The Federal Member for Bradfield no longer has to spread himself across three different LGAs for citizenship ceremonies, ANZAC Day, Remembrance Day and community events. Instead, he dedicates his time to representing the people of Willoughby and Ku-ring-gai. Meanwhile, the suburbs of Asquith and Waitara rejoins their other Hornsby council communities in the seat of Berowra.

The AEC's proposal also means that the Federal member for Mackellar can focus her efforts on the Northern Beaches Council without having to traverse the geographic divide for events with Ku-ring-gai and the forgotten people of St Ives. Further south, the AEC's proposal also largely aligns with LGA boundaries, and that makes it much simpler for pre-established community groups to know that if they belong to the same LGA, they also belong to the same Federal electorate.

Thank you for listening to me. As mayor, I care deeply for our community, including the residents of St Ives, and I know that they would like to be represented by someone who lives and breathes the North Shore.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Mr Roderick Simpson.

#### < RODERICK SIMPSON

MR SIMPSON: Good morning. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. Roderick Simpson is my name. For the record, I was the instigator of the Voices of North Sydney community group, whose focus is on participation in our democracy. I'd just like to stress that it's a nonpartisan group. It's actually interested in the processes of democracy, and at this point I would like to really commend this process, because it really is exemplary and I think in Australia we really do benefit from such open processes, which are transparent and thorough, with a number of rounds. So it's clearly an exemplary process.

1

10 11 12

13

14

36

37

38

39

27 28

29

30

31

44

45 46 47

I made a suggestion. I did not make an objection because I missed the deadline, I'm afraid, thinking it was midnight rather than 6. But what I'd like to say is that my original suggestion was to do with two things, primarily. One was to do with the community of interest, and I think we have heard from the previous speakers just how important that is to many of us. I'm in the electorate of North Sydney, and I would like to recognise that the proposal does actually now align with the local government areas which we are concerned with in North Sydney.

However, the second part of my suggestion was to do with, actually, a commentary on the population projections. It's unfortunate that we don't have a little projector or something to be able to project numbers, so if you'll bear with me, I do apologise. But the important thing here is to recognise that the projections of population that come from the Australian Bureau of Statistics do not really represent what's happening on the ground in terms of development. Within State Government, there is a set of population figures which are called the "common planning assumptions", which are the result of various agencies coming together, including Planning primarily, to look at what the anticipated increase in dwelling numbers will be in five-year increments in particular, but also longer term, in terms of 10 years. Those figures are readily available, they're on the Planning portal, and those figures are guite at odds or guite different, I should say. to the figures that are on page 20 of the report. You may say that this is fiddling around the edges with some detailed numbers. However, the figures are quite significant.

For example, on page 20 it does say that there is an anticipated very small reduction in population and that therefore there is actually a significant shortfall in terms of the quota, in terms of electors in relationship to the expected quota. In fact, it talks about a 13 per cent - in 2029, being 13 per cent less than the quota, on the basis that there will be a 0.06 per cent this is what I was saying about very detailed figures -0.06 per cent reduction in the population of electors.

In contrast, if we take the Department of Planning figures from a little while ago, which do not include the more recent policy changes to do with what's referred to as the transport oriented development proposals for intensification around railway stations, so putting that aside, but simply the current common planning assumptions that the State Government is planning to, it would seem to me, and this is where the figures get dicey, but it's quite difficult to take the figures, and I think we shouldn't be too obsessed, however we're talking not orders of magnitude here, but a significant amount, where I would say there's actually going to be a 12 per cent increase as opposed to a 0.06 per cent decrease in the number of electors, and therefore, there would be a 3 per cent shortfall in terms of the quota, rather than a 13.16 per cent shortfall, which is actually in the report on page 20.

> So, as I say, the thing that's important here is to recognise that there should be, and could be, a greater coordination of figures in population projections, based not simply on projections, I would stress, but actually what's happening on the ground. So, for example, there will be an additional 6,000 people around St Leonards railway station in the next five years, and those figures do not seem to be picked up in the ABS figures, because of the way that the ABS figures are projected on demographic trends primarily, then they are rectified in terms of an overall equilibrium model, essentially, with the State Government in consultation, but then also remembering that the State Government common planning assumptions do not necessarily - even those don't really represent what's actually happening on the ground in terms of the projected investment.

So, in summary, I think it's likely that the population of North Sydney will be quite close to the 2029 quota, and I think it would be great if that could be looked into in a little bit more detail. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Simpson. The next speaker will be Caroline Gallagher.

#### <CAROLINE GALLAGHER:

MS GALLAGHER: Good morning, and thank you for letting me address you today. My name is Caroline Gallagher, a mother of three girls, and we have been lucky to live in Hunters Hill for 19 years. I am co-responsible for the number of objections and comment of objections you have received to

11 12 13

8

9

10

14 15

16

17

18

19

31

36

37

38

39

44 45 46

47

stop the abolishment of North Sydney. I am also the person who started the Save North Sydney petition, which as of now has about 2,500 signatures. More, actually. I attribute my level of activeness to the fact that I have been part of this North Sydney community. Being an engaged civilian is contagious there.

I just want it recorded that I have done the above as a volunteer, and also as an engaged and activated citizen of my community. I have also personally paid for expenses associated with this, too. I have not been compensated in any way.

I am standing here before you today not because I am against the New South Wales redistribution of the boundaries, as I can see that adjustments need to be made. However, I respectfully believe that the source of your data does not accurately project North Sydney population numbers. I am referencing objection 720, objection 719, and comment on objection 212. And, importantly, I also believe that saving our seat is really worth the additional work and effort that will need to be undertaken to find an appropriate alternative. That said, objection 686 does present a good solution with an outcome that has fewer negative impacts on communities and electors, and I strongly endorse it.

I am standing here because, aside from the many other reasons North Sydney should be saved. I feel it should be said that keeping North Sydney is important for our democracy, as it does democracy very well. North Sydney is unique in the sense that we are a community of highly engaged individuals, who not once but twice have banded together to elect independent members of parliament.

We are progressive and inclusive, as we overwhelmingly voted for marriage quality and said yes to the Voice. We have fought to preserve parks, trees, we have fought against various council amalgamations, we have fought to keep historic sites and many, many more. We are activated and connected because we take our civic duty seriously and want out electorate and nation to be influenced by high-quality and independent political representatives in our Federal but also in our local and State seats.

This was all achieved by actively engaging in respectful and constructive conversations with our fellow constituents, and thus creating an incredible and wide network of people with common interests and values throughout our electorate. This sets us apart, as it requires a strength and community spirit not commonly seen in many other electorates. Hence, great and cohesive communities like ours that generate incredible civic participation should be kept intact.

On a personal note, I never thought I would be community nor politically active, but it did happen. Just by living in North Sydney and becoming friend with people there, you start to care more and more. It's empowering, and a real blessing. I am proud of the fact that my daughters are way more politically and community aware than I was at their age. This is good for my daughters, this is good for my community, good for our country and our democracy.

Australia is unique, as it is one of the few nations to penalise people for not voting, which to me says Australia does want politically engaged citizens. North Sydney, being a highly engaged community, in particular with politics, is therefore to be encouraged and celebrated. I have read more than 250 of the submitted objections, and my goodness, do you need any more evidence how passionate we are, how interconnected we are, of our spirit? If there was a single definition of what a community of interest is, it is our community of North Sydney.

In short, preserving engaged, cohesive, active electoral communities like our North Sydney is crucial for maintaining the strength and integrity of our democratic system. This is a key reason for the continuation of North Sydney as a Federal electorate, and it is in this spirit that I ask the AEC, as one of our democracy's gatekeepers, to find an alternative and not proceed with the abolishment of North Sydney, as there are other and better options. To lose it will be a great shame in a time when we need communities and engagement more than ever. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next person is Ben Raue.

<BEN RAUE:

MR RAUE: Thanks. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. My name is Ben Raue, and I am an independent election analyst and someone who writes about elections and analyses redistributions. I don't normally make objections, but I particularly had concerns about two electorates, and that motivated me to want to make an objection. But here, I kind of want to talk to some general principles that I think relate to those two divisions, and those are the divisions of Kingsford Smith and Hughes. And I have laid out some numbers in my objection around, you know, it's a requirement and it's a good requirement that electorates 12 need to be very similar in population, that we need to try 13 and ensure equal numbers of electors, and that means that 14 sometimes you need to draw constituencies and divisions that cross over strong boundaries and include multiple 16 communities that don't have a very strong link between them.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

What I have been arguing here is where that is done. I think it's preferable that both of those communities, or all three of those communities if necessary, should all have a substantial part of the electorate, and try and avoid situations which I see in both the divisions of Cook and Kingsford Smith where there is one predominant community that makes up the vast majority of the electorate and then a little bit hanging on of another one that's quite separate.

27 28 29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

So in the case of Cook, it is about 9 per cent of the electors proposed live north of the Georges River, and I think that's more problematic than under the old boundaries, where it was 25 per cent. I think if you are a sitting MP, if you are a community member who lives in that area, it's harder to get attention. You are less likely to be someone who, you know, is listened to. And particularly in the case of Kingsford Smith, where less than 10 per cent of the electors live on the south side of the airport. And yeah, so that's the main principle that I wanted to address, was that question around strong boundaries.

39 40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

In the case of Kingsford Smith in particular, part of the - you know, so the way Kingsford Smith has been drawn is it's included this kind of thin strip of suburbs that kind of go along the shore of Botany Bay and cut Barton off from the waterfront, basically. Those areas are now included in the same Local Government Area as a large part of Kingsford Smith on the other side of the airport, but I

3 4 5

6

7

8

9

10

1

2

21

16

27 28

29

40

41

42 43 44

45 46 47

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is

.14/08/2024

14

There is a strong push within that community to have those areas de-amalgamated, and while I'm someone who supports larger council sizes, I think generally that wasn't one that made a lot of sense. If you live in the former Rockdale LGA and you want to go to the former Botany Bay LGA, you basically have to leave the area or you have to kind of run across the tarmac of Sydney Airport. They are quite separate areas and I think if we were to draw Kingsford Smith in that way, that community on the south side of that airport would be disadvantaged.

would argue while that is the case, I don't think that they

represent the same community of interest. They are very

distinct areas. It was a very controversial amalgamation,

and I would argue probably one of the less sensible ones.

To a lesser extent - so I have proposed instead for Kingsford Smith that Kingsford Smith expands north into the southern end of the City of Sydney, places like Rosebery, Beaconsfield, I think maybe Alexandria. Those areas have a much stronger connection. The division, the dividing line between those communities in the areas already in Kingsford Smith is not as strong a divide, it's a line that people are much more likely to cross, and I think it makes sense, and then you can have knock-on effects through Sydney and Grayndler and so on.

And I also wanted to, as someone who is a former resident of Campbelltown, my old high school is in the area that's been moved into the seat of Hughes. I also wanted to object to the inclusion of parts of the city of Campbelltown in the Division of Hughes. I've drawn up one proposed solution to that for Hughes. It's not my favourite solution, but I think there are other ways to do it, and in the case of Hughes as drawn, almost 60 per cent of the electorate is in the Sutherland Shire and the rest is split roughly evenly between Liverpool and Campbelltown, and I argue that it would make more sense to include more parts of the City of Liverpool and even parts of the Bankstown area, the City of Canterbury-Bankstown rather than those parts of Campbelltown. I think the transport links between those areas are quite weak. And that would produce a division that would be easier to represent, that would make more sense, and that those communities would have stronger connections. Thank you.

Meredith King.

#### <MEREDITH KING:

MS KING: Thank you. My name is Meredith King, and I live in the suburb of Milsons Point, which is part of the electorate of North Sydney. I'd like to thank the Committee for allowing me to speak against the proposed redistribution of the Federal seat of North Sydney. In addition to my submission, I'd like to support the current Federal member's submission to retain the electorate of North Sydney with adjusted boundaries, specifically because it gets the balance right between reaching the target of 130,000 electors and keeping strong communities of interest together.

It's on that point of keeping strong communities of interest together that I'd like to make a couple of extra comments around - I grew up on a property in northern New South Wales and I've been coming down to this particular region of Sydney all my life. This is where my family and friends live and have always resided. So when I decided to make the move back to Sydney in early 2023, I wanted to be able to make the move to this particular electorate because after all these years it still represents the values and neighbourhood that have stood the test of time.

I rent in Milsons Point, and I expect to continue to be renting there for a significant amount of time to come, and I count myself lucky to be able to afford to rent in a lovely suburb like Milsons Point. However, as a renter in an area that is slated to have a significant increase in medium to high density housing, I'm concerned about having the voice of renters diluted if our electorate is broken up and absorbed into other regions where the rental demographic isn't as high. We are currently going through a period of rapid change that requires transition to more efficient forms of energy. New dwellings are going to require batteries and EV charging stations, to name a few different things that need to happen, and we need our Federal member, regardless of their political persuasion, to fight for the rights of renters and to understand what a just transition looks like for every member of society.

Within the Federal electorate of North Sydney, a community of interest has understood that and intimately

understands what social justice looks like, including that renters needs are taken into account. I'm concerned that that genuine passion and concern for all members of society, regardless of their economic status, is reduced because of the realignment of those Federal boundaries, and that the voice of community interest is reduced because they are scattered and absorbed suddenly and quickly.

Since Federation, the Federal electorate of North Sydney has embodied that essence of community of interest, which has included public housing projects like the Greenway flats in 1954, and with an in housing availability projected for our electorate, which is a good thing, it is critical now more than ever that our community of interest continues to have a strong voice that advocates for the rights of all.

Thank you for your time. I hope that you take into account that the North Sydney community of interest has been evolving and developing for since Federation, so for close to 123 years. That takes time for those values to develop and to be able to come to fruition, and that the needs and concerns of all of its citizens are taken into account, and we'd like that to continue for another 123 years. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker will be Conor Magee.

#### <CONOR MAGEE:

MR MAGEE: Dear augmented Commission, thank you for providing this opportunity to speak to you today on what is a very important topic in relation to the draft New South Wales electoral boundaries. I would like to discuss what I believe is the most important concern to arise from this draft boundaries, which is the boundaries for the division of Kingsford Smith. This was the focus of my objection, objection 723, and also my comment and objection, comment and objection number 181. The Division of Kingsford Smith --

CHAIR: Sorry, just before you go any further, could you state your name?

46 MR MAGEE: Conor Magee. Sorry.

The Division of Kingsford Smith has always been a division located north of Botany Bay and the Cooks River. There is no justifiable reason for moving it south of the Cooks River. It is not necessary to do so on numerical grounds, and doing so does not strengthen community of interest or any other links between different parts of the electorate. In fact, due to the location of Sydney Airport on the northern banks of the Cooks River, it weakens them to the point of disenfranchising those voters located to the south of Cooks River. It is my hope that the augmented Commission will consider the over a dozen submissions that deal with this in detail, particularly objection number 375 from Ben Raue, objection 421 from Darren McSweeney, and objection 687 from Hilde Risseeuw.

But I won't go further into this well-discussed issue today. What I believe is important is that the Commission really considers what the appropriate boundaries for the Division of Kingsford Smith is. If it isn't to go south of the Cooks River, it then needs to gain territory north of the Cooks River in order to actually meet that numerical requirement. And I steadfastly believe that this is entirely possible in numerical requirements. Now, the existing boundary between Kingsford Smith and Wentworth has been in the same location since 2006, and this division/boundary is a compromise. It's a compromise to ensure that the schools of Emmanuel and the Moriah War Memorial College remain within the Division of Wentworth, where the Jewish community of interest is located, and not in Kingsford Smith. Now, this means that Stanley Street through Randwick, which appears to be a small residential street, is not in fact a random boundary, but is in fact a carefully considered boundary that takes into account community of interest that exist within the area and have been defended by community members, including that local Jewish community and a number of local MPs, previously Malcolm Turnbull, and now the current local MP, Allegra Spender, in her comment and objection 117.

Further east, Clovelly Road is a major road that serves as a dividing point in this region between the suburbs of Coogee and Clovelly. There has been much commentary and a number of objections that moving the boundary south to Alison Road would strengthen Clovelly as a suburb within one division, but in fact Clovelly is entirely located within the Division of Wentworth at present. It would be Coogee that is split between

Wentworth and Kingsford Smith if the boundaries moved south, and this splits a much - Coogee is a much larger suburb, with much clearer communities of interest than Clovelly is. Clovelly is a very small suburb, it doesn't have its own post code, it shares a lot of services with suburbs to the north. Coogee is its own distinct area. And so, it would be a shame to split Coogee along Alison Road, which in Coogee is a very small residential street. It's not a state road like it is further west through Randwick.

10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Now, of course it's also unnecessary from a numerical perspective if Kingsford Smith is contained north of the Cooks River, and it actually presents problems numerically to push the Kingsford Smith border south, because it means that Kingsford Smith has to find territory elsewhere and would have to push further into the City of Sydney. Now, from a numerical and geographical perspective, it's actually my opinion that it would be ideal if Kingsford Smith could be made up entirely within the Randwick and former Botany Bay LGAS. Such an arrangement is advocated by the Labor party in its comment of rejection 170, and I would be supportive of the Commissioners taking this up as an option. But I do accept that due to the community of interest reasons that have been stated previously, which led to the border that has been in place since 2006, that this may be something that the Commissioners are not willing to take up because there is that contention between where that water should be, as has been raised.

29 30 31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

Now, I do believe that the western border is really strong between Kingsford Smith and Sydney, and crossing Southern Cross Drive is problematic. However, that may need to be the case. If that is the case, I would advocate for Rosebery to be included in Kingsford Smith. It was previously included between 2006 and 2012, and part of Rosebery is already in Kingsford Smith. And it is quite different to the remainder of City of Sydney. It has got detached, low density housing, which is very distinct from the high density Green Square area to its north and the terraces in the western part of the City of Sydney LGA. So I would really strongly advocate for the Division of Wentworth to push north into Surry Hills and for Kingsford Smith to include all of Coogee and perhaps Rosebery instead of pushing south of the Cooks River into the Brighton-Le-Sands area. Thank you.

46 47 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed, Mr Magee. Dr Robert Coles is the next speaker.

#### < ROBERT COLES:

DR COLES: My name is Robert Coles. I am a resident of Hunters Hill, which is within the North Sydney electorate. I'd like to speak in regard to communities of interest and I'd like to give an individual idea of why it's so important to me that North Sydney remains as North Sydney. My story starts with my mother and my grandmother. My mother and grandmother moved to Lane Cove area just before World War II. My parents were brides or were sweethearts within the second world war. They got married straight after the war, in St Giles at Greenwich, which is within the area.

My father was a teacher. He taught at Lane Cove Public School. They built a home on a greenfield site in Riverview, where my parents lived for the next 70 years. My mother only left after she was unable to look after herself at home, when she was 94. My father died at the age of 92, but in the meantime he came back to Lane Cove and was the headmaster at the primary school. He, for many years, presented the award for the music person at Lane Cove Public School and it was named after him. My mother died in the nursing home which was next to Lane Cove Public School.

I was born at the Mater Hospital, which is in Crows Nest. The obstetrician who delivered me was in fact early on a GP in Lane Cove. She then became the first female obstetrician in Australia. I went to Lane Cove Public School. I was taught by a friend of my father's who was there when he was a schoolteacher. My next-door neighbour was my year 4 and 6 schoolteacher. The friends that I developed at that time remain my friends. After primary school, I went to North Sydney Technical High School, which was opposite North Sydney station. My uncle, when he was living in Lane Cove, he went to the same school. A teacher that taught him was my science teacher.

That school land was sold and we went to North Sydney Boys. North Sydney Boys at the time had 1,250 students and I was one of 250 in year 12. When we played sport, it was right across at North Sydney Oval. I watched Alan Border score many centuries there when he played for his school.

I was fortunate the be the school captain the first 15, and played many games there.

When I got injured, I went to North Shore Hospital to get stitched up. When my father died, he was at North Shore Hospital. When my wife recently got sick, we went to North Shore Hospital. When we shop, we shop in Gladesville, Lane Cove, and when we need something bigger, we go to Chatswood. We do not go to Ryde, Top Ryde. When my wife got sick, I wasn't going to Ryde Hospital.

Now, why is this important? Well, I believe it shows the community of interest. I am a product of that school. I am a product of the schools that are in that area. I think in the paper yesterday it showed that North Sydney Boys was the top state in the school in the HSC. North Sydney Girls, where my sister went, was number 6. The top comprehensive school was in fact Willoughby, which is again in that area.

The proposed changes disrupt all of those community aspects. They disrupt the transport systems which have been set up. It's the people that really are, that make North Sydney, North Sydney. I have been involved as a volunteer, recently politically, and to me the spirit within North Sydney has never been greater. I think the destruction or dismantling of North Sydney would be an absolutely inappropriate consequence of the redistribution as proposed. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Mark Crew.

#### <MARK CREW:

MR CREW: Commission, my name is Mark Crew. Thank you for fitting me in. I know I wasn't on the main list. My goodness, met another lad born at Mater Hospital. Fantastic.

My family has grown up in the area. I'm going to speak about general on-the-ground observations. I was a Scout leader for 30 years. My wife was a teacher at Castle Cove for 30 years. She taught students of her own students. These people moved back into the area. Our daughter has moved back into the area. I am now the president of my local Progress Association at Castlecrag,

and so we have been reading about the TOD, "transport orientated development", which I call "top down dictated".

Nonetheless, we are going to have an increase in population in our area which I think fits the expectations of the Commission in terms of the total number of voters. I've tried to stay in touch with, and indeed do, many of my ex-Scouts and young people I've known. I try and engage them politically and get them motivated. Unfortunately, it's not widespread. They are absorbed by so many other interests and activities.

But by dismantling North Sydney, you're going to take away one of those foundational rocks, building blocks, of their community that we have tried to express amongst our community. The people who spoke today are so better versed on the nuances of the submissions that have been made. I'm not trying to sway away from that, because they are incredibly important, but it's the community feel, the commitment to our electorate, and indeed my involvement over a long time. I remember when Ted Mack got elected.

I think that's about all I can come up with at the moment. I didn't come really well prepared. But thank you very much for hearing us out.

CHAIR: That's much appreciated. Thank you. The next speaker will be Mark Christensen. Mr Christensen?

#### <MARK CHRISTENSEN:

MR CHRISTENSEN: Yes, sorry. I am another person on the waiting list, and I was sitting there just enjoying the presentations.

So my name is Mark Christensen. I am grateful for the opportunity to add additional information to my objection to the abolition of North Sydney. Firstly, I'll try to give you some reason about why I stand, perhaps not as much detailed as previous speakers, but with as much heart and as much sincerity. And secondly, I might try and sing you a little song because you look as though you're getting very bored - not really. I'll sing you a little stanza. And then I then want to talk about community of interest, predicting the future from the past, and institutions, social institutions, within communities of interest.

So, what's my standing? Well, I'm a slow learner. I've been to six publicly funded institutions. I did my PhD outside of North Sydney. I did my masters of business administration outside of North Sydney. I did my undergraduate study at Macquarie University, getting closer, whilst I was a resident of North Sydney, as a division. I went to North Sydney Boys High, and great to see other colleagues. I went to Castle Cove Public School and I went to Castlecrag infants school.

Those six institutions are publicly funded institutions. Five of them survive. The one that died, and I feel like I'm talking to potential undertakers here, because you are going to kill an electorate, but the one that died was Castlecrag infants school. It died because the government said, "There is not enough demand for primary school education, for early age education, in Castlecrag." I continue to live in Castlecrag. I live in the house that I learned to walk in, and I am now in my eighth decade on the face of the Earth.

Why was Castlecrag sold? Because of projection. A projection from the past into the future. Who bought Castlecrag school? A private school. So there we are. There is not enough demand to continue to run a primary school - an infants school, I should say - in Castlecrag. Again, it was purchased by Glenaeon's school, which is a private school. I see in the street that I live in continuously the numbers of school kids that are going to schools, in private schools, in cars. So I want to talk about education later, but I'm afraid that time is going to get away with me.

Let me talk about communities of interest. My concern with this process is that you are driven by representations, maps and ABS statistical reports. So I've brought a book along with me. It's called "The Mighty Bears!" It's a social history of North Sydney, written around the rugby league club. And it has a map in it. You can't see the map, but the map has - maybe you can make out this line here. That line is the Warringah Freeway, and it bifurcated the catchment area of North Sydney. North Sydney as a rugby league institution drew from as far north as Killarney Heights, as far south as Kirribilli - I don't know why I'm dealing with the K's - over into Artarmon, The Spit, Clontarf.

Now, the creation of the Warringah Freeway actually was a problem because it split the community. The community has recovered from that, and the community is strong, vibrant, as other speakers have given you details about. If it was to lose its electoral representation, I think that it will be harmful, very, very harmful. Whenever I try to engage my local member, it takes some time to get access to that person. If I have an issue, which I do have about public education, I'll have to engage 10 three local members to represent the schools of North Sydney Boys High, North Sydney Girls, Willoughby, and then 11 12 to consider the private schools that are run up the North 13 Sydney line.

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

So I've run out of time. I would - less than one minute left. I would ask you to take a lot of notice of the projections of future population in the electorate, because those numbers that you are working with are poor predictors based on the past to the future. And you have to remember we've just been through a 1 in 100 year event and it's changed living conditions. We now have less people per dwelling. We now have a different set of circumstances, and for you to make a decision that would change things dramatically for us would be a big problem. I've run out of time, but thank you for the opportunity to speak.

26 27 28

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Next speaker is Dr Philip Laird.

30 31

29

<PHILIP LAIRD:

32 33

34

DR LAIRD: Thank you very much for the invitation to appear. I come from the City of Wollongong, and you might ask why.

35 36 37

MR ROGERS: Could you just state your name for the transcript?

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

MR LAIRD: My name is Phillip Laird, and my first question is I hope you've got it right in that we have to lose a seat in New South Wales. I simply cannot follow the logic in your original report. You know, if it's going down from 151 to 150 members overall. So I hope you can address that question in more detail in your final report.

45 46 47

Assuming that that is the case, and I question it,

that brings back to mind the situation in the Northern Territory many years ago, whether it - should it have had one or two Federal members. That was difficult, and I appreciate that this is difficult. But North Sydney, I think, needs another look at.

Why? Why North Sydney? Why should it be of relevance to someone from Wollongong? Well, firstly, I had the honour of working not for them or with them, but interacting with the late Ted Mack. As the Lord Mayor of Sydney, he and I stood on a ticket together to try and get on the NRMA council in 1986. I had the honour of working alongside him in State Parliament and I appeared before him in a Federal committee, and his service was exemplary.

I regard the contribution of the current member as significant, and I think we need more approaches, community-led approaches, in our Parliament, and I appreciate her taking on not only electoral matters, but matters of wider significance, including reducing emissions and in transport.

Now, the other question I have is that we say, "Right, New South Wales hasn't grown as much as the rest of Australia, so it has to lose a seat." But hang on, Greater Sydney is growing faster than the rest of New South Wales. So if you apply the logic, that, "New South Wales, you're not growing fast enough so you have to lose a seat," and if the rest of New South Wales is not growing as fast as Sydney, then maybe a seat outside Greater Sydney should have been looked at for dismantling and abolition.

And finally, it's not - you think of some of the notable people who have lived in North Sydney. Sister Mary MacKillop, Australia's only canonised saint. I mean, Billy Hughes. You know? I mean, a Federal politician. He had many different seats, but North Sydney was one of them. And so my main point, though, is I think we may have underestimated the impact of that metro, which hopefully will open this month, as it was supposed to open. That will put Chatswood within about 12 minutes of Martin Place. I think you will probably see conversion of some underutilised office buildings to residential apartments at the time, and - do not underestimate the impact of that new Sydney Metro. It's going to be very significant.

I don't think I can say anything more, except if you

do want to abolish something within the Greater Sydney area, then I would support the suggestion or recommendation of the present Member for North Sydney. Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Laird. The next speaker is Isobel Tyquin.

#### <ISOBEL TYQUIN:

MS TYQUIN: Hi. My name is Isobel Tyquin, and I would like to speak to the proposed abolition of the seat of North Sydney as well. And I'd like to talk about communities of interest and representative democracy.

In early 2022 I joined a group of young people who were frustrated by the lack of progress in representation from our Federal MP at the time and wanted to make a change. In the two and a half years since then, I have become one of the leaders of this group and I have worked with young people from Cremorne to Hunters Hill to advocate for the interests of young people in our electorate, and also for greater civic participation of young people.

I do think that representative democracy is incredibly important, and the presence of communities of interest in and across the current electorate of North Sydney have been vital to the representation of North Sydney as a whole. I think there's quite a strong community identity across North Sydney, within its current boundaries, and I do think North Sydney is a glowing example of what can be achieved with good political representation. And by abolishing the seat of North Sydney, it would dilute this representation that has been achieved by tacking parts of this aligned community onto separate parts of - onto quite different parts of Sydney.

I live in Artarmon and I would become a constituent of the electorate of Bradfield under the proposed changes. I don't believe that Artarmon as an area has very much to do with Hornsby or some of the Upper North Shore, where - and to find good political representation, I don't feel can be achieved. While it can be achieved with people with different views, I don't think - I think it is more effective when there is a strong sort of cultural and community identity.

 Yeah, I don't know. Yeah, I think that's it. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Chris Quilkey.

#### <CHRIS QUILKEY:

MR QUILKEY: Good afternoon, Chair and inquiry members. Thank you for this opportunity to address you. My name is Chris Quilkey, and I am the deputy mayor of Blacktown. I am a councillor in ward one of Blacktown LGA, which falls entirely in Greenway, and I am here to speak about Greenway. I might add I was born in North Sydney, I lived in and I was raised in North Sydney and I am a diehard Bears supporter. I live in the North Sydney diaspora, which is everywhere else.

I wish to expand on my submission in respect to the proposed addition of the Box Hill/Beaumont Hill subdivision currently in the electorate of Mitchell to the electorate of Greenway. It seems to me that this subdivision was added as an afterthought following the proposed insertion of part of McMahon into both Greenway and Chifley, for whatever reason that I am not aware of.

In expanding McMahon across its northern border into Greenway and Chifley, it seems to me that the boundary drafters could not find a suitable natural boundary to differentiate electorates until they came to the railway line. This then left a hole in the number of electors in Greenway that needed to be filled somehow. The proposal to transfer electors from Mitchell to Greenway to do that is in fact the tail wagging the dog. I submit that a different natural boundary be found for the northern border of McMahon, such as Bungarribee Road and Leabons Lane, overcoming the need for additional voters into Greenway, alternatively that the Box Hill/Beaumont subdivision be removed and natural population growth be used to expand elector numbers in Greenway.

In terms of the community interest, the subdivision of Box Hills/Beaumont Hills falls in the Local Government Area of Hills Shire Council, Federal electorate of Mitchell and the State electorate of Castle Hill, formerly The Hills. Now, I doubt that you could find any two neighbouring councils that have more dissimilar communities of interest

politically than Blacktown City Council and The Hills Shire Council. They are polar opposites. The same applies to the corresponding Federal and State electorates. The Hills Shire Council has four wards, each with three councillors, plus a popularly elected mayor. Currently the break-up is a conservative mayor, 10 conservative councillors and two Labor councillors. And I use the word "conservative" because the Liberals did not endorse any councillors for the last election, although many of those supposed independents are now standing as Liberals in the upcoming council elections. Put another way, conservatives comprise 84.6 per cent of elected representatives and Labor 15.4.

Blacktown City Council has five wards, each with three councillors, including the mayor elected by the councillors from our number. For each of the past two councils on which I have served, there were 10 Labour councillors, 66.7 per cent, and five Liberal councillors, 33.3 per cent.

The Federal electorate of Mitchell is described by Wikipedia as the most conservative metropolitan electorate and the second-most conservative electorate in Australia, after the Division of Maranoa. In 2022, the current Liberal member achieved 60.69 per cent of the two-party preferred vote, versus 39.31 per cent for Labor. In Greenway at the same election, the current Labor member gained 61.53 per cent of the two-party preferred vote, versus 38.47 per cent for the Liberal candidate. A polar opposite.

In 2023 State elections in The Hills, the current Liberal member achieved 60.9 per cent two-party preferred versus 39.1 per cent Labor. The neighbouring State electorate of Riverstone, which falls almost entirely within Greenway at the same election, the Labor candidate won 53.7 per cent two-party preferred, versus 46.3 for the Liberal candidate. A substantial difference. Maybe not a polar opposite, but still substantial. I submit that there is virtually no community of interest politically on any level between the two electorates.

In the past year, Blacktown City Council has conducted 12 citizenship ceremonies, each averaging 400 new citizens plus one super-ceremony of 1,200 citizens, a total of approximately 6,000 new citizens. Of these, approximately two in three resided in Greenway and one in three resided in Chifley. This means some 4,000 new citizen electors in

Greenway in one year alone. Bear in mind that the current redistribution is based on the number of electors enrolled on 9 August 2023. The Greenway population has already increased by 4,000 from the pre-distribution total, less an allowance for emigration and deaths. Extrapolating these figures and assuming consistency in ceremony numbers, that means some 12,000 new citizens and electors in Greenway before the next election and the potential redistribution in 2028. That is sufficient on its own to make up for the proposed number of electors coming in from Box Hill and Beaumont Hills.

I see I'm out of time. I have condensed my speech notes. I would like to hand up my speech, if I may, and there is a whole lot of data in it that would be boring to read out.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Could you give that paper to the member and secretariat. Thank you very much indeed.

The next speaker will be Passang Kyipa. I apologise if I've mispronounced that.

#### <PASSANG KYIPA:

MS KYIPA: Good afternoon, everyone. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we are gathered here today, and I pay my respect to Elders past, present and emerging.

My name is Passang Kyipa, the vice-president of Tibetan Community of NSW Incorporated. Dee Why is the centre of one of the largest Tibetan communities in Australia, and I stand here to represent our community and raise our interest of our community. The Tibetan community has been established since 1990, and we have 11 committee members who run the Committee. The Committee members elect all the Committee members every two years and we all work as volunteers. Our community previously made a written submission to the AEC, comment 63. However, those comments were made before the AEC's draft boundaries were published.

Now that our community has had time to consider the AEC's draft boundaries for Mackellar and Warringah, I'm here today to present additional comments to you. On behalf of Tibetan community, we support the AEC's proposal

to unite community of Dee Why into the electorate of Mackellar. Our community has a strong relationship with Mackellar and beaches. It will be highly beneficial for our community to be united under one MP. As we outlined in our initial statement, comment 63, our Dee Why community is currently split between two electorates, Warringah and Mackellar.

As our community is run by the volunteers, it is very difficult to coordinate with two Federal MPs. For meetings and special events, this is a major obstacle for our community. Dee Why has been joined with Mackellar electorate, it will help our community to communicate, raise our concerns effectively, and will help us to feel that we are united and belong to one area rather than being divided and we can't raise all our community members' concerns effectively with our MPs.

Uniting Dee Why and Mackellar, forming one electorate, would not only strengthen our bond as a community but also amplify our collective voice. Since we submitted our comments to AEC, we understand that others have proposed parts of Dee Why should be moved to Warringah. Those performances failed to link all of the Dee Why, as they leave parts of the Dee Why community on the west side of the Pittwater Road still separate from the rest of the Dee Why. We are deeply concerned that those objections, including 671 and 686, fail to unite our community. On this basis, we oppose the proposal and hope that the AEC will stand by its decision to allow our and Dee Why community to be united with Mackellar. Thank you so much.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Gareth Evans.

#### <GARETH EVANS:

MR EVANS: Good afternoon. My name is Gareth Evans, which of course has political implications and political infamy, some say. Notwithstanding, I am here, as you might not be surprised to hear, to object to the dissolution of North Sydney electorate. I understand the need for the redistribution but object to dispensing with North Sydney for two major reasons. One, you've heard a lot about the history and I will not dwell on that too much other than to say I think we dispense with our physical history too readily, and indeed with our cultural history, and I think

2 3 4

1

5

14 15 16

17

18

13

25 26

27

34 35 36

37

38

43

44

45 46 47

it's - there are other ways of dealing with that. But the main reason, as others have spoken, is the loss of community.

I have been a 40-year resident of Lane Cove West, and - in the same house, actually, which probably says a lot about me. But I've also been on the P&C of local schools and been a coach and manager of several junior sporting clubs, including football, cricket, Little Athletics and occasionally AFL. Now, the reason I mention this is I think this brings a little bit of fresh evidence to the thing, is because all our schools and all our sporting clubs compete within the North Sydney area or indeed further north.

Personally, I'm somewhat dismayed to find that the proposal will push us westwards into Bennelong. We have a natural physical boundary, western boundary to Lane Cove, and that's the Lane Cove River. And guite frankly, even though I walk alongside the Lane Cove River, we really have very little reason to cross it for any particular means of dealing with our daily lives. I've been to Parramatta once, I think, in about a decade, and our new boundaries will be out there.

What I'm saying is we have everything to do with the Northern Sydney suburbs and nothing to do with the suburbs west of the Lane Cove River. It's one of my pleasures in life, to walk around having coached all these kids, as a senior, to walk around our North Sydney suburbs and see the parents and kids that I've coached, and that's lovely. I wouldn't know a soul, I don't think, west of the Lane Cove River in that regard.

We have a community MP in North Sydney, and not for the first time, a true community MP. I think it shows that North Sydney has in the past and currently shows the best of democracy, that we have community representation.

The major objection I have is that a three-way split completely destroys that community. Even a two-thirds split would be better, but it will be far better in terms of my experience in my 40 years at Lane Cove West, would be to push the boundaries northwards, where we naturally are drawn to. Thank you for your time. It's been a pleasure to have the opportunity.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Charlotte Bonnar.

#### <CHARLOTTE BONNAR:

MS BONNAR: Good morning. My name is Charlotte Bonnar. I'm a resident of Mackellar. I have lived in Mackellar for 11 years and I also work in Mackellar. Before I start, I'd like to thank the Australian Electoral Commission for the work that's been undertaken to date in relation to this enormous task of boundary redistribution for New South Wales.

I have submitted comment COB118 in relation to objections 82, 671 and 686. In my comments, I confirm my support for the AEC's proposed draft boundary for Mackellar. I believe that this proposal makes sense geographically, socially and economically. I also note that several objections and comments have been submitted opposing the AEC's proposal, as referenced above, by people living outside of the Mackellar electorate. I would like to provide additional comments today to supplement what I have already provided in writing.

So, firstly, I would like to talk a little bit about communities of interest. I fully support the AEC's proposal to reunite the communities of Frenchs Forest and Dee Why into Mackellar. Specifically in relation to Dee Why, I would just like to note that objections raised by others do not acknowledge that the majority of Dee Why is already within Mackellar. This includes Dee Why's commercial centre and the beach. These same objections, including 671 and 686, propose removing Dee Why, Frenchs Forest and other southern suburbs from Mackellar and replacing them with St Ives and St Ives Chase. Not only would the expansion of Mackellar west to St Ives separate the St Ives from the rest of its LGA, as we have already heard this morning from mayor Sam Ngai, but it would result in the St Ives electors becoming a significant minority in an already geographically large electorate that's Mackellar. So the St Ives community would become - account for only around 10 per cent of the total Mackellar electors.

 And I note comments made by Ben Raue earlier today about the issues associated with minorities from one local authority area within large electorates in terms of

difficulties with equal representation from their MP. Of the 47 current New South Wales Federal electorates, only three have electors from two local government areas and have more than 90 per cent of their electors in one LGA, and these are Greenway, Newcastle and Grayndler.

I would next like to talk a little bit with about economic factors and travel. So, St Ives is within the Ku-ring-gai LGA. Page 19 of the Ku-ring-gai Retail and Commercial Centres Strategy from August 2020 states that the LGAs of Sydney, Ku-ring-gai, Willoughby, North Sydney and Ryde are the workplace of almost 80 per cent of Ku-ring-gai's working population. So 80 per cent of people who live in the Ku-ring-gai Council area work within the Upper North Shore area.

In addition, the strategy also indicates that commercial and shopping activity in Ku-ring-gai is focused within the Upper North Shore, not the Northern Beaches, north and south along the transport corridors. And I think this was also referenced by mayor Sam Ngai earlier, also. It's only a short, 12-minute bus ride from St Ives to the North Shore train line, with the quick links that that provides to the large commercial centres of Hornsby, Chatswood and of course the city.

It is unrealistic to believe that there is any significant flow of commercial and economic activity between St Ives and the rest of Mackellar in the Northern Beaches. This isn't surprising, given the significant natural barrier between St Ives and Mackellar that is the Ku-ring-gai and Garigal national parks. Given this natural barrier and the 17 kilometre distance between Mona Vale and St Ives, it's also not surprising that active and public transport between those two areas is far from ideal. The Mona Vale Road West traffic and transport assessment of 2017 notes that the lack of active transport along this road, that being Mona Vale Road West, is a reflection of the challenging nature of the terrain.

Thank you, I've run out of time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Alison Hamill.

<ALISON HAMILL:

MS HAMILL: Good afternoon, Commissioners, and to everybody else here in the room. My name is Alison Hamill. Thank you for the opportunity to address you regarding the Division of North Sydney. I also represent my husband Derek Hamill, who can't attend. We have lived in North Willoughby since 1998 and are voters in the electorate of North Sydney, where we have many connections. I have never been politically fired up, and certainly never imagined myself presenting to this esteemed panel today, but voting and volunteering in North Sydney has made me a political animal - well, a pussycat at least.

So my motivation for presenting to you today is to speak further to our objection number 707, and particularly regarding North Sydney's passionate and community-spirited heart. "Passion", "passionate", in our opinion these words are overworked in the modern lexicon, so please excuse the robust work-out I am about to give them in the remaining minutes.

Regrettably though, many Australians aren't passionate about their democratic privilege to vote. Sadly, much of this laissez-faire attitude can be attributed to the lack of community engagement by political parties. This is not the case in North Sydney, where much of our community is politically enfranchised. This is clearly demonstrated to the AEC by the number and the passionate voice of representations today, the large number of objections and comments on objections lodged, and over 2,500 signatures on our Save North Sydney petition.

I would like to share with you today some further insights into North Sydney's impactful democracy. For example, our Federal member and her team regularly engage and consult with voters and provide them with information so they can make informed decisions. A fine example is last Thursday's ageing well seminar on death, dying and grief, convened by the Federal Member for North Sydney, which I, along with over 90 others from the area attended and found extremely worthwhile. And the North Sydney community updates, mailed to all constituents, are a written testament to the seat's ongoing achievements for our community. Just last Monday, I was part of a volunteer working bee to pack and post another 1,000 welcome packs to new voters in the electorate, one of many ongoing working bees.

 Lastly, but certainly not least, the immediate "Where do I sign?" responses from North Sydney residents who were canvassed during the Save North Sydney campaign, responses which will stay with me always, especially those from objection 564, page 27, Cremorne's adorable in-their-90s Mr and Mrs Mansell, whose family have lived and owned property and paid rates for over 100 years in North Sydney and still live in the area. Or objection 562, page 57, from 83-year-old Adrian from Lane Cove, who signed his objection, then added "Leave the beep thing alone." Adrian and I agreed to somewhat temper this more colourful expletive for a milder "Leave the stuffing thing alone."

And this final scenario: dusk has fallen, I've run out of Save North Sydney flyers after five hours of letterboxing and decide to call it a day. Despondent at only two objection signatures, I head homeward in my trusty pavement pounders and cross the Warringah Freeway overbridge at the top of West Street and Crows Nest. But then I realise I'm heading the wrong way. I turn, and above the roar of the traffic, speak with two residents who don't think it at all strange that I've accosted them to talk about the draft proposal to abolish the seat of North Sydney, and happily sign objections.

My canvassing good fortune continues as I walk through the populus in St Thomas Rest Park, where locals are making their way home, picking up children from day care, walking their dogs. And although they are all busy with their everyday lives, five more still stop, listen and sign, all in the space of 30 minutes. Happy days in volunteer land, and as I sleep soundly that night, who would have thought a necropolis could be such a lucrative cache of volunteer support.

And I humbly pat myself on the back, because it was my idea to provide a written submission, and this resulted in 300 objections. Such is the level of political engagement in North Sydney.

In closing, Derek and I don't envy the AEC in its impossible position of trying to equitably appease the wishes of all voters. But equally, the instances cited highlight the passionate - ding, there's that word again - community spirit, and democracy in North Sydney doesn't get any more real than this. To this, the people of North Sydney respectfully ask the AEC to retain our founding

Federation seat and to allow its strong and independent political heart to beat and flourish into the future. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Zoe Baker.

#### <ZOE BAKER:

MS BAKER: Good afternoon. Thank you. Before I begin, I'd just like to acknowledge that we are here on Gadigal land and pay my respects to Elders past, present and emerging.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. By way of background, I was born and bred in the North Sydney Local Government Area, part of the greater North Sydney federation seat. I was born there at the Mater Hospital on the then Pacific Highway at Crows Nest, I was educated at North Sydney Demonstration School, Neutral Bay Public School and North Sydney Girls.

My mother first arrived in North Sydney in the late 9160s and is still, at 82, living there today. My family has long and deep connection to this area. I speak to you today, though, as a private citizen and resident of North Sydney, but I think it's important that you understand that since 2008 I have had the privilege of serving as a councillor on North Sydney Council, and I am currently the mayor, but I do not represent the views of North Sydney Council formally today.

In short, I would like to strongly urge you to reconsider the abolition of this historic Federation seat, on the grounds that insufficient weight or consideration has been given to the planned population growth of the local government areas within the seat, and particularly as that relates to State Government housing policies.

I will, by way of example, confine my remarks to the North Sydney Local Government Area, but I can assure you that those trends that I will be talking about today are echoed across all of the local government areas within the Federal seat, particularly Willoughby and Lane Cove. The North Sydney Local Government Area is one of the three most densely populated local government areas in the State of New South Wales. At 10.49 square kilometres, there are currently 72,000 residents. 89 per cent of the population

live in medium and high density dwellings.

1 2 3

 Under council's existing plans, with no further amendment by the State Government, we are planning for and delivering an additional 19,500 population - that's 27 per cent above the existing population - by 2036. Following the announcement of the metro project in July 2016, the State Government announced a plan to precinct for Crows Nest and St Leonards, and ultimately that became what is known as the 2036 Crows Nest St Leonards plan. Under that plan, that precinct alone, which is a very small part of the greater Federal seat, is to absorb and produce an additional 6,683 new dwellings by 2036.

As of today, in the North Sydney Local Government Area, and I am giving this to you to say this isn't just plans, this is happening on the ground, there are 1,078 new dwellings that have been approved under planning proposals or are subject of development applications. In late May of this year, the minister, state minister for planning, announced new housing targets for the North Sydney Local Government Area, in fact for 43 metropolitan councils. For the North Sydney Local Government Area alone, and that's not Willoughby or Lane Cove, also in the seat, 5,900 completed new homes - and that's a new planning piece of jargon - but completed new homes by 2029.

And so, I cannot say to you more strongly that when I read your draft decision, it just did not ring true for what is happening on the ground in terms of planned and future population growth. And on that basis, I think it is exceptionally short-sighted that you would abolish the seat, which with the sorts of growth levels that we're talking about, and I cannot stress enough that the North Sydney examples are just examples of one portion of this seat - it is echoed in each of the other local government areas - that you will be having to undertake another distribution, I would say by 2029 at the latest, because the population figures that are held by local and State governments do not seem to have much relationship to those that you based your decision on.

The second point, as a resident, that I must echo the statements made by the previous speaker: the community of interest within the Federal seat of North Sydney is a special one. I'm sure every seat tells you this, but it is particularly evident, for example, in 2016 as they were

planning that big new population growth at Crows Nest and St Leonards, the State Government sought to abolish a number of the local councils within the Federal seat of North Sydney. North Sydney, Willoughby, Lane Cove, but particularly North Sydney and Lane Cove councils, fought the State Government and won.

And much of the basis of that decision and that passionate fight was about retaining what was a special community of interest. And so, I would repeat what I said in my submission to you, which is that there is something about - it is different, what is happening in the Northern Beaches, which is separated by water, to what is happening along the North Shore rail line part of this seat of North Sydney. It is significantly different, and I would say that, speaking as someone from the North Sydney Local Government Area, there is a long and strong tradition of independence.

And I will finish with a plea that when I told my mother that I was coming to speak today, she said to me-she, unfortunately, has COVID, and she said, "I would have liked to have said to the panel that we have had, for most of the history of the seat of the Federal seat of North Sydney, we have had terrible duds as local members, and we finally have a very engaged and energised local member who is community-focused, and not just community-focused, she is held up on the wings of a very engaged and active population." And so, on that personal plea, I would ask that you please do retain the Federal seat of North Sydney, not least because on population alone I think you'll be having to revisit it within the next five to 10 years. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you so much. The next person is Vivian Bayl.

## < VIVIAN BAYL:

DR BAYL: My name is Vivian Bayl, and I live in the North Sydney electorate. I would like to thank the Committee first of all for the opportunity to speak. I think it's a wonderful opportunity. It shows democracy in action, so I really support that.

I'm a new person coming into this electorate.

Originally, I moved here only 11 years ago, having lived in

Bennelong for 53 years. So I lived in Epping, brought up my family and had a lot of links there, but never experienced the sort of community that I have experienced in the North Sydney electorate.

The character of Epping changed dramatically with the opening of the metro line to Chatswood, which is around the time that I actually moved from that area, because Epping was changing so dramatically, with that change, because it made that transport link, and as a result there was big changes in the actual level of development, with much high-rise. And anybody who travels through Epping on the railway line these days will see all the towers around Epping station, 24-storey towers.

The thing is I've noticed very much that accelerated development where the metro line goes through. So it goes to north western Sydney now, and we have to remember again, as other people have mentioned, that the metro will open in North Sydney, in the North Sydney electorate, within this month, hopefully. There are stops in Crows Nest, in Victoria Cross, which are North Sydney, and I think again we are going to be seeing huge development.

I was very appreciative of the comments from the Mayor of North Sydney, because I'm well aware that in Crows Nest particularly there are requests to try and increase the height development of the actual - what is currently allowed by about another six storeys which will make it much more attractive to developers to build around the Crows Nest metro station.

That increase in height is basically waiting for approvals, it needs to be gazetted, but we will actually see a very much significant increase in population in that area, as has been discussed by other people. We have to remember of course that past performance does not indicate future performance, as we are always told when looking at businesses. And I think the same applies for population. And I think what we know about the population and the projections on population are already out of date. And I think we need to be looking to the future and not relying on what the past tells us.

My other major concern is that Crows Nest is being split three ways. Crows Nest is going to become three different electorates, and I will be - I am very concerned that in fact, that puts each of those little corners of Crows Nest into different electorates. And as a result, they will be on the periphery of those electorates, and I think we will have little chance of getting much interest from the local members who will be based in places like Manly, Bennelong and moving - just moving everyone around to such an extent that they are no longer focused in the Crows Nest area, which is a huge development area.

There is also the issue that Crows Nest is very much a health hub. It has - again, they will end up in three different areas. So we have the Mater Hospital, and some people have spoken about that. And of course we have North Shore and also the hospital, Greenwich Hospital, which is actually a palliative care and rehab hospital. So that will bring in three different electorates, and I think that creates issues too, because many people have been involved with one or other or combinations of those hospitals. Many of the doctors live in the area. I am a doctor myself. Many of the doctors also have rooms and so on in that area, and it means that the cases they are working will be in different electorates and will have different responsibilities for their Federal members.

I would also like to just mention a couple of the other objections that I would like to note. I support particularly objections 729, 719 and 686, both of which, or all of which are much more detailed than what I've got to say and are very detailed to do with possible redistribution.

The only thing I would add to that is moving the northern boundary of North Sydney to Boundary Road Chatswood instead of being Victoria Road Chatswood would mean that Chatswood CBD would be reunited with North Beach and with the rest of Chatswood, and I do think that's a very logical boundary which has not really been considered. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Donna Patterson is the next speaker.

#### <DONNA PATTERSON:</p>

MS PATERSON: Yes, I am Donna Patterson. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today. I have lived and worked for 27 years in the North Sydney electorate, to

which is what I am speaking today about the proposal to abolish that. I have never been politically active in my life until three years ago, when I recognised that we can't take democracy for granted. And I knew I had to stand up and pay attention and work with a community of people to get change, and I have been doing that ever since.

I want to add to the objection I have already put in, and I refer the Committee to objections 727, 720, 237 and others, and I can see that North Sydney already has the required numbers that you're looking for in the electorate, and will have greater numbers next year and in the ensuing years with already built residences, buildings that are in progress, buildings approved, buildings required to be built in the next five years by the State Government. The numbers are all in those objections and you have been told many of them already today. I concur with what's been said, in particular splitting the business hub of Crows Nest three ways will disenfranchise that burgeoning community.

I support the proposal put forward in objection 727 regarding adjusting the boundaries to North Sydney as the Lower North Shore electorate and extending it further north. Indeed, as Dr Vivian just said, the only unusual feature to me in the electorate, having lived there and worked there, was the split in Chatswood along Victoria Avenue, which just seemed illogical. I support the merged Upper North Shore electorate involving much of Bradfield and Berowra as a distinct residential community, connected by the train line and the highway.

As I stated in my objection, there are significant implications for communities of interest with the AEC's proposal as it stands. I feel in a unique position to comment, as I've lived and worked in the electorate for 27 years and have just recently moved to Warringah, and I can tell you that the Lower North Shore is not the Northern Beaches. People in the suburbs of the North Sydney electorate feel they are part of the Lower North Shore, a thriving inner city electorate, the third-largest business district in Sydney, full of hospitals, full of schools, organisations and sporting clubs and a multicultural hub. I'm not sure how much that's been touched on before, but it definitely is. My own children at their schools, with surveys done of the enrolment, 60 per cent and more of families were from non-English speaking backgrounds.

45 c 46 p 47 a

We're bounded by Sydney Harbour and the Lane Cove River has also been mentioned, and the electorate's spine, indeed their anchor, has always been the train line, soon to be two train lines, in parallel with the freeway and the Pacific Highway. I have lived this with my family. It was rare to ever go to Ryde or to go the Upper North Shore or to the Northern Beaches. I am a speech pathologist. I have worked in this electorate, in schools, in day care centres, medical allied health centres. I still play womens football for Chatswood under the Northern Suburbs Football Association. We play around North Sydney and only extend into the Bradfield electorate, not Bennelong and not the beaches. They are different competitions.

So in closing, I confirm my objection that I have registered, that North Sydney has the numbers now and into the future. There will be major impacts on community should the current proposal stand. I love our democracy. I love that we have an independent Electoral Commission. I know it's a challenging task that you all have, but I respectfully suggest that there's a better way. I stand with the detail proposed in objection 727, but I sincerely thank you for the opportunity of the process to stand here today. Thanks.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Kyle Patterson is the next speaker.

### <KYLE PATTERSON:

MR PATTERSON: Thank you, distinguished members of the panel for this opportunity to speak to you, and I wish you well in your deliberations, whichever way they go.

My name is Kyle Patterson, and I'm mad as hell, but I will play nice today, I promise. I am here to speak about my objection to the abolition of the North Sydney Federal electorate. I was among the hundred who started just about three years ago from scratch doorknocking, letterboxing, talking to strangers at railway stations, getting told, "You're wasting your time."

The election came, lo and behold, 50,000 people either cast a first number one vote for our candidate, or preferenced against the status quo to make sure she got across the line. 50,000 people. It was an idea whose time

had come. Climate change. Like many others, I was sick of screaming at the TV. I was sick of the apathy and the cynicism. And so guess what? I got out of the lounge room, turned the TV off and got stuff done.

We are here today, I'm told, to convince you guys and make a case for the strong community of interest in North Sydney. Haven't we already done that? 50,000 people from scratch voted for a candidate unknown to most of them for a topic that was not talked about at dinner tables, because people are too embarrassed to talk to their friends about climate change in case there's a closet climate denialist hiding there. We have a community of interest. What's at stake now, the flourish of the election day was great, we all had at the election night party, but it wasn't a flourish that ended there. We have now the opportunity to make North Sydney the electorate a template of what's going forward, because of its characteristics. Lots of business, lots of high-rise, high density living, lots of medium density, lots of still normal suburbs, lots of health, lots of schools. It's got everything. It's a little microcosm of the changes Australia needs to make to get to a transition to net zero.

 What we have in the past is this: we had a local member who was a lovely chap. I met him. He dealt with the basics very well. He got up in the morning, he had a shave, he put a blue suit on and he turned up on time. He went to Canberra, having said to us on the side, whispered sweet nothings in our ears about how concerned he was about climate change. He would go to Canberra and vote with Barnaby Joyce every single time, in my name. He would vote for fossil fuels, he'd vote against climate change. And he'd come back and say, "Sorry, that's how the system works." We said sorry to him. I wish him well in the future.

We can't go back cutting up this community which is committed, progressive and engaged in building a net zero in North Sydney as a template for the rest of Sydney and Australia. We cannot go back to having those people represented by guys in blue suits who whisper sweet nothings in our ears and go to Canberra and vote for fossil fuels. It cannot happen. That's why I'm angry, because I lived through it. I lived for three decades in the electorate. I live through the sweet nothings. "Yeah, we'd love to something about it, but it's so hard, you

know? There's Barnaby. There's Barnaby."

 We've heard so much about Barnaby. He's still there. But what we have now is a voice in Canberra for this community. And what we also have is a plan, a commitment. For example, the laws coming up about fuel efficiency in Australia were a pre-election promise by Kylea Tink. Yes, the Labor government put it in place, but it was on the agenda and she pushed hard. Good reason, because North Sydney has over 200,000 cars going through it every day, fossil fuel driven cars spewing out pollution from dirty old fuel, because of the Harbour Bridge and the tunnel. We accept that's part of what North Sydney's about.

We're now going to have fuel efficiency, so it's not just a flourish of the election. The reason why that we've got that law through is because the people behind Kylea Tink are still engaged today. It would be a travesty to cut this up. There is a community of interest. It's powerful, it's strong. I'm sorry if I've let my emotions go. All I can say is this: let North Sydney stay intact. Let us put facts on the ground that will trump - and I use that word carefully - will trump the fake news of the climate denialists. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker will be Gary Barnes and then we'll take another speaker by way of video conference. Dr Barnes.

### <GARY BARNES:

DR BARNES: Thank you. I'm a resident of Mosman. I'm a retired doctor. I think that I agree with the last speaker, that the community feeling in North Sydney and in Warringah is extreme and important. I've become much more interested in politics since I retired, mainly because of what has been going on in the US and their faulty electoral system. I have become much more aware of the importance of the AEC in our system. I have been aware of the disinformation register and the article in the Herald by the Commissioner about his fears for the next election. Because of that background, I am acutely aware of the importance of the AEC and its impartiality.

I believe, though I am not certain, that the redistribution process involves submissions by various political parties. I think that is unfortunate, not

because I think the AEC has lacked impartiality, but that it is important to be seen to be impartial. I don't think I am the only one that has fears that we could be heading down the US slippery slope. I think you have seen how much the community feels about all this. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed.

When I said - what we propose to do now is take 5 minutes break, and then we'll come back and take the video conference presentation at 1 o'clock.

# SHORT ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR: All right, everyone. We are about to begin. We are going to have a presentation from Kylea Tink MP.

## <KYLEA TINK:

MS TINK: Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIR: Very well indeed, thank you.

 MS TINK: Thank you. I want to start by acknowledging that I'm joining you from Ngunnawal Country and pay my respects to the Elders both here and on the lands of the community I now represent, the Cammeraygal and the Wattamolla. I also want to thank the Committee for the opportunity to speak to this hearing today.

My testimony today follows the submission lodged in my name, OB676, which responds to and builds on information in the Commission's proposed redistribution report. That submission provides detailed information on a number of things, including projected population growth, communities of interest, and importantly proposes an alternative solution which meets both the AEC's requirements whilst impacting a similar number of constituents across the State.

The additional information I wish to provide today then focuses on my personal reasons for rejecting the current proposal and supports the broader actions my community has taken as separate from me. Before I became the Federal representative of the seat of North Sydney, I was just another proud resident of the area. Politics was not in my future. Rather, I was a mum with kids at schools

there, a sporting club participant with many hours spent commuting to various locations for competitions, a friend who enjoyed time across the community with a variety of people, a community builder who established online groups to share support babysitters and support local families, a worker who eagerly engaged those around me to help build the businesses and not-for-profits I was involved in, and a business owner employing locals and supporting other businesses and not-for-profits around the community.

9 10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

Each of these roles brought me into contact with different elements of what kinds of people who live in the area currently geographically defined as the Federal seat of North Sydney, and each helped build an incredibly strong sense of belonging. When I think about the boundaries of my day-to-day life, I would actually seldom leave the North Sydney area. The area has now been home to my family for over 18 years, and I can honestly say the experience of returning over the Harbour Bridge and coming into the Lower North Shore when I am headed home brings me joy. The news of the possible abolition of our seat, then, when it came was devastating. Not because of the potential impact it has on my current employment, because of the impact it would have on the fabric of the place I called home. At the time, in my initial response, I made it clear: my concern was then and continues to remain today for the people who identify as being from this area and the potential this boundary redistribution has to tear that community apart.

29 30 31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

In the days immediately following the draft announcement, people from across my community reached out, unprompted by me, in distress and with questions about what they could do, and it's this truth that I want to share with the Committee, for despite what some in the major parties and media have said, the desire to fight to keep the seat of North Sydney is something that has come from the community, for the community. When you look closely, this depth of commitment to the community is completely understandable for a number of reasons. There is a deep sentence of a clear community of interest, there is a clear sense of the specific nature of the area and its surrounding natural, built and business environments, and there is also a society very adept at embracing the rapidly increasing population, where one in three people living in our area speak a language other than English at home, and the inflow of people more than offsets those leaving the

1

9

15 16 17

18

19

20

21

22

32 33 nationhood.

34 35 36

37 38 39 you.

40 41

42 43

44

45 46

47

Mr Ben Wilson.

<BEN WILSON:

MS TINK: Thank you.

.14/08/2024 46

area, as single dwellings are knocked down to make way for

Given that then, it was volunteers who came together

from across the community to work the numbers and identify

a reasonable alternative proposal, one that allows the AEC

within New South Wales by one, whilst also ensuring fewer

sincerely wish the current boundaries for North Sydney did

growing at a much faster rate than currently predicted and

I also do not believe the people of Kirribilli have a

many of those centres are, at least on the sporting field,

often our fiercest rivals. But, understanding an outcome

here is going to require compromise, I believe the

and social prosperity of this part of our country to

strong affinity with the people of Northern Beaches, nor do

the people of Lane Cove associate as being from Ryde or the

people of Willoughby see themselves as being from Gordon.

Indeed, our incredibly strong sense of community means that

community of North Sydney has as in good faith, and without

the machinery that comes with a major party, presented an

elegant alternative solution that would ensure the economic

continue to build and contribute in a positive way to our

In closing, I would ask the Committee to accept the objection made in my name, submission OB676, as offering a

solution that meets the demographic requirements of the

boundary redistribution, impacting fewer communities,

continue to participate fully in their democracy. Thank

CHAIR: Thank you so much for that. That's very helpful.

CHAIR: And the next speaker is here in person, I believe.

whilst also ensuring activated citizens are able to

to meet its obligations to reduce the total number of seats

people are shifted across electoral lines. To be clear, I

isolation, they would be left alone as our population is

not have to be altered, and I believe that if seen in

our common sense of belonging is very clear.

medium to high density housing.

MR WILSON: Hello, my name is Ben Wilson. I would like to thank the Committee for inviting the community to make further comments on the redistribution, which I do today in my private capacity as a former resident of Greenwich, a current resident of Lane Cove North, and a resident of the North Sydney electorate for 24 years.

The Committee has received my objection to the abolition of North Sydney and the reasons for it. Put most simply, there is an alternative redistribution that meets all of the statutory and electoral quota requirements, delivers superior community of interest outcomes and inflicts fewer community of interest harms on our community. I'll speak in support of the sitting member's objection.

The AEC does face a difficult task, to balance the numerical requirements taking into account population and demographic moves. In my submission, I have made a number of observations about the underlying assumptions which are used to forecast that North Sydney would be under quota in 2028, which are inconsistent with the AEC's own current enrolment numbers, local and State planning policies to create a priority population growth centre in the heart of North Sydney, and the lived experience of the community. Any forecast that suggests North Sydney would have fewer electors in 2028 than it does today defies government policy and runs contrary to common sense and reality. Yet, here we are.

As I said, I have lived the entirety of 24 years in North Sydney and I have always been a resident of the Lower North Shore. Never once have I been a resident of the Northern Beaches and never once have I been a resident of the Ryde district.

Objection 686 from the sitting member sets out a compelling alternative that meets quota and preserves two distinct community identities, the Lower North Shore, represented by North Sydney, and the Upper North Shore, represented by Bradfield incorporating Berowra. These are clearly defined identities that are deeply embedded in the language and the living patterns of these communities. It may be true that rivers flow to the sea, but jobs, trains, buses, school kids, sporting teams and communities of North Sydney run or flow further south.

686 makes the further comment I'd like to speak to, which is preserving the consistency of representation for the economic and population growth precincts of North Sydney and Crows Nest in a single division. The indisputable, in my opinion, centre of gravity of the Wahroonga electorate sits east of the Spit Bridge. Its identity is unabashedly associated with its core at Manly and along the Northern Beaches. The North Sydney CBD and Crows Nest, with their metro and heavy rail connections, orient north-south. So placing these precincts at the westernmost extremity - westernmost extremity - of a Northern Beaches electorate on its face pays little regard to the unique and specific needs of those business and residential communities and their patterns of commerce and living. And it would invite, I think as Zoe Baker said, invite almost inevitably, another significant redistribution in three or four years' time.

I would like to speak strongly in support of 231, which was an anonymous comment, which suggests that North Sydney is really only being abolished because nothing else in the region is growing, in effect robbing Peter to pay Paul by bolting high growth areas onto the static and shrinking ones, and inflicting community of interest harms in the process. I'll quote it. It says, "When a division is to be abolished, past Committees have generally aimed to split electors between as many neighbouring divisions as possible, with the objective to minimise the 'blast radius' of such an abolition." Incorporating Berowra into Bradfield as has been put forward, I submit, has a materially less impactful blast radius. Abolishing North Sydney has a force multiplier effect on those damaging communities of interest.

I'd also like to make a brief comment that no weight be given to 210 in particular, as it has regard to relocating St Ives into Mackellar. I would respectfully submit that if the Commission takes the view that moving St Ives to Mackellar represents an unacceptable community of interest detriment, then the same should hold for moving Wollstonecraft into Warringah and Greenwich into Bennelong. The principle is the same, and that the community of interest at St Ives should not be greater than the community of interest of those other electorates.

If I've got time on indulgence, I'd like to offer some reflections on this process as a member of the public. We

are seeing a remaking of civic dialogue in Australia, where communities like ours in North Sydney are taking a much more engaged and direct interest in our representation and community governance. I commend the AEC for this process; everyone has had a great chance to say their piece. But I would like to encourage the Commission to do whatever you can to invest in community confidence that the voices of the people you hear today carry the same weight as the institutional stakeholders for whom this is a day job and for whom engagement with the Committee and the processed is inevitably leavened by their own divergent interests in outcomes in other divisions. We hold no higher interest than the common best interest of our community, which we are all serving by appearing here today. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker will, Elijah Gaddi.

### <ELIJAH GADDI:

MR GADDI: Hello, my name is Elijah Gaddi. I am here representing Leon Shinkai. Leon currently lives in northern Chatswood and has previously lived in the suburbs of St Leonards, Northbridge, Willoughby and North Willoughby. He has also attended high school in Killarney Heights, Chatswood and Normanhurst. He primarily wishes to issue comments on which electorate the Epping and Forestville areas should be located in. Some comments may differ from past positions due to recalling new details or findings new solutions. This assumes St Ives stays in Bradfield, which Leon claims to make North Sydney a certain abolition.

The train connection between certain parts of Ryde LGA relies on changing at the Epping interchange and many Ryde LGA residents have a close association with Epping. This already shows that there is merit to putting Epping in Bennelong, but the effect this has on Bradfield and Berowra further supports this case. This also has the effect of putting all of Lane Cove North, Chatswood and Chatswood West into the now Chatswood-based Bradfield. Most of these areas are inside the Chatswood catchment areas for Chatswood High School and hence has a very strong gravitation to Chatswood rather than the Ryde-based Bennelong. Lane Cove itself is in the catchment area for Hunters Hill High School instead.

 Further, this will move northern parts of Ku-ring-gai LGA, which gravitates closer to Hornsby as a hub than to Chatswood and to Berowra. Leon considers both to be favourable. To that end, Leon asks the Committee to move Epping back into Bennelong. He is less concerned about North Epping and Carlingford.

Forestville. The bus connections from Forestville to Dee Why and Chatswood are both reasonably good, with services running every 10 to 15 minutes, respectively, at peak times. Thus the present arrangement of having this in the now Dee Why-based Mackellar is not problematic at all, hence not objected to earlier. However, moving this to Bradfield has several benefits. Firstly, the suburbs of Narraweena and Beacon Hill will be united into Mackellar where they were previously chopped at Warringah Road. This will also moving Brookvale and Allambie Heights into Mackellar.

Secondly, this will help unite communities of interest in the Lower North Shore. St Leonards will be united with the closely associated Crows Nest into Warringah. Further, Naremburn and either Northbridge or Greenwich will also move into Warringah, which Leon prefers the former of. Northbridge has a very strong bus connection to North Sydney and Warringah, with frequent services starting at early times while services to Chatswood and Bradfield only run every 30 minutes. This contrasts with the neighbouring Willoughby, which has far stronger bus connections to Chatswood but a far weaker connection to North Sydney.

When Leon was living in Northbridge and was attending Normanhurst Boys High School, he was reliant on entering the train network through North Sydney as buses did not run to Chatswood at the times he needed them for 7.30am classes. To that end, Leon asks that the Committee moves Forestville, Killarney Heights and the southeastern parts of Frenchs Forest into Bradfield. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. I wonder, is Gordon Lang here? Good. Could you come to the lectern please, Mr Lang.

<GORDON LANG:

MR LANG: My name is Gordon Lang. Thank you for the opportunity to address this Commission. I am principally

.14/08/2024

Transcript produced by Epiq

addressing objection 671 regarding Mackellar. I am what is locally called a newbie to Mackellar, as I have only lived in Palm Beach for nine and a half years. However, my connection dates back to a recorded rescue and attempted resuscitation on Palm Beach in 1919 by my grandfather. My parents spent many youthful days enjoying our great beaches and ended up living in Mackellar for around 50 years. My recently deceased wife's family had a house in the same area for the same number of years. Whilst I did not grow up in the electorate, most of my weekends and holidays were spent there, where I attained a great passion and interest in the area. More importantly, I met my late wife at the beach.

> I am an active surf lifesaver of 55 years, I've been a member for four Northern Beaches surf clubs and a president of one. I was president of Surf Life Saving Sydney Northern Beaches, which encompasses 21 surf clubs from Manly to North Palm Beach, and which at the time encompassed 20,000 members. I was also on Surf Life Saving NSW and Surf Life Saving Australia committees, including Westpac Rescue Helicopter Service. I am honoured to be a life member of both Palm Beach Surf Life Saving Club and Surf Life Saving Northern Beaches. I was the Pittwater Council Citizen of the Year in 2010 and nominated for New South Wales Volunteer of the Year Northern Beaches 2018. I am a director of the Palm Beach & Whale Beach Association and 2IC of the local community fire unit. I operated a local business for around 16 years and still mentor a number of local businesses. Due to my strong and vocal passion for regional economic development. I am a member of the Northern Beaches Council Business and Industry Stakeholders Committee, and its prior iteration, the Economic Strategic Reference Groups, since 2015. I am apolitical in as much as I am not a member of any political party. I talk to and support anyone who works for the benefit of our great community and region. I do believe I am of and for the community.

Mackellar is currently wholly within the Northern Beaches LGA, a clearly defined region. As part of the redistribution process, my understanding is the AEC is only required to consider four major factors. The fourth is a logical parameter which supports having a Federal electorate within one LGA where possible. The second and about third factors define themselves. Northern Beaches is bounded by the Pacific Ocean, Sydney Harbour, Pittwater and

national parks. To consider including non-Northern Beaches within the electorate means transgressing one of these barriers. These barriers do create a sense of ownership and at times isolation, often for the good, except during COVID. The transport system is principally north-south, not east-west. The only real connection between the current electorate's suburbs and those suggested at 671 is the Mona Vale Roads. I do not want to say "outsiders", but the North Sydney is a different region, culturally and politically and population-wise. Viewing the first factor is easy. Whilst there is difference between localities within the LGA, they are bound by a definable lifestyle. Most live here because of the beaches, coast, environment, facilities and the community.

I appreciate the argument that there are differences between the communities in the southern suggested suburbs and the current suburbs. However, there is a stronger and more distinct difference between the current electoral suburbs and those on the North Shore. Dealing with the 21 surf clubs from Manly to North Palm Beach gave me strong insight into the differences, but also highlighted the common ground. A good number of surf club members do come from outside the region, but a vast majority are from the Northern Beaches. And, anecdotally, a good number of those outsiders do eventually move to the Northern Beaches. The majority of the residence interconnection is Northern Beaches-defined, be it sporting, educational or cultural. It is usually only at high levels that we venture outside the region's boundaries.

According to sociology discussion, as "community" may be defined as a group of people living in a defined geographical area, characterised by a consciousness of kind, common lifestyles and various intensive social interaction. Mackellar is Northern Beaches, community-wise and electorate. It is, to a strong degree, a homogenous region. I strongly believe the original boundaries as suggested by the AEC draft do fulfil this definition. I support the original AEC draft boundaries. I would like to thank you for your work and for hearing my thoughts. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. We're going to take Ms Zali Steggall MP by way of the conference now.

<ZALI STEGGALL:

MS STEGGALL: Good afternoon to the panel. If I could - and I thank the Committee for the opportunity to address it, even with the difficulties of Parliament sitting.

I'd like to start by paying my respects to traditional Elders of the land I come to you from, but also the land on which that we're talking about in these communities, in particular since Warringah has such, I think, a distinctive name, which is incredibly important in acknowledging the traditional custodians and its history when it comes to Indigenous people.

I would like to provide the perspective on behalf of the current Warringah, as I have received a lot of communications and submissions from them, and in relation to the possible divisions of the North Shore, and then comment on specific aspects as it relates to Warringah in the draft redistribution proposal. I would suggest that there are four distinct areas in the divisions that are being considered in relation to this redistribution, divisions of Warringah, Mackellar, North Sydney, Bradfield and Berowra.

Firstly, the area east of Warringah Freeway encompassing the suburbs known as the lower North Sydney, being Kirribilli, Neutral Bay, Cremorne, Cammeray and Mosman. This later shares a shoreline with Middle Harbour, with Manly, and its surrounding suburbs. And this area has been represented with Manly and Mosman at its core in the electorate of Warringah in one form or another since 1922 as the Division of Warringah. And I note there's been very few suggestions in relation to abolishing the Division of Warringah, but there has been submissions in relation to the name, which I strongly would refute. There is a strong community of interest and transport connections in the division as it is currently established, very clear retail precincts, professional offices, recreational areas and a vibrant sporting culture. Within its beaches, national parks and shopping areas there is a very clear, relaxed atmosphere and lifestyle that is very symptomatic of the Warringah area and obviously very high from a tourism point of view.

 Secondly, the next area is to the north, the area known as the upper Northern Beaches. Now, this of course extends all the way up to Palm Beach, and that includes the

Division of Mackellar, and the suburbs in the hinterland of Pittwater Road and settlements around Pittwater in the Ku-ring-gai national park.

3 4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

Thirdly, the area of focus is the area of North Sydney. This inquiry is partly about the proposed abolition of the North Sydney division, and I wanted to say a few words about that. The North Sydney commercial business district, within the CBD, is a very clear area and very, I would argue, different to the other areas of the current Warringah division. The North Sydney commercial business district, with the CBDs of Sydney and Parramatta, is one of the main CBDs in Sydney and I would say Australia. It connects to the growth area of Crows Nest and St Leonards, the industrial area in Artarmon and the retail hub of Chatswood. And the corridor from North Sydney CBD to Chatswood also contains major transport hubs, such as train, new metro and highway, and two large hospitals. Now, these are now significantly different to the current Division of Warringah. Under the draft redistribution proposal, the North Sydney CBD and Chatswood corridor would be split and the Crows Nest St Leonards growth areas would be divided into three very different divisions. The draft proposal also splits two large hospitals, and these splits, I would suggest, would make it more difficult for Federal MPs to represent the communities of interest that they service and to coordinate with local and State representatives to address the specific needs of those communities.

29 30 31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

In addition, I note that both mayors of North Sydney and Willoughby are expecting much higher population growth in their council areas due to new density requirements, and if that growth is taken into account by the ABS, on which the AEC assumptions are based, it would suggest the real future growth hasn't really adequately been considered. I would also support the submissions I believe you have already heard or are going to be hearing today in relation to that there is a new social community of interest in the North Sydney area that has brought the community together, and this is a community of interest that should be considered, and I support the submission by Ms Kylea Tink in relation to that.

43 44 45

46

47

Fourthly, in relation to the distribution, there are the suburbs of the mid and upper North Shore. Now, these are largely residential, predominantly houses with commercial and transport hub in Hornsby. And I support the call that those areas have a particular identity quite separate to the CBD of North Sydney and those areas. I feel that each of the areas I've identified have clear identities and needs, and they each meet the broad meaning of "community of interest" under the Act, especially in terms of community engagement, geography, history, and transport connections, and they do warrant separate representation in Federal Parliament. Consequently, I support the request for the Committee to review its decision to abolish the Division of North Sydney. And while remaining, I obviously support also that Warringah should be maintained and Mackellar, and I would argue that the similarity of communities between Berowra and Bradfield would support the suggestion made by Kylea Tink, Member for North Sydney, that those seats be combined.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

Finally, I would like to comment on the excision from the current Division of Warringah of the areas of Frenchs Forest, Forestville, Killarney Heights, Dee Why and Curl Curl from Warringah. There hasn't really been any reason for that excision of those areas from the current division of Warringah. They have clear community of interest where they are currently located, and much stronger linkage to Warringah than they have to Mackellar and the northern part of the beaches. The argument appears to be solely based on the idea of being only within one Local Government Area, but respectfully, that is not a criteria that is applied to other divisions and it is highly common for Federal divisions to be across multiple local government areas. And so that, I would argue, is a - is not a primary consideration for - in considering the redistribution boundaries. The communities impacted by the proposed excisions from Warringah also have strongly identified to me to represent against being excised from Warringah, where they have much stronger linkage to the shopping centres, for example, of Warringah Mall and the southern part of the peninsula than to the north.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Now, of course, I acknowledge the complexity the Commission has before it in the need to reduce, but I respectfully submit that an approach of minimal disruption should be a priority to ensure continuation of representation and best interest for the communities of interest and, in such a vein of minimal disruption, focusing on more logical and easier combination of - and changes to boundaries. Thank you for the opportunity to

make this submission to the Commission.

CHAIR: Thank you very much for coming to speak to us today. We are very grateful for you doing so.

I think it might be timely for all of us to have a break. Perhaps I suggest half an hour. So if we reconvene in half an hour's time. Thank you very much.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR: Well, good afternoon, everyone. It's time to commence, I think, with Alex Burger. Is Mr Burger here? Excellent. If he would come to the lectern and state his name.

#### <ALEX BURGER:

MR BURGER: My name is Alex Burger. I've lived in Lane Cove, which is part of the North Sydney electorate. I've lived there for 35 years. I would like to thank the AEC for this opportunity to discuss my concerns about the abolition of the North Sydney seat. That being said, I do understand this is a very difficult and complicated process, trying to redistribute the boundaries. I acknowledge that. There are three main points I want to make.

The first one is about connection. As the electoral boundaries have changed during my time in Lane Cove, I have voted both in Bennelong and North Sydney. A key geographical feature which dividends the Bennelong electorate is the Lane Cove River. In recent years, as part of the North Sydney electorate with members such as Joe Hockey, Trent Zimmerman and Kylea Tink, I've noticed a much great level of voter interest and engagement amongst my friends and acquaintances in Lane Cove. I believe this reflects the connections Lane Cove citizens feel with the eastern side of the Lane Cove River, whether it be community, business, health services or education.

My next point is about projected population. The latest newsletter from Lane Cove Council, which I'm holding up here, reports their responses to the New South Wales government planning for housing in our area. Within the south St Leonards precinct there will be 2,900 new dwellings, with 900 of these already in process. In all,

the statement government is proposing 3,400 new dwellings in the Lane Cove Council area by 2029 and there are similar projections for other parts of the North Sydney seat, with major residential investment clustered around stations on the new Chatswood to Sydenham metro line. All this amounts to strong growth population growth in the North Sydney electorate.

Now, my next major point is around health services. The North Sydney electorate includes the Royal North Shore Hospital, the Mater Hospital and the North Shore Private Hospital. Along with these are all the associated medical services. There's the specialists, there's the imaging services, there's the ambulance, as well as many others. These health services are not just for residents of North Sydney, but for a large part of the Sydney population, as well as rural and regional people who need to come to Sydney for treatment. These hospitals and supporting services are located in St Leonards, Wollstonecraft, Crows Nest and Artarmon, and are located within a 2 kilometre boundary hub.

The proposed boundary changes will see these important services fall into three different electorates. I believe this is counterproductive, to have these services distributed into those three electorates. This hub of health services needs one coherent voice in Parliament, rather than three individual and arguably competing voices. With that, I finish my presentation. Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Just before you go, you had a document when you were talking about population. Might we have a copy of it?

MR BURGER: You can take this one.

CHAIR: Thanks very much indeed. Thank very much indeed. It will be helpful.

The next speaker will be Barry Buffier, I think.

#### <BARRY BUFFIER:

MR BUFFIER: Thank you, Commissioners, for the opportunity to address you today. My name is Barry Buffier. I have been a resident of Hunters Hill for the last 12 years. I am a community representative on the local planning panel for the Hunters Hill Council an a very active member of

North Shore Rowing Club. I would like to address my comments to the proposal to abolish the Division of North Sydney and how that fails to meet the community of interest test. I don't envy your mandated task of considering all the objections and comments on the proposal, and I do acknowledge that those proposals don't come from you, but you're sitting over the top of those.

Many of the objections lodged question the veracity of the statistical projections for the number of electors in North Sydney come 2028. It's not surprising, really, that there were so many objections, because it is difficult to envisage a scenario where there is actually predicted to be fewer electors in 2028 than currently exist. You could be excused for thinking that North Sydney is a stagnant backwater, being buffeted by the winds of change and technology, yet this is one of the projections relied on by the Redistribution Committee. I won't comment further on that, but I place a lot of emphasis on objection 720, which is most compelling in this regard, and I understand the author, Margaret Stoneman, will be addressing you later today.

 But in my opinion, a much larger problem is the apparent disregard by the Redistribution Committee for their duty to comply with the following requirement, which is the same requirement as you have, which states, "In relation to each proposed Federal electoral division, you must give due consideration to the community of interest within the proposed electoral division, including economic, regional and social interest.". I would question what weight was given by the Redistribution Committee to that requirement and that consideration. Fortunately, it's up to you. You have the ability to rectify that oversight.

So, where is the rationale for abolishing North Sydney and dividing the spoils three ways? Many of the objections that were lodged highlight what a strong community of interest exists in North Sydney. That's not surprising when it's the third-largest CBD in Australia, hosting 28,000 small to medium businesses, as detailed in objection 197. And as you heard from the previous speakers, it is a very significant health hub and educational hub. It has a long history of community action on issues that are relevant to the community, all of which helps to explain that it's been a seat since Federation, 123 years ago. It's not by chance that that's happened.

I acknowledge that the job you have of assessing the strength, capacity and size of one community of interest against another is somewhat subjective since it can't be easily assessed in purely quantitative terms, but that's part of what you're required to do in considering all these viewpoints or objectives. But I can't for the life of me understand why anyone would deliberately trifurcate such an outstanding example of a strong, viable and vibrant community of interest as North Sydney. And it's even worse when there's no compelling statistical analysis to justify it.

Surely, one criteria for any redistribution would be the objective of trying to retain and nurture those strong communities of interest, so why would you pick one of the strongest in Australia as one that you found suitable to split apart? The objective of redistributions should be to enhance the democratic process by allowing the views of significant communities of interest to be reflected in Parliament. This proposed redistribution is effectively diluting the voice of a very strong community of interest by dispersing it into three other electorates.

However, this is not the first time that such a trifurcation has been proposed. It has happened before in Victoria, in 2010, when there was a draft proposal for the abolition of the Division of Murray in Victoria. For those of you who don't know that, this is the irrigation food bowl of the Murray Valley in the central Goulburn irrigation district, centred around Shepparton. You couldn't get a better example of a strong and vibrant community of interest. Not surprisingly, it caused a similar community uproar and objections. Fortunately, the augmented commissioners listened to those reasons and logic, and announced a decision to reinstate the division of Murray.

Commissioners, there can be little doubt from your readings of the objections and the passion of the people who are here speaking today that the community of interest argument in relation to North Sydney is overwhelming and has not yet been given due consideration. In conclusion, I urge you in the strongest possible terms in your deliberations to emulate the commissioners of Victoria in 2010 and reject the proposal to abolish North Sydney. Thank you.

<PAT EVANS:

be Pat Evans.

MS EVANS: Thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak with you today. My name is Pat Evans and I am speaking against the abolition of the Division of North Sydney. I am a long-term resident of North Sydney, residing in Middle Cove. I have submitted an objection and a comment on objections. Now, I have to confess that this is the first time I have taken such an active interest in the electoral process. I feel a strong connection to the North Sydney community, where we share a common civic interest, and I would hate to lose that connection with the abolition of my electorate.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker will

Now, firstly, I can't see or comprehend a clear rationale for this proposal. It does not seem to stand up on the projected growth numbers, as clearly outlined in various submissions, including objections 729 and 702, plus comments on objections 212 and 133. Many have noted that both the AEC actual recently gazetted data, up-to-date ABS population data, and the NSW Government housing targets, and the housing strategies and plans of the four local government areas, all of these predict a vastly different and more realistic population outcome that negates any concern regarding having the required number of electors in the Division of North Sydney.

The "community of interest" factor does not appear to have been given due consideration in the abolition proposal. Objection 686 by the current MP details this well. The importance of that eastern economic corridor being represented by a dedicated Federal MP is well-defined in objection 702, and the distressing impact on one suburb, Crows Nest, being split into three, is highlighted in objection 729. The genuine concerns about breaking up communities of interest are repeated so many times.

Before I conclude, I would also like to make a brief comment on COB210 from the Liberal party. Aside from the dismissive and uninformed comment regarding the abolition of North Sydney, their other comments appear to be all about political issues and swipes at the Labor party. This surprised me, as I naively thought this process did not

consider political issues, but focused on the number of electors in each division and other factors such as communities of interest. On the basis of the approach in COB210, I would suggest that their comments should be disregarded.

With the Division of North Sydney, we have a well-connected, well-integrated, actively functioning community that has in recent times and over the decades demonstrated shared values and common interests. One example is the recent yes vote and another is a history of supporting independence. That can be retained with the alternative and superior proposal presented in objection 686 that meets the demographic requirements and has fewer community impacts.

We also have a division that has projected growth in the electoral roll based on current forecasts from multiple prospective sources, including the recent AEC data, ABS statistics, State Government and Local Government Area housing targets and plans. This alone should be enough to force a reconsideration of the abolition of the Division of North Sydney, and I respectfully request that the numbers are reviewed in light of these projections.

Right now, it feels like we are almost in an ongoing battle between two warring political machines, and there is no place for regular ordinary citizens who believe that in a democracy our opinions should count and we are entitled to a voice. The more I learn about some of the processes, the more powerless and disadvantaged I start to feel. I urge you to consider the genuine concern and the deeply felt wishes of North Sydney residents, who wish to retain their electorate, plus retain their belief in the integrity of our electoral system and the future of our democracy. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker to Claire Finch.

#### <CLAIRE FINCH:

MS FINCH: I'd like to thank the Commission for this opportunity to address the panel. My name is Claire Finch. I and my family have lived in Artarmon in the North Sydney electorate for about 20 years, and we identify as being part of the North Sydney community. The reason I am here

today, not my comfort zone, is that like many people I was upset, dismayed, distressed, to learn of the proposal by the Redistribution Committee for New South Wales to abolish the Division of North Sydney. I submitted and objection and a comment on objection. I wrote of coming from the UK as a migrant and finding a community of health, social, education and sport within North Sydney. Perhaps it's an indictment on myself that activities within these communities mean I rarely go north of Chatswood.

I'd like to thank the Commission for the additional opportunity to make further representation and would like to address in particular the comment on objection 210 which was made by the Liberal party. I'll limit myself to commenting on the first paragraph, which I'll just read quickly and briefly:

The NSW Division of the Liberal Party of Australia has examined the 738 objections to your proposal.

The vast bulk of these can be characterised as a "paper war", solicited by three Federal Members using their parliamentary resources to support some very dubious propositions not built around any of the statutory criteria for which the augmented Electoral Commission are required to have regard.

I too have read the 738 objections, maybe give or take a few, and I would make three points in regard to this paragraph on DOB210 as regards to whether the vast bulk of submissions can be considered as a paper war, whether Parliamentary resources were used, and whether the statutory criteria were not addressed.

May I tell the panel I have a personal interest in this, because I used to lecture on critical reasoning in writing, and so when I read this, I felt that I would have marked this first paragraph as not yet competent, requiring a rewrite, and I'd like to give my reasons for that, and the comments I would have made to the writer. So to be specific, my comments could have been on the first point, is it a paper war, I would have written, "Reason?? Isn't the required process in the form of written submissions necessitating paper? Are you saying there were pro forma or template submissions by those advocating the retention

1 c 2 r 3 r 4 p 5 c 6 c 7

of North Sydney as a seat? I didn't see - having read them myself, I didn't see any evidence of that. I found the majority of objectors wrote apolitically, unlike your own piece of writing, focusing on such issues as consideration of population growth and lived experience and their sense of being part of the community, so not a paper war."

On the second point, saying that parliamentary resources were used, I would have written next to that, "Fact check? I did fact check and found that parliamentary resources were not used by the North Sydney electorate office. I don't have time to fact check other areas, but as you are the writer, this is your responsibility. Please fact check before writing a second draft."

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

8

9

10

11 12

13

On the third point against, the statutory criteria were not addressed, I would have written "Be more specific." This is, of course, for the Commission to decide. However, in my reading of the objections relating to North Sydney. in the vast majority of cases it looks to me as if the statutory criteria were significantly addressed, without straying into political issues. There were numerous examples given of people's communities of interest. And reading some of them, I realised they related to me, too. I hadn't realised that all the years of netball and daughters playing netball had taken place in North Sydney, in the netball association. So, I would encourage you, the writer of COB210, to avoid writing sweeping sentences unless backed by evidence and to always fact check." The writer then goes on to dismiss the alternative proposal made by the sitting member of the Federal seat of North Sydney as being without merit, and that it ought to be rejected.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

I recognise the Commission has a very difficult task in finding a solution to the number of seats to be formed, while taking into account ever-changing demographics and communities of interest. However, on reading the alternative proposal by the sitting member for the Federal seat of North Sydney, OB686, I found it tightly argued, based on facts which were in addition to the original proposal, and that they had great merit, in my eyes. I would therefore ask the panel to dismiss the COB210 as being without merit and that it be given no weight, but rather to consider the proposal made in OB686, which I thought did have merit in providing a well thought out solution with minimum impact on communities. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker will, Jillian Bryant Deere.

## <JILLIAN BRYANT DEERE:</pre>

MS BRYANT: Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Jill Bryant, and I live in Queenscliff in Warringah. I have been a resident of Warringah electorate since I arrived in Sydney over 30 years ago, and would like to speak in support of Zali Steggall's submission 671. Whilst I wasn't politically active before I left England, I quickly understood the importance of community in Warringah as I became involved in Peter McDonald's independent Federal campaign in 2001. Career and family stood into the way of much more political activity until I became aware of the independent community bringing people together to stand up against the sitting member in 2019. Over the years, I have become more engaged and developed a deeper understanding of what belonging to a like-minded community means, and how much stronger a democracy is when ordinary people feel they are heard.

Having recently moved from North Balgowlah to Queenscliff, it does feel that it is a suburb very much joined with Curl Curl to one side and Manly to the other, with easy links of public transport and a boardwalk. Just as Dee Why and Curl Curl are hand-in-hand with Freshie and Manly, Wollstonecraft and Waverton do not seem to share that family tie. I worked in Waverton for three months when I first arrived in Sydney, and to be honest, I haven't been there since. It therefore seems appropriate to maintain these links that we have and to instead look further north to Berowra and Bradfield for a more appropriate combination, as Kylea Tink has outlined in her submission 676.

Finally, I would like to support those who believe the Aboriginal name of Warringah should remain for the electorate. To those of us who feel a sense of belonging, there appears little benefit in changing it, and indeed it reflects the AEC's own criteria, I believe, of maintaining Indigenous names where possible.

I would like to thank the AEC for this opportunity to speak on redistribution, as it balances the needs and values of local communities and the future populations.

.14/08/2024

Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Susan Edwards.

## <SUSAN EDWARDS:

MS EDWARDS: My name is Susan Edwards and I live in Bennett Street, Cremorne, part of Warringah. I am a lawyer and a university lecturer. I moved into the electorate at the end of 2019, so I missed the big election that was just referred to, and it's the seventh electorate I have lived in. I appreciate the opportunity to express my views on the proposed redistribution.

Basically, I will be speaking about the importance of maintaining the sense of community of Warringah, and secondly, of the importance of not losing the independent electorate of North Sydney, also representing a unique segment of the Australian population. I also strongly support the submission of Zali Steggall. Warringah is the first electorate I have lived in which has an identity of its own.

The previous electorate I lived in for 22 years had no activities based on the electorate, whereas Warringah has activities which unify our electorate. Our electorate is more than lines on a map. We are a beach and harbour community. There is a sense of shared values, including those focused on environmental protection and the realities of climate change. There is a strong focus on democratic values, including the quality of our representation in Canberra, and there are regular community meetings, surveys, walks and other activities based around giving the community the opportunity to express its views and to receive feedback. The community has come to expect Warringah-based activities, and the regular holding of such activities has created new friendships and bonds within the electorate.

Although I have always been politically aware, this wonderful sense of community has caused me for the first time to become active on the basis of the electorate in which I live, and I have walked for community issues, assisted with surveys to gauge the views of the electorate, helped respond to questions raised by fellow members of the electorate through the electoral office, and I became

 involved in the last election as I was keen to preserve the culture we have.

I urge the Commission to reconsider the proposal to change the boundaries of what is a cohesive electorate with a strong sense of identity. North Sydney has a separate identity and also an electorate valuing an independent voice in the Federal Parliament. It saddens me that a consequence of the proposed redistribution would be the loss of an independent electorate and thus deny the current residents of that electorate their separate, independent voice.

I believe that the representation of diversity is important in a democracy. Electorates around the country have emerged wanting their own independent voice, representing their own issues. This is the basis of representational democracy. The loss of an independent voice for North Sydney as a consequence of a redistribution, rather than voter choice, is terribly upsetting. Further, on the theme of diversity, it is very upsetting that we would lose a seat represented by a woman if the redistribution results in the loss of a female MP.

 And finally, on the issue of diversity, I urge the retention of the Indigenous name of Warringah. Its acknowledgement of this country's Indigenous identity is important. It is a name used for a variety of things throughout the electorate, and is a name familiar to our residents, under which our community unites. So for reasons of community and for the importance of our independent voices, I urge that there be no change to the boundaries of Warringah or the abolition of the seat of North Sydney. Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Kate Lindsay.

#### <KATE LINDSAY:

 MS LINDSAY: Good afternoon. I am Kate Lindsay. Thank you for allowing me to speak here today. I appreciate this process that we are going through, as I value our representative democracy and I value the independence that comes to this process. This is not my comfort zone either, but I felt the need to turn up today to object to the dissolution of the seat of North Sydney. I want to speak

to the communities of interest requirement that is a consideration in the reassignment of electoral boundaries. And really, I want to speak from a personal viewpoint.

I have been a member of the North Sydney electorate since 1995. I currently live in Northbridge. I have three children who have been to school in Northbridge and are now in North Sydney. I am dismayed that there will be a redistribution of the area in which my family and I live and engage. Our focus is the Lower North Shore and I think of us as living in the Lower North Shore, not in Northbridge. My children are in the school sports clubs of Northern Suburbs Netball, which was mentioned earlier, and a shout out to Northern Suburbs Tennis Association too, and also involved heavily in music through Big Music at Crows Nest, who are engaged in community activities in Crows Nest. I am a singer myself. I sang at the Crows Nest fair. I'll be singing at the Northbridge Bar's 100th anniversary on 12 October, just a little shout out.

So we're engaged, and this is our community, and the other aspect that I want to talk about is how activated this community has become. I have never been engaged with politics prior to the last election, and now I'm heavily engaged. And I see that in my neighbourhood, I see it in the signs that go up, in the conversations that are had. People are engaged politically. There is civic engagement in North Sydney, which I think is such a precious commodity, and that is the thing that I am really dismayed to think might be lost with this redistribution.

I became engaged with the Voices of North Sydney before they found Kylea Tink and I volunteered on Kylea's campaign, so I can't say that I am apolitical. My daughter had just turned 18 and I thought it was important to represent to my daughters that you need to stand up and you need to turn up and you need to be involved. And I have found that the area in which I live, the Federal electorate in which I live, has encouraged that and has engaged me.

I appreciate the difficulty with this redistribution and that there are various options on the table. I am particularly dismayed at the idea that Crows Nest will be split into three portions at a Federal level, given the forecast growth in this area, the opening up of new stations in North Sydney and in Crows Nest. And those are really my arguments to request the reconsideration of the

proposal to dissolve the North Sydney electorate. I feel personally about it. I feel dismayed that it is being considered. And I hope that you will take the community interest, which I have seen today - I've been here all morning - that you will take those interests into consideration. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Mary Curran.

## <MARY CURRAN:

MS CURRAN: Thank you for the opportunity to address you today. My name is Mary Curran. I would also like to thank and support those other speakers who braved the elements to explain why we need to retain our North Sydney electorate. In particular, the submission from our current sitting member, Kylea Tink.

I am a member of HarbourCare, Streets Alive, the Waverton Peninsula Working Group and Euroka Precinct. I have very deep connections to our community. I have lived and worked in the North Sydney electorate since 1984. In fact, I purchased my first one bedroom unit in Crows Nest in 1984. We thought of it a high-rise then, when it was a three-storey walk up. How times have changed. Crows Nest landscape bears little resemblance to those decades. And that is why I'm asking you today not to divide this area. Please consider not the past, not the current, but the future.

With the metro opening, numerous high-rise are under construction, resulting in many more residents coming to live in this community. It needs to have cohesive representation. My stepdaughter purchased a one-bedroom unit in Crows Nest only last week. Please afford her the representation she deserves. Our history of representation should be maintained. I thank you for your time.

CHAIR: Thanks so much. The next speaker is Cathy Browne.

## <CATHY BROWNE:

MS BROWNE: I'd like to begin, as many others have, by expressing my sincere thanks to the redistribution committee for this whole AEC process, and thank you for your valuable time, expertise and attention. A quick look

at the news reveals that most of the world has a very different reality from the one we share here today, and my experience here is one that I profoundly value and appreciate.

My name is Cathy Browne. I live in Lavender Bay with my husband. I feel that I haven't had the time, nor do I have the expertise, to do justice to this opportunity to speak, for which I apologise. Nevertheless, I am here because I am strongly opposed to dismembering the integrity, effectiveness, aggressiveness and power of the North Sydney Federal electorate, as I see it.

For us in the North Sydney Federal electorate, the Pacific Highway is not a convenient highway separating disparate areas, as the proposed redistribution seems to envisage it in part. The highway is a transport spine through our cohesive electorate, around which we coalesce. Three elements in particular which this three-way division will impact diversity, I believe, are medical, economic and community. And I also am aware that you're listening to the same things again and again, and I'm going to contribute to that, sadly.

I would like to note that Liberal COB210 dismisses Labor's proposal of unifying Epping southwards, describing it as a "curious three-way splitting". This curious three-way splitting is exactly what would happen in Crows Nest to St Leonards under the current proposed draft abolition of the seat of North Sydney, which however the Liberal objection doesn't oppose or seek to amend.

The proposed North Sydney three-way submission includes the division of the major currently highly effective St Leonards medical hub, resulting in North Shore hospital and associated entities on one side, the Mater and a range of rival specialist services on the other. These serve not only our local area, but offer some state-wide best practice services in specific medical areas such as spinal injury at Royal North Shore and birthing excellence at the Mater. We know that our medical system is under significant financial and other stresses. Surely this division into separate Federal seats for which different MPs are responsible would further complicate this already complex situation.

Another currently vital, effective and also rapidly

developing area is our North Sydney CBD, as has been said, as I'm sure you know, the third largest in the state. Our wider business precincts, including Crows Nest, St Leonards and Artarmon, house more than 25,000 small businesses which offer a wide range of services and which will continue to grow as our population increases into all the high-rise apartment blocks everywhere being planned and built. What economist or urban planner would arbitrarily divide such a significant economic precinct between different governing or managing entities?

The third area I'd like to address is the social or community character of North Sydney. I've lived as an adult in Avalon, Epping, Mosman, what is now Macquarie Park and the upper North Shore. I've never encountered such an informed, engaged group of people as those I know or have encountered in North Sydney. We are a disparate community of many ethnicities, religions, opinions and backgrounds, who inclusively work side-by-side to offer friendship, hospitality, social support, services, jobs, education and opportunity to one another, as well as to a wide range of people, groups and organisations outside our community. We have a well-developed, long-held community of interests which is different from that of the three electorates into which it is proposed that North Sydney be absorbed.

I understand that this necessary redistribution process is the art of the possible, like most things, and a compromise is always needed. In this spirit, I'd like to support the redistribution proposal OB686, which I think achieves both the retention of the strong North Sydney community and its economic entity and social entity, and all those things which many people have spoken about, and it does this without, I think, significant harm or disruption elsewhere. I therefore respectfully request that the proposal to abolish the Federal seat of North Sydney be reconsidered in the light of the detriment to the seat's powerful community interests and effectiveness that I believe will result. Magnifying this detriment, I believe, are the projected numbers on which the redistribution is based, which seem to me to be demonstrably outdated, including on the AEC website, and which others much more informed than me I believe have specifically addressed. Thank you very much for your time.

46 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is 47 Nerissa Levy.

## <NERISSA LEVY:

MS LEVY: Thank you, committee, for the opportunity to speak today and contribute to the redistribution process. My name is Nerissa Levy. I am a resident of Crows Nest. My profession is as a market research data analyst, and I regularly work with ABS data and population statistics. I have lived and worked in the Northern Sydney region my whole life. I contributed to the objection raised by Kylea Tink MP, OB686. I contributed to the alternative proposal for redistribution to the whole North Sydney region, and I support maintaining the Division of North Sydney. I volunteered to do this work after the release of the draft redistribution, and noting its significant impact to my community of Crows Nest, an area of fast growth and urban renewal in the next five to 10 years.

I wanted to speak today to further explain the reasonings behind decisions made in the alternative proposal in OB686, acknowledging also the necessity to reduce the number of divisions in the wider Northern Sydney region. It was clear from the unprecedented number of objections received in recent weeks that many people in the region were opposed to splitting of significant business, shopping, transport hubs in their local communities, not just in Crows Nest North Sydney, but also in the areas of Epping, Eastwood, et cetera.

The Committee should acknowledge, and I'm sure you do, that this is not an ideal result in the current draft distribution, as it rightfully noted in the draft about reuniting Chatswood, also in our local area. So I approached the proposal with the goal of reuniting significant localities within their distinct communities of interest, as well as others in the wider northern Sydney region. I do acknowledge, having made an attempt at a proposal myself, the difficulties of drawing a redistribution, that no map is perfect, that compromises will always need to be made to satisfy the number of elector quotas.

As a basic principle, I suppose, any division will be a combination of numerous communities of interest. No group of over 120,000 electors is homogenous in any way, so within any division there is going to be some communities of interest that have similar concerns, similar

practicalities, and other communities of interest will have different concerns.

I suggest that a poorer outcome for electors is to divide a community of interest, splitting commercial/transport hubs areas with a high concentration of schools, hospitals and other services that makes the role of an elected MP more difficult. So, thus I would argue that it's far better to combine different distinct communities of interest than it is to fracture existing communities of interest purely on geographical lines.

So with all of this in mind, the proposal in OB686 aimed to minimise fracturing of communities of interest by maintaining the Division of North Sydney within the Lower North Shore and extending north along - like, locating the Division of Mackellar in the upper Northern Beaches and extending into the St Ives area, along with other changes as previously detailed. And it did all of this whilst still achieving the required elector quotas. So the locality of St Ives and St Ives Chase can naturally be considered a distinct community of interest. Demographically they are distinct from neighbouring suburbs of Pymble and Turramurra. Their population is older, they're more likely to own their home outright, they use private vehicles more, and they also include a large diaspora of groups that are not present in different nearby suburbs. They have their own central shopping, social and transport hub around the St Ives Chase Shopping Centre and St Ives Village Green.

Some objections were made to the inclusion of St Ives region in Mackellar, on the basis that the locals of St Ives and Mona Vale are disconnected. However, I would argue that they are connected to Terrey Hills and Mona Vale within the Mackellar electorate via the same major road and two bus routes. The boundaries suggested in the proposal I did was also aligned with the New South Wales state's Division of Davidson, that includes both Forest and St Ives, so there's a precedent for that conclusion.

So this is all on the basis of creating the least harm in the redistribution, to include distinct communities of interest together and keeping them intact whilst reducing the splitting of communities of interest like Crows Nest, Epping, Hornsby, even. So, I thank you all for the community to speak.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Rebecca Clarke.

### < REBECCA CLARKE:

MS CLARKE: Good afternoon. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Rebecca Clark. I have lived in Mona Vale and Mackellar for 30 years. I have also been extensively involved in the community independent movement over the last five years, as I strongly believe that having a politically engaged community is crucial to a strong and healthy democracy. I completely understand the devastation felt by Kylea Tink MP and her supporters on the proposed abolition of North Sydney after they have dedicated so much work into strengthening community engagement and representation in that area.

I would prefer North Sydney not to be abolished. However, I do not agree with objections 671 and 686 alternative proposal, which both include the suggestion that the locality of St Ives should be transferred to Mackellar. In my opinion, the Redistribution Committee made the right and sensible decision not to do this, and this decision has been further well-supported in many written submissions and by people here today.

 However, if the augmented Electoral Commission decides to revisit the proposal to abolish North Sydney, it does not necessarily follow that the only option is for St Ives to be transferred to Mackellar. There are many different ways to slice a cake. I suggest two alternatives in regards to Mackellar that would meet the requirements of the Commonwealth Electoral Act and may assist if the decision is made to revisit the proposal to abolish North Sydney.

 The first is the suggestion I made in COB176, and only represents a slight variation on the current redistribution proposal. That is to only transfer the proposed electors in Dee Why and North Curl Curl from Warringah to Mackellar. This would provide enough additional electors for Mackellar to be within the permissible range. It would unite the currently split locality of Dee Why, which is a major commercial and residential area. The proposed boundary along Curl Curl Lagoon is easily identifiable and was in place between 1968 to 1983. It would also allow the

electors in Killarney Heights and Forestville to remain in Warringah. Therefore Warringah would need to gain fewer electors than currently proposed from North Sydney.

The second suggestion is a significant variation from the current proposal, but was mentioned in at least a number of early submissions, Anonymous 13 and CO7. By raising them again today, I wanted to ensure that this suggestion didn't get overlooked due to the volume of other objections and comments relating to Mackellar.

Mackellar could become a long, narrow electorate from Palm Beach in the North to Manly in the South, encompassing all the beaches in between, as it did when it was first created in 1949 and remained like this until 1968. This would strengthen the existing dominant community of interest in Mackellar created by the culture and lifestyle associated with the beaches. The beaches are the essence of the community and an electoral division that includes them all would provide the truest reflection of our community. Admittedly, the boundary would need to be carefully drawn to avoid an excess of electors, but I believe that is your area of expertise. The proximity to beaches is why many of us choose to live in Mackellar. The surf clubs, with our large base of local volunteers, create significant communities of interest.

The major arterial road, Barrenjoey Road, and its continuation into Pittwater Road, link all the beach suburbs along its 28 kilometre route from Palm Beach to Manly. This road is one that many of us use daily as we commute to work, go to school do our shopping, carry on our business, seek health or other government services, and for our sport and recreation activities. It is a major public transport route that takes us to other parts of the electorate and into the city. This suggestion would mean that a significant number of electors in the western localities of Mackellar could be transferred to the neighbouring electoral divisions of Warringah and/or Bradfield. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Mary-Jane Morgan.

<MARY-JANE MORGAN:

MS MORGAN: Thank you, but I wasn't expecting to be heard

.14/08/2024

Transcript produced by Epiq

today. My name is Mary-Jane Morgan, a resident of Chatswood of 37 years. Thank you, commissioners, for holding this hearing today. Thank you for publishing the many submissions, including mine, that indicate our concerns if you go ahead and break up the Federal electorate of North Sydney. I would hate this.

As an Elder, I recently reengaged in supporting young community independents, supporting smart women to be politically active and independent in their thinking.

Larissa Penn, last state elections, and then the coming local government elections, mentoring Christina Dodds. I am thrilled at the number of volunteers that have come forward to physically give up time to support them in standing for election at both State and local government, and I think you are already aware of the over 1,000 volunteers still supporting our Federal member, a community independent. Today, I think about 25 already, people, have given up their day to demonstrate to you their concerns about the importance of North Sydney in their life and their community of interest, and I am repeating a little of what they say.

 I was an elected independent councillor for two terms in the 1990s. This is how I learned to listen, listened to my neighbours, and found my community of interest, the group of concerned medical staff and potential patients who are desperate to ensure no land at Royal North Shore Hospital is rezoned away from the hospital and clinical uses, the same Royal North Shore Hospital organisation. As a daily school pick-up granny, I hear the busy parents of our local schoolchildren, other grannies, and also I observe and listen to our little people as they play in our open spaces. I hear them all and I respect their opinions.

Since making my submission, I have continued to realise our citizens know more about the local area and local politics than the popular press would have us believe. They are actively involved in the local area. This was strongly evident when I stopped people in Lane Cove Shopping Centre randomly to ask them if they knew our electorate in North Sydney was to be abolished. Yes, they did know, and asked me how long they had to make a submission. I think it ended up being about 735.

In North Sydney, we do have an identifiably strong community of interest. I am going to give you another

three examples of people gathering together in the last month that demonstrates their active engagement in North Sydney about issues of common concern. Firstly, when invited to a recent community consultation on the transport orientated development, "TOD" as it's known, the residents of North Sydney came in droves. The two sessions held were booked out as soon as the bookings opened, a little bit like today. Attending one of the consultations, I was delighted and astounded by the knowledge shared and recorded. Subsequently, I note that the Department of Planning have extended the comment period for another two 12 weeks. This consultation was about a very specific area, 13 as commented many times today: St Leonards and Crows Nest. 14 As I see your changes, the Australian Electoral Commission propose to separate the community into three areas. I do 16 not think this is a good idea.

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Secondly, a week ago the Bay Precinct held a meeting with the North Sydney mayor to discuss local issues, first re the concrete nightmare of the Warringah Freeway upgrade, and the effects of transport orientated development in Tunks and Cammeray parks, because of the increased high-rise densities proposed. A good crowd of 60 people attended in a pretty cold evening. And finally, on the Willoughby City Council July 22nd meeting there were dozens, maybe 70 parents, attending the discussion where Willoughby City Council was proposing to vacate the management of Devonshire Street child care centre. As I recollect, about 40 citizens registered to speak at the open forum, objecting to the council proposal. Council heard three and, unwisely in my opinion, did not support the parent community.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

Like the five, 2,500 signature petitions and the detailed submissions to you, the attendance of so many people in three totally different issues concerning North Sydney in the last few weeks demonstrates our strong engagement by the community. My understanding is that these people want to be heard by you, so again thank you for calling this hearing today. We appreciate being heard, even if all speaking times were allocated by 1pm yesterday, hence my surprise at being heard. Good afternoon and thank you again.

43 44 45

CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'm sorry if you were surprised.

46 47 MS MORGAN: I was a bit.

CHAIR: The next speaker is Joanna Mawson-Lee.

### <JOANNA MAWSON-LEE:</p>

MS MAWSON-LEE: Good afternoon. Again, someone else out of their comfort zone. My name is Joanna Mawson-Lee. I made a formal submission in relation to the Warringah redistribution, and I just wanted to give a more personal point of view, so thank you for the opportunity. I am an active member of the Warringah electorate and have lived as a renter in Brookvale, Freshwater, Manly and now Balgowlah in my 12 years on the Northern Beaches. I was involved in the 2019 and 2022 election campaigns as a Warringah voter and I can testify to the proud, vibrant community that exists in Warringah. These community ties have been strengthened by a Federal member's representation for our area.

I've got strong links across Warringah, particularly around South Curl Curl where after the death of my husband six years ago, I was helped through that initial grieving stage by playing beach volleyball very badly and fully clothed with a group of middle-aged has-beens at South Curly, which involved erecting a very old-fashioned volleyball court and big, you know, wooden beams, and it took 30 minutes to erect it and then if the weather was really bad, we would cheerfully move up to North Curly, and one of our members was part of the surf lifesaving club, and he didn't even have to ask, the ties between the two clubs were so strong.

So I've just become aware of how close that connection was on that beach, and obviously I can't speak for the club, so that's just my observation. Curl Curl is not a long beach. It forms part of the popular Manly to Dee Why walk, with the natural finish at Dee Why. And then Curl Curl Creek, which has been called a natural boundary, has sports fields on both sides. There's a tiny bridge that people flow across in their thousands at the weekend, so it perplexes me that it's called a boundary. And then of course an enormous dog park for people walking from South Curl Curl to North Curl Curl, ending there at the creek, but it's just this sense of community, the two flowing together. And on New Years Eve, people stream up to Dee Why - notice the "up" to Dee Why - for the fireworks,

and I'm pretty sure they're not streaming down from Collaroy on foot to Dee Why for the fireworks.

I just feel as a Warringah voter that we're being pushed off the Northern Beaches, and it's very much an upper Northern Beaches, lower Northern Beaches, on the Northern Beaches. Sorry, I'm not following my notes.

Mackellar is very much in the upper Northern Beaches electorate, which has more in common, I feel, with other northern suburbs than Warringah, which we would have with the inner city suburbs like North Sydney. I respectfully ask that Warringah not lose its lower Northern Beaches suburbs. They are a core part of our community. Like Palm Beach is valued by Mackellar, Dee Why and North Curl Curl are valued by Warringah. We've worked hard since 2019 in Warringah to define our community and use our collective voice. We generously helped other electorates to find their voices at the last election, and in return it would be wonderful if our community was not chopped in half and half pushed off the beaches, turning it into more of an inner city suburb than a Northern Beaches one.

A previous speaker mentioned the sense of community along the beaches as a reason for them to be included in Mackellar, but that same point can be used to say that the lower beaches should not be split up. I just think we need to respect the individual value and character of each beach, their importance to each of the two electorates, and not rip two of them out of the heart of Warringah and replace them with a business district that most Warringah voters have no ties with. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Judi Homewood.

## <JUDI HOMEWOOD:

MS HOMEWOOD: Thank you, everyone, for the opportunity to speak today. I am Judy. I am a long-termer, as we'd say, in the electorate of North Sydney. I have lived there for 42 years with my partner, now my two sons, my daughter-in-law and my baby granddaughter live in the electorate of North Sydney. Little Eloise, I can't - she's only 15 months old so she hasn't come to your attention, so I can't claim to speak for her but, I do speak for my family and my extended family.

points made in my objection. The first is about community of interest. I assert that over time, the electorate of North Sydney has become a distinct and connected community, and quite different to Bradfield, Bennelong and Warringah. Now, the empirical evidence for that assertion, that we feel part of a distinct community is here today, is the size of the response to the proposed abolition of the electorate of North Sydney and the unprecedented, I would have thought, take-up of opportunities to speak today, despite the very short time frame. I understand slots to speak today are in fact oversubscribed. So that in itself, I think, speaks to the community concern for the proposal.

I'd like to make two additional points to the three

Clearly, many in our electorate don't want it to disappear into electorates that are culturally and geographically different to North Sydney. The proposal to move part of North Sydney to Bradfield ignores the very real fact that the Chatswood CBD is a hard divide. Some call it less flattering terms than that. Anyone who has driven along the Pacific Highway knows about the Chatswood CBD. We in North Sydney are harbour focused and inner city focused to a much greater extent than the electorate of Bradfield.

As for moving parts of North Sydney to Warringah, we actively campaigned against putting a tunnel to connect North Sydney to Warringah. That's how much we want to be part of a beach-side electorate. We are harbour and inner city focused. I doubt if there is another electorate in Australia where voters wouldn't welcome better connections between parts of the electorate. We actively and successful campaigned against it.

 The connectedness of the electorate is shown by its practice of electing community-focused independents. We in North Sydney value that. Clearly, if the voters in Bennelong and Bradfield - they could have voted in community independents if they wanted to, but they haven't. We've done it twice. This is about what the electorate wants, not about individual MPs. The electorate of North Sydney values community independence to a much greater extent than Bradfield and Bennelong.

The second new objection I want to speak to is that I'm now aware of the submissions by MPs Tink and Steggall,

which I assert provide valued and viable options to the current proposal. This is not a game of numbers for us; it's about our community. So, I respectfully request you reconsider the proposal to abolish the electorate of North Sydney. I thank you for your time today.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Matthew McKay.

### <MATTHEW McKAY:

MR McKAY: Thank you very much, committee, for the opportunity to talk to you. And I also acknowledge the very difficult job that you have trying to sort all of this out. Look, there has been many sensible submissions against the proposed abolition of North Sydney Council and North Sydney LGA, and I can only support the submissions made specifically by the sitting member, Ms Tink, but also Ben Wilson who spoke just before lunch. I think they are practical solutions and they suggest - I agree with and I can't - I won't bang on about the same points, other than to say that I wholeheartedly support them in their opposition.

CHAIR: Just before we any further, I don't think you stated your name at the beginning.

MR McKAY: I do beg your pardon, madam. My name is Matthew McKay, and I am a part of this community. I have been since 1990 when we were first married. As every part of this community that I am immersed in, be it schooling, working, socialising, eating, drinking, shopping. Nearly everything is done within this LGA, and you'd have to blast us out.

What I would like to talk about is our sense of community that very much makes up this. Having been part of this community in my neighbourhood, which is very close, I can say with complete confidence that we are an eclectic community, with a very strong social licence. We have a very proud history of voting for our electoral rights and voting out those that choose not to heed that. We are not a community that just accepts the two-party duopoly of power in politics and we have demonstrated that on many occasions at the ballot box in the past, and I would like to acknowledge Claire Finch, who spoke earlier, about the politicisation of this decision. Effectively, they're

trying to make us exactly what we do not want to be. We don't vote on party loyalty, we vote on local and national constituent concerns. And I'm sure that you have seen the level of opposition to this change as an indication that we are a politically aware, mature and informed community in this respect.

So it's no surprise - well, it was no surprise, I suppose, if you consider the recent referendum or indeed the plebiscite from years before, that North Sydney very much came out strongly in favour of social progression and it always has, as opposed to division and exclusion. So it was exactly this sense of community, and community belonging, that grew a true grassroots movement to elect our current member in the House of Representatives. Not only could we sense the need for change, but we could sense how to do it and we had the social cohesion to make it work, and it was a huge community effort and a great source of pride when it did.

I mean, thousands of people, literally thousands of people, were out walking the streets, doorknocking, letterboxing. They continued to do just that, providing listening posts, welcoming new constituents, helping in the MP office, attending to constituent matters, attending every single community function and event that occurs, and basically giving out huge amounts of volunteering time to progress democracy as we see it should happen. Forgive my egotistical belief, but I think we are a great microcosm of how democracy was meant to be, and not as a by-product of a two-party power-sharing.

So, no surprises, we were utterly appalled and galled at the thought of having this all taken away from us. Perhaps more than other communities, we appreciate the need for change, but we don't accept that the proposed changes necessarily progress the correct electoral reform. Our sense of community gain through electoral successes will be lost, we believe, with this proposed change.

Whilst you could argue we just should go somewhere else and recreate that sense of community, it's not going to happen. I mean, I'm a long-time resident of Crows Nest who are about to be smashed three ways. I have got no interest in community issues in Manly and I'm not going to participate in them. Same-same a business in North Sydney that is having VISA issues with workers is going to wonder

11

16 17

18

19

20

25 26

28 29

27

30 31 32

33

34

35 36 37

38

39 40 41

42

43 44

45 46

47

where it's prioritised among environmental issues that might be occurring in Dee Why. The fact is you can't simply stitch together apples and oranges for statistically convenient purposes, and yet that appears to us the way it's going, and we object most strenuously about it.

Why should we have to change? We created something good. We think it should be preserved and not removed by a bureaucratic process. You only have to look at the amount of extra growth and housing that's coming into the area to understand surely it's better for democracy for new residents to be parachuted into a community filled with engaged and inclusive constituents rather than an indifferent collection of hamlets with competing priorities.

I will conclude by again thanking the Committee for your hard work, and please implore you to consider it's not just about population growth and history and, you know, a geographic common sense and so on and so forth, but it's that sense of community that's been created within our community that we feel is critical, and not the bordering LGAs that have their own social dynamics. I implore you to consider this in your decision-making. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Gayle Peres da Costa.

#### <GAYLE PERES DA COSTA:

MS DA COSTA: Good afternoon. My name is Gayle Peres da Costa. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I do appreciate the role of AEC in our democracy and I am grateful for this process.

I have been living in the electorate of North Sydney for the past 26 years, first in Artarmon and now in Castlecrag. I've raised four children, which has led me to be a parent at the schools in the electorate of North Sydney for the past 25 years. My involvement in the community outside of schools has included sporting teams, community band, community choirs, local fairs and the parish of St Mary's North Sydney. But under the proposed changes, I would be moved to the electorate of Bradfield. I have no connections whatsoever to the area of Bradfield. In fact, I rarely drive North of Castlecrag.

82

14 15

16

17

18

19

26 27 28

29

30

37 38 39

40

41

42

43

44 45 46 47

I had not been particularly interested in politics until 2021. I have never been partisan. I was and still are a swinging voter, deciding on issues that were important to me at each election, but when I read about Kylea Tink planning to run as an independent Member for North Sydney, she inspired me and I immediately volunteered to help her. I had been despondent about party representatives and was excited to potentially have a member who was truly representative of the community and not required to toe the party line. I was one of the army of volunteers who helped get Kylea elected, handing out flyers and doorknocking in our pink T-shirts, and I'm ready to do it all again.

I have been so proud to have Kylea represent me in Parliament. I've become passionate about the quality of our representation instead of despondent. It defies belief that after the community has come together so strongly to elect an independent candidate, something that has been historically so hard to do that she could be removed from Parliament, not because she's not doing a good job, because she is doing a great job, but because her seat could just vanish. And so, I am here to ask you not to abolish the seat of North Sydney when there are clearly other options available.

And I want you to know that when I was recently handing out flyers and seeking petitions outside North Sydney produce markets on a Saturday morning, I was overwhelmed by the support of strangers that I approached, saying exactly the same thing, saying, "How could this happen? How could we have created this environment and have this fantastic independent and then have her just pulled from under us?" We couldn't have anticipated how much support there was and how many people wanted to sign petitions. We ran out of flyers.

So since sending in my written objection, I have had the opportunity to read many of the objections made to the Commission, and I would now like to make two additional points. The first, though I am not any sort of statistician, is based on everything that I have read, and it is now clear to me that the population of North Sydney on its current boundaries is growing, not declining. If that's correct, then with the greatest respect, the AEC seems to have failed to consult the appropriate sources for future growth, and it seems that at the projection date in 2028, North Sydney will have acquired the number of electors that is required. And on that basis, I would just urge the Commission to change its decision and to leave the electorate of North Sydney as it is.

Secondly, from a purely selfish perspective, I do not want to lose the electorate of North Sydney. It means something to me that we are one of the original electorates formed at Federation. I feel that we have a unique character and we have a unique community that I feel part of. I don't feel that my interested will be represented by the minister for Bradfield, but more importantly I am concerned about the economic impact of splitting up a fast-growing business community at Crows Nest St Leonards across three electorates, to be managed by three different members. That can't be in anybody's interests. Crows Nest St Leonards is set to grow into another massive CBD with the metro that's about to open, and this community deserves the opportunity to be nurtured by one focused representative, rather than be pulled apart in three different directions by three representatives with competing interests. How can it possibly flourish under those circumstances?

I appreciate that the Commission has a difficult task ahead of it. I know that you have a number of matters to consider. I am here to ask you, please, in making your decision, to focus less on the statistics and to focus above all on the economic and social interests, the community interests, of the North Sydney electorate. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The final - no, there are two more speakers. Margaret Stoneman. And the speaker after that is Christopher McLelland.

# <MARGARET STONEMAN:

MS STONEMAN: Good afternoon. I am Margaret Stoneman. As a longstanding resident of North Sydney, I am dismayed by the proposal to abolish our exceptionally cohesive electorate and to distribute its literally dismembered parts between three disparate neighbouring electorates, in the process cleaving through its commercial and community heart, with no apparent rationale. This leaves the constituents of our dense inner urban electorate

languishing at the periphery of suburban electorates with very different lifestyle values.

As a mathematician with long experience in forecasting, I cannot reconcile the AEC's projection that the North Sydney electoral roll will shrink over the projected period in 2028, not with its own gazetted data, not with ABS estimated resident population data, not with New South Wales planning department's data and projections using the same method, and not with any detectable comparability in extrapolation method between North Sydney, Warringah, Mackellar, Bradfield and Berowra.

It seems the AEC has overlaid ABS extrapolated population growth rates based on 2021 data onto enrolment figures as at 9 August 2023, in a period when inner urban population base changes were atypically erratic due to the exogenous COVID shock and its subsequent unwinding. This alone would produce perverse outcomes, relative to more representative underlying medium-term trends. The shock hit North Sydney disproportionately in population shifts but not electoral enrolment, the former reflecting sharp declines in numbers of foreign students and net overseas migration, while the eligible population of voting age continued to grow, not fall.

 This is not captured accurately in the translation between population extrapolations to actual enrolment, leading to distorted enrolment projections. It is equally anomalous that enrolments in the sister electorates of Mackellar and Warringah have risen at the same rate since the last redistribution, yet Mackellar's enrolment is projected to suddenly shoot up by 5.61 per cent while Warringah stagnates at 0.91 per cent. Unlikely.

Some quick facts: far from declining over the next four years, the gazetted enrolment of North Sydney has already grown by 1.05 per cent in just the first nine months. It is well on the way to surpassing the 3.85 per cent increase recorded in the 55 months to August '23, a period equating to the AEC's forecast horizon.

Since the previous electoral redistribution, North Sydney's enrolment has grown by 7.84 per cent, much faster than any other northern Sydney division. You would not know that from the enrolment projections in the redistribution proposal before the inquiry. In those

1 pro 2 0.0 3 suc 4 to a 5 Pla

projections, ours is the only one in that group to fall, by 0.06 per cent, while Mackellar and Berowra are expected to suddenly double their enrolment growth, in Mackellar's case to a rate that is an unlikely 3.5 times faster than NSW Planning projects for the LGA in which it is incorporated.

I note that there are 17 electorates further below the AEC quota benchmark for the existing role than North Sydney. 12 are urban, the star underperformer being Wentworth, at 14 per cent below target, with Warringah second-last. While it is the enrolment data that directly determines redistribution parameters, it is instructive to consider underlying population growth as well. Between pre-COVID 2018 and 2023, the latest ABS data show North Sydney's population rose by almost 1 per cent, despite taking a 2.8 per cent hit from COVID disruption in 2021. The populations of Mackellar and Warringah fell. Our trend growth is also higher.

By any past performance criteria, there is no reason to single out North Sydney for abolition, particularly after adjustment for obvious anomalies in the enrolment projections in light of the actual gazetted enrolment data. The only apparent rationale is to boost the flagging rolls of the much slower-growing neighbours. There is a deep iniquity in that.

In a nutshell, with modest realignments in its boundaries to correspond in full with just three of its constituent LGAs, North Sydney, Lane Cove and Willoughby, the Division of North Sydney would easily achieve the required quotas, both current and future.

A quick correction, if I may. My submission proof check was interrupted by a calving emergency. I had to hit send before seeing my typos of "27,787", instead of "2,787", and "Bradfield" instead of "Mackellar" in the last sentence of the second para under my second table in COB212. The calving had a happy ending. We are hoping this inquiry does too. Thank you for your reconsideration.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Can I ask you when this is over perhaps to speak to Ms Taylor about some of those figures?

MS STONEMAN: Happy to. It's all from officially published data.

.14/08/2024

Transcript produced by Epiq

3

4

really useful.

MR ROGERS: If you'd hand the notes over, that would be

MS STONEMAN: Okay. Lovely.

5 6 7

CHAIR: Mr McLelland.

8 9

### <CHRISTOPHER McLELLAND:

10 11

12

13

MR McLELLAND: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Christopher McLelland, and like the others, I appreciate the opportunity to address the panel. You're doing a great iob.

14 15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 31

32

33

Now, I am arguing to keep the Federation Division of North Sydney in its current location, with peripheral adjustments to its boundaries only. In light of the AEC criteria of maintaining community of interest test of the cohesiveness and integrity of the communities that constitute the electorates, both individually and as a whole, and allowing the natural geographic features to be an important determinant in establishing its boundaries, I am proposing that this division embrace the entirety of its constituent local government areas of North Sydney, Willoughby, Lane Cove and Hunters Hill. All these LGAs share the commonality and natural features of being long-established historical inner metropolitan harbourside areas. This is logical, because councils are the nucleus around which communities coalesce and connect. Maintaining these areas intact within the division is critical to ensuring its integrity and to retain the important vertical integration from local to Federal representation which best

34 35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

Now, how does this work demographically? Well, the clearly observable reality is that housing within the division has been growing at an accelerating rate over recent years. The AEC's enrolment data confirms this. The densest of these developments are centred around the key transport hubs of North Sydney, Crows Nest, St Leonards and Chatswood. More are coming on screen right now, and also in the pipeline with the new completed metro. Rezoning legislation now passed will stimulate this growth even more into the future.

addresses the electorate's concerns and interests.

44 45 46

47

Based on New South Wales government forward

.14/08/2024

87

1 projections to 2028, 5,600 new homes are to be built in the 2 North Sydney LGA, 3,400 new homes in Lane Cove, 1,700 new 3 homes in Willoughby, 400 new homes in Hunters Hill. This 4 would increase by a further 2,000 when extending the 5 boundaries of the division to be totally inclusive of the 6 above LGAs, a total of approximately 14,000 new homes. Add 7 in the planned intensification of revised zoning laws 8 encouraging the entirety of 12 residential areas not 9 already zoned as multi-storey residential to be redeveloped 10 up to seven storevs, irrespective of its environmental or heritage impact. These are North Sydney, Kirribilli, 11 12 Milsons Point, Lavender Bay, McMahons Point, Crows Nest, 13 St Leonards, Naremburn, Waverton, Wollstonecraft, 14 Willoughby and West Cammeray.

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

On this trajectory, the population would reach, if not exceed, the AEC's generic quota range by 2028 and beyond. Analysis of existing data revealed in COB212 underscores this. Another important distinguishing characteristic of North Sydney is the inclination of its constituents, when the opportunity presents, to elect an independent to represent the community interest rather than vote ideologically for a major political party. This has occurred regularly at local government and Federal level since the 1990s. Disenfranchising the electorate of this current benefit would be a great disservice to grassroots democracy. None of the other suggestions or objections proposing either elimination of the division or irrationally manipulating boundaries to achieve political objectives have the clarity and logic of keeping this well-defined and established electorate intact, or recognise the importance of the cohesion of its constituent communities, severing its community of interest.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Historically, cities grow concentrically. Heartwood differentiates itself from sapwood. This is evident in the cosmopolitan nature of the Division of North Sydney, and in its distinction from the surrounding distinctions to which it is proposed to be contortedly carved up and relegated. On the grounds of equity and logic, it is essential that the Division of North Sydney is retained where it is, in essence following the suggestion 22 by our local MP. Should its abolition be the consequence of a statistical error in population growth projections or a quirk in time of setting base data markers, as pointed out by others, this would be a short-sighted and absolute travesty. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. In case you're wondering why the pause, it was arranged, I think, that Ms Sophie Scamps, the MP for Mackellar, speak by way of video at this time, and there's an issue with the connections.

#### <DR SOPHIE SCAMPS:</pre>

DR SCAMPS: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Dr Sophie Scamps, and I would like to thank the Australian Electoral Commission for the opportunity to present today as the Member for Mackellar. Australia is indeed extremely fortunate to have an independent electoral commission.

 I was deeply saddened by the proposed abolishment of the seat of North Sydney, which is represented so powerfully by my good friend and cross-bench colleague, Kylea Tink MP. As the elected representative of Mackellar and a community independent, I promise to genuinely represent the best interests of the people of Mackellar first and foremost, and so, I would like to state that I strongly support the AEC's draft proposal to move Mackellar's southern boundary further south.

These changes adhere to the four key criteria within the Electoral Act. On the other hand, I strongly object to any suggestion that the western boundary of Mackellar move further westward to incorporate St Ives and St Ives Chase. Such suggestions have overwhelmingly come from people living outside of Mackellar and do not consider the best interests of the people of Mackellar.

I spent 25 years living in Turramurra, the suburb next door to St Ives, when I was growing up, and I have spent the last 25 years living and working in Mackellar. One thing I know without a doubt, and have confirmed again and again through innumerable conversations, is that the people of both the upper North Sydney and the Northern Beaches regard the two communities as clearly separate and distinct. I refer to the submission of the mayor of Ku-ring-gai which supports this assertion.

Add to this the fact that since the seat of Mackellar was created in 1949, the residential parts of St Ives have never been a part of Mackellar. On the other hand, the localities of Killarney Heights, Forestville, North Curl

Curl and all of Dee Why to the south have all been transferred in and out of Mackellar at various times since 1949. Extending the electorate of Mackellar south is the only logical and fair outcome when considered against the four Electoral Act criteria for designing electoral division boundaries.

I will now speak to these four criteria. Firstly, maintaining communities of interest. St Ives is a part of the Upper North Shore and Mackellar is a part of Northern Beaches. The Upper North Shore, including St Ives and Mackellar, are different separate communities with little linking them. They have different councils, different sporting competitions, different school catchments, different shopping centres and regions, different and unrelated business precincts, separate and poorly-linked public transport networks, different hospital catchments and they are even served by different divisions of the Rural Fire Service. Importantly, Mackellar has an incredibly strong Surf Life Saving culture, which is one of the defining characters of our community, and our 15 surf clubs are an important factor in uniting and linking Mackellar communities. The surf club connections also create strong links between Mackellar and the coastal communities of our Warringah neighbours to the south.

Two, the physical features of a proposed division. St Ives and St Ives Chase are separated from Mackellar by both distance and major topographical features, including the Garigal and Ku-ring-gai national parks and Cowan and Middle Harbour creeks. Since 1949, these natural and topographical barriers have formed a clear, major boundary between the electorates of Mackellar and Bradfield.

Three, transport connections. The public transport links between St Ives and the rest of Mackellar are very weak. The only public transport service linking the two regions is an infrequent bus service between St Ives and Mona Vale, which runs every half hour at most during the day. There are no direct public transport links between St Ives and Frenchs Forest or St Ives and the southern parts of Mackellar. For travel to the city, St Ives and the Northern Beaches are served by separate and poorly interconnected transport lines, St Ives being served by Pacific Highway and North Shore train line, and the Northern Beaches being served by Pittwater Road and the B-Line bus service along the coastline.

I strongly welcome the committee's decision in the draft to keep Mackellar wholly within the Northern Beaches Council area as the most sensible and workable outcome. The trial proposal was also very welcome, as it fixed the problem of the suburbs of Dee Why, Frenchs Forest and Forestville being split between two electorates, by bringing them wholly within Mackellar. It makes the most logical sense for Dee Why to come wholly within Mackellar, as it is very strongly affiliated with its close Mackellar neighbours, including Collaroy, Long Reef, Narraweena and Cromer. These suburbs have strong economic ties and share shopping precincts and places to socialise.

Dee Why, on the other hand, has very little affiliation or links with the lower North Shore suburbs of Warringah, including Neutral Bay and Mosman, with very different socioeconomic and cultural demographic, different economic zones and disparate shopping and socialising precincts. On behalf the people of Mackellar, I therefore strongly object to any suggestion that the boundary of Mackellar be moved westward to incorporate St Ives or St Ives Chase. This is not in the best interests of either the communities of St Ives or Mackellar. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed and for giving us your time.

DR SCAMPS: Thank you.

CHAIR: I think we'll take a 5 minute break at this point, and then after that, the first speaker should be Remko Tan - does that make sense? Remko? Remko, you're first after the break.

### SHORT ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR: All right. Well, we've had a brief break. Can I ask Remko to come forward.

### <REMKO TEN BRUGGENCATE:</pre>

44 MR BRUGGENCATE: Thank you, committee, for taking the time 45 to listen to me. My name is Remko Ten Bruggencate. I am a 46 resident of Wollstonecraft and I have lived in Neutral Bay, 47 Crows Nest and Wollstonecraft for the last 25 years. I

.14/08/2024

have a strong connection with the area, both economically and socially, and I have to say that because my speech would repeat many of the arguments that have been made before here, I will leave that and do a bit of an off-the-cuff speech. It is my opinion that the draft proposal that has been prepared by the Committee is not in the best interest of the people of North Sydney, and I am therefore speaking against the abolition of the seat.

For the electorate to be split up over across three different electorates, Bradfield, Warringah and Bennelong, is clearly not in the best interest of the - all of the community. And the strength of that community was to me shown in 2021 when out of the blue the community got together and decided to form a force that eventually elected Kylea Tink as our representative. Kylea has been a strong community representative, and we would like to maintain that. So I strongly support your argument that North Sydney, St Leonards and Chatswood would remain as one social, economic and recreational hub, and for it not to be split. North Sydney is a growth area, with many high density and medium density developments either planned or under construction. I strongly support the objection OB686 from Kylea Tink, which I believe offers a very credible, well-researched, alternative proposal, with outcomes that meet the criteria of the Commonwealth Electoral Act.

To get an idea about how my fellow residents in the area felt about the proposal, I decided to ask quite a few of them what they thought. I asked about 50 people. The good thing about that was that most of the people knew that there was an electoral redistribution plan being put forward. Very few of them knew that that would actually mean the abolishment of the seat of North Sydney. Of the people who did know, it was almost universal that people thought that it would not be in the best interest of our community. And while this straw poll of about 50 people may not be representative of the whole of the electorate, it gave me, definitely, a good sense of where the community sits on this issue.

So, may I strongly suggest that the Committee reconsiders their draft determination to abolish North Sydney. It's a growth area. It is important that it stays as one community and as one electorate. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much, Remko. The next person

.14/08/2024

Transcript produced by Epiq

I would call upon is Jill Newton.

#### <JILL NEWTON:

MS NEWTON: Thank you for the opportunity to add additional comments to my OB720 and COB133 to the proposal to abolish the Federal Division of North Sydney. My name is Jill Newton. I have lived for over 25 years in Castlecrag, which is in the Division of North Sydney. I am devastated at and object to the proposal to abolish the Division of North Sydney and split the community asunder into three. With the greatest respect, I think this proposal fails due to the use of faulty demographic projections, a failure to properly consider the community of interest test, and the abolition of North Sydney being incredibly inequitable.

There is no real reason I can see why it's proposed to abolish North Sydney. In its report, the AEC says nothing much about why it should be the one to go. Nothing indeed is said about how North Sydney measures up in the community of interest test. I'm aware this inquiry is not an inquiry into the AEC's reasons for the proposed distribution, but I think this is most unfortunate. The AEC's reasoning is the elephant in the room. I think it's absolutely necessary. Transparency of institutional processes is an essential feature in a democracy, so the public can still view the AEC as a trustworthy institution working above and beyond politics and in other words working for the public interest.

I'll direct my submission now to what I believe are the reasons behind the proposal to abolish and split the Division of North Sydney asunder into three other divisions and why I think this is based on false premises.

One, the AEC's predicted enrolment as at 10 April 2028 of the Division North Sydney under its current boundaries is a fallacy. I have already given reasons in my objection OB720 and comment COB133 for the proposition that the population of North Sydney under its current boundaries is in fact growing, not falling. So how, then, did the AEC get to produce such flawed figures for its projected electoral enrolment as at 10 April 2028, in relation at least to the Division of North Sydney, in which it says it was minus 13.16 per cent variation from the projected enrolment quota, and it gave the division a projected negative growth of minus 0.06.

This flies in the face of reality to those of us on the ground in North Sydney, as everybody has been telling you, but even so these flawed figures and the projected enrolments of the Division of North Sydney is still closer to the quota than, say, Bradfield, Berowra, Warringah or Wentworth, which go from minus 15.51 per cent to minus 21.01 per cent, and even the PM's seat of Grayndler, which heavens above is only, minus 14.02 per cent. Why weren't any of these targeted for the chop rather than North Sydney, I ask?

Margaret Stoneman has just discussed today that the actual AEC enrolment data proves the AEC's projected decline of 0.06 for North Sydney is based on a fallacy. Also her OB720 and COB212. Please read these thoroughly. They are absolutely critical, I think. Margaret is an economist. She used to work at the Reserve Bank. I don't know if she has told you this, but she is absolutely spot-on and please read them.

In summary, the actual AEC data now shows that since the AEC base date in 2023, the Division of North Sydney has grown by 1.05 per cent, a rate of 1.3 per cent per annum. This false projected decline of 0.06 per cent may have alerted the AEC to focus on North Sydney for abolition.

Secondly, the other reason is I think it could be the Liberal party 's suggestion to abolish the seat or division of North Sydney. I know parties and candidates put forward their suggestions about carving up the electoral pie for redistribution. The major parties only have the resources and expertise for conducting maps and statistics to best determine their preferences. Others don't. No party is going to suggest a scenario that goes against its electoral interests, are they? I hope and trust that the AEC does its own determination based on its own maps and statistics, and isn't too influenced by an one proposal of a major party so as to ensure politics is kept out of the equation.

This is correct, isn't it? Please tell us if it isn't; it should be disclosed. Having looked at the Liberal party's suggestion 47 and its objection 578, I am really concerned that in this case the AEC may have followed the Liberal party's suggestion in S47 to a T.

I once again refer to Margaret Stoneman's COB202 at

pages 3 and 4, under the heading "Similarity between the AEC's proposed redistribution and the Liberal party's suggestion 47." On the face of the Liberal party's S47, it's very easy to miss its suggestion to abolish and carve up into three the Division of North Sydney. For example, I refer the panel to the first two recommendations on page 13 of suggestion 46. It's that the Division of North Sydney and Warringah be combined into one division to be then North Sydney, with the Federation division name to be retained, but the divisional name of Warringah not be retained.

Finally, I refer to the Liberal party's one-page objection 578. The fact that the Liberal party could find nothing it would like to have modified in the AEC's proposed distribution report contrasts with that of the Labour party, the Greens and even the National party. The constant reference to providing divisions and naming of Warringah "North Sydney", et cetera, I think shows that there's been confusion.

And this is compounded in table F of the AEC's distribution report. I haven't got time to talk about it now, but the Liberal party doesn't appear under those suggesting the Division of North Sydney should be abolished. The AEC isn't proposing a name change, but apart from that, its redistribution is uncannily similar to that proposed in section 47, as Margaret Stoneman has shown in her table at page 4 of the COB212.

Abolishing North Sydney is inequitable. You'll have to forgive me, but the whole process to abolish our North Sydney division and divide us into three is very inequitable. Why North Sydney with our current electoral population and predicted strong growth? It looks like North Sydney and our community is the sacrificial lamb to make our more NIMBY neighbouring divisions stay intact.

Two, the fact that the Liberal party suggested this very same proposal as the AEC to abolish and carve North Sydney division into three is a clear red flag to me.

Three, the two seats that Australia is losing in this redistribution are held by women. One women is an elected independent MP; they are as rare as rare as hen's teeth. And the other is a Labor MP. Surely based on House of Rep numbers, it would be more equitable to lose one Labor and

one Liberal seat.

Action: on this basis alone, due to the AEC's incorrect projected enrolments, as of 10 April 2028, I ask for this redistribution to be reassessed. For North Sydney division, my suggestion is to leave it basically intact but with some tweaking at the edges to include the whole of Willoughby, Lane Cove and North Sydney LGAs as shown by Margaret Stoneman in COB212, a more accurate enrolment prediction as at 2028, April 2028, as well and truly fits within the quota. Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Next speaker, John Turnbull.

### <JOHN TURNBULL:

MR TURNBULL: Thank you, members of the Committee. My name is John Turnbull. I live in Mona Vale and have done for over 30 years, and am a very happy resident of Mackellar. I heard Dr Scamps, who is my local Federal member talking on the telephone a few minutes ago. May I say, I wholeheartedly support what she says. I provided a submission a while ago opposing what I will refer to as the Tinks-Stegall proposal that Mackellar be extended west to St Ives and Warringah North, into what is currently Mackellar.

I support the Australian Electoral Commission's decision that has been put out. I think taking into account - taking Dee Why into Mackellar is an obvious thing to do. At the end of the day, Dee Why is a large, commercial precinct in Mackellar. Well, at the moment in Mackellar and Warringah. It should be in one area, as it is for the local government.

Can I say this, though. If the Committee was minded to not abolish North Sydney, there is of course an alternative that's been raised, I've seen in some of these submissions, and that is to extend Mackellar down to Manly. These are beaches suburbs. The beaches are an integral part of what we love about the area, and of course the beaches extend from Manly to Palm Beach. We have, as it turns out, a council that pretty much covers that area as well. The beaches are all linked by Barrenjoey and Pittwater roads. It's the same road for much of the way. We have commonality in lifestyles, we have a common

interest in maintaining the beaches and the clubs that form a very important part of it. So, insofar as the Committee looks at what is common in the communities, the beaches is very much - when I say "the beaches", literally the beaches and the clubs that go with it - are very much part of it.

By contrast, if Mackellar was forced to take the proposal put forward by others that North Sydney stay, Warringah extend north into what is now Mackellar, Mackellar then has to take into account St Ives. There are, as you have heard, not one but two national forests, national parks, between where I live, Mona Vale, and St Ives. They are clearly places that don't have a commonality of interest. It's just madness to suggest that that's what should occur. The AEC has not sought to do that, and in my respectful submission, for very good reason.

I've heard a lot of your speakers today and of course there is a lot of disappointment that Ms Tink will lose her seat. That of course, is not a matter that you should take into account. And so far as it's suggested that there is, in North Sydney, an inner city harbour lifestyle, I frankly find that, and I imagine you will as well, hard to believe that suburbs like St Leonards, Crows Nest and Castlecrag could be said to be inner city suburbs.

Finally, can I just say this. A lot of people have talked about if you abolish North Sydney, if you make these changes, there will be changes to the community and the community groups. It's not going to stop anybody. If you change the electoral boundaries, of course, as you well know, it's not going to stop anybody going to their preferred restaurant and that sort of thing. It's not going to change where you live; it's simply going to change who you vote for.

And finally, I want to say this. I have also heard criticism of the underlying numbers that the commissioners no doubt looked at in terms of future population growth. The Commission of course must make projections based on what you accept as being the appropriate numbers underlying population growth. I assume you have terrific resources, and I have every confidence in your decision, but of course one needs to make projections. Projections are looking in a crystal ball, bringing together all of the information and making that projection. Just because there are

alternatives that might be suggested, may I say you should not be deterred from your path. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Michael Fong.

#### <MICHAEL FONG:

 MR FONG: Good afternoon. My name is Michael Fong and thank you to the augmented Electoral Commission of New South Wales for this opportunity to speak and to add to my written submission which I made back in, I think, on 11 July.

I come from a humble beginnings, born and raised in Sydney's inner west, the smallest of five children to a fruit shop owner and later a cafe owner. I must admit, I knew nothing of the other side of the Harbour Bridge during the 50s and 60s when I grew up. During the 70s, though, I discovered that there are beaches on the other side of the harbour, very nice ones indeed. The air was notably cleaner. The residents were friendly and relaxed. I promised myself then, at that very early time, that this is the place that one day I will raise a family.

I married in 1987 and rented in Forestville and later in Lane Cove until I did in fact buy my own house in Forestville in 1999. My brother had already made the move there to Killarney Heights in the 80s. All my three adult children attended Forestville Public School and Killarney Heights High School. They all shared the same kindy teacher, Mrs Law. My eldest daughter moved out and rented in Dee Why for several years before purchasing in St Ives. She loves Dee Why and the surrounding beaches, and there is the yearly fight over who gets the second parking permit.

My son moved to Lane Cove two years ago. I see him every second or third day to babysit my grandson. He, too, loves Forestville. It's his childhood home and he recalls memories with fondness to his wife. My brother, his wife and his family of three now-adult children also live close by, now in Killarney Heights. His family followed a similar path, with all three children attending Forestville Public School and Killarney Heights High School. I have in total eight nieces and nephews that all attended Killarney Heights High School. My family is very connected to the

Forestville 2087. I am proud to say that all these young adults have now become gainfully employed and contribute to our society in diversity, imagination, innovation, and fiscally through taxes. Warringah provided them the platform through for which to grow and develop.

I joined Australia Post in 1994 as a postman, rising through the ranks to become a delivery manager at Dee Why in 1997, then becoming assistant manager for the North Sydney delivery centre from the 2001 to 2007, and lastly as a production manager at St Leonards delivery facility until 2013 when I retired. I gained an insight into the distinct differences of demographics of both Warringah and North Sydney, Warringah being the haven for young and old, with a relaxed lifestyle and a community yearning for something better, an alternative. Losing Warringah would diminish the creativity that New South Wales requires.

Then there's the high-powered corporate world of North Sydney. There's a community of citizens who are interested in democracy and civic participation that strengthens democracy, and the proposed abolishment of North Sydney diminishes this. My whole adult life has revolved around the Lower North Shore and Northern Beaches. I have been active in the community, trying to improve the lives of residents and rate payers. The loss of Forestville and Killarney Heights from Warringah would certainly sadden my family and my brother's family. In total, my families have spent close to 70 years in 2087, which is the post code for Forestville and Killarney.

I've also witnessed rapid changes in Dee Why as a delivery manager in those days, from the early days of being contacted by my local member, who was Tony Abbott at the time, working with him to improve services provided by Australia Post, working with the Royal Blind Society and Guide Dogs Association to find appropriate employment for the vision impaired back in the late '90s, my affiliation to Warringah and North Sydney have been both for family and career. Now in my retirement, I believe I have the experience to see the different perspective. What others may see as logical and straightforward, I see as expedient and possibly unethical.

The very hard-won seats of North Sydney and Warringah are now in danger of being reduced by a full half because of this proposal. To me, a long term resident that has

made Warringah his home, this proposed redistribution does not sit well. I respectfully urge the redistribution committee to reconsider this proposal, which will result in the loss of either North Sydney or Warringah electorates. Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Ann-Charlott Paduch.

#### <ANN-CHARLOTT PADUCH:

MS PADUCH: Hello, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Ann-Charlott Paduch. I have been living in the Division of Warringah for 15 years, since 2009 when I moved to Balgowlah Heights with my husband and my two daughters. For the past three years, I have worked as the community engagement officer in Zali Steggall's electorate, and I would like to support Zali Steggall's objection number 671. I fully support her argument to keep the current communities in Warringah together and grow our division by adding North Dee Why in the north, and the remainder of Neutral Bay and Cremorne, as well as all of Kirribilli and Cammeray in the west. This is outlined in her plan A. I particularly object to the removal of two areas that are very much part of Warringah, one being North Curl Curl and part of Dee Why, and the second being Forestville, Killarney Heights and Frenchs Forest south of Warringah Road, as we have just heard from Michael Fong.

In my role as a community engagement officer, I have been contacted by numerous constituents who reside in those two areas since the AEC has made their draft proposal public. The constituents are devastated that their areas are being removed from Warringah and they are no longer part of our electorate. Many Warringah constituents have made objections or comments on objections, but not all feel they have the skills or the time to make an objection, or can appear today at the public inquiry at short notice, midweek. They have asked me to voice their concerns and their deep desire to stay in Warringah. They feel very strong personal ties to the electorate of Warringah, and these ties are often two-fold.

Firstly, they and their families spend the majority of their time in the broader Warringah electorate. For shopping, leisure, schooling, for almost any activity, they look south to Brookvale, Manly and the southern beaches instead of the upper Northern Beaches which comprise Mackellar. As one example of arbitrary change, the community of Curl Curl would be split in half with their beach as well as their schools and businesses divided into two electorates.

Secondly, the residents of those two areas also feel very connected to the grass roots movement that has grown in Warringah since 2018 and has transformed Warringah into a community independent seat where the MP represents her constituents first and foremost rather than party interests. The strong community bond has enriched the lives of many of us and created a strong sense of belonging. For the first time, many people actually care which electorate they live in.

A new community of interest has been created. It has led to new friendships and community groups in areas ranging from climate action to refugee support and First Nations allyship. All these activities and relationships lead to better mental health, help improve the fabric of our society, and foster a renewed engagement with democracy. Strong engagement with our democracy is especially important in these uncertain times, with formerly strong Western democracies under threat overseas. We need to support activated citizens and keep seats such as Warringah and North Sydney with their strong sense of community.

In conclusion, I urge you to keep the areas of Forestville, Killarney, Frenchs Forest as well as North Curl Curl and Dee Why and Warringah in the current electorate. And I urge you to keep both seats Warringah as well as North Sydney with their vibrant community of active citizens. I thank the Electoral Commission for your time and for hearing me today along with so many others. Thank you.

CHAIR: Can I thank you and also apologise for mispronouncing your surname.

42 MS PADUCH: No, it is very tricky. You did a good job. 43 Thank you.

CHAIR: The next speaker is Steven Kunz.

<STEVEN KUNZ:

.14/08/2024

Transcript produced by Epiq

MR KUNZ: Madam chairman, you've got two German names in a row. Sorry about that. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to address the Committee today. My name is Steven Kunz and I have been a resident of Warringah for some 47 years. I've not previously made a suggestion, objected or commented in the redistribution process. We're all aware that both Warringah and Mackellar need additional voters to be within the 2023 and projected 2028 thresholds. Today, I want to address the specific areas of St Ives, St Ives Chase, and Killarney Heights, Forestville, Frenchs Forest, Dee Why and Curl Curl as they directly relate to the divisions of Warringah and Mackellar.

The decision whether these suburbs are allocated to Mackellar or Warringah is more than about these two divisions. The loss of Killarney Heights, Forestville, Frenchs Forest, Dee Why and Curl Curl from Warringah to Mackellar means that for Warringah to obtain the quota, it has to take those numbers of electors lost in those suburbs and then more from North Sydney. That pushes Warringah into the suburbs of Wollstonecraft and Waverton, far from the electorate's hubs of Mosman and Manly. When the remainder of North Sydney is split between Bennelong and Bradfield, that results in the abolition of North Sydney.

Viewed objectively, the connection of Killarney
Heights, Forestville, Frenchs Forest, Dee Why and Curl Curl
to Warringah is much stronger than their connection to
Mackellar. In terms of travel, education, retail and
employment, the focus of these suburbs is towards the
south. The distances between each of these suburbs and
Manly and the shopping centre of Warringah Mall is less
than the distance from centres in Mackellar with similar
amenity, such as Mona Vale and Warriewood. Simply put,
these areas are proximate to major centres in Warringah and
share a strong community of interest with the division.

 Turning now to the proposed addition of St Ives and St Ives Chase to Mackellar, I would contend that the arguments used to object to the addition of these suburbs to Mackellar, specifically the comments on objections number 186, are mainly related to the remoteness from the division and are overstated. Mackellar has, by virtue of its geography, a number of areas of population at some distance from its main centres in Mona Vale and Warriewood. Take Scotland Island and Cottage Point, for instance. The

former is separated by water from the rest of the
electorate and the latter by the Ku-ring-gai National Park
and having no public transport connection whatever. So
separation by topography is not an anomaly in Mackellar;
it's actually a feature of that division.

In comparison, St Ives is connected to Mona Vale by a road with public transport and is similar in distance and time from Mona Vale as are Duffys Forest, Davidson and Belrose, that are existing suburbs in that division. In fact, according to Google Maps, both the travel time to and distance from St Ives to Mona Vale is actually less than that of Davidson to Mona Vale, and Davidson is part of the Mackellar electorate. So can it be seriously suggested then that the voters of St Ives and St Ives Chase are so different from the voters in those suburbs in terms of housing, education and general concerns, that they could not effectively be represented if they were added to the Division of Mackellar?

Finally, the proposition has been advanced that Mackellar, although not occupying the whole of the Northern Beaches LGA, would benefit from being wholly within the boundaries of it. However, Federal issues tend not to be restricted to a single Local Government Area, and there is a level of government between Federal and local, being the State Government. So, one wonders whether this alleged benefit is somewhat illusory.

In conclusion, I don't believe there are any particular valid reasons to excise the suburbs of Killarney Heights, Forestville, Frenchs Forest, Dee Why and Curl Curl from Warringah. Moreover, there is a reasonable argument for adding St Ives and St Ives Chase to Mackellar, and I would urge the Committee to consider that option. The decision faced by the Committee in respect of these areas is simple. But, as I said earlier, it is about more than Mackellar and Warringah. The stark choice is to excise areas of Warringah which share a strong community of interest with the division, with the almost inevitable consequence being the abolition of North Sydney, or keep those areas in Warringah while adding North Dee Why and extending the division's western boundary to the Warringah Freeway, and add St Ives and St Ives Chase to Mackellar for it to reach its quota. Then North Sydney can, by expanding north, remain a Federal division.

I thank the Committee for their time today and wish them well in their deliberations.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Penny Scardifield.

### <PENNY SCARDIFIELD:

MS SCARDIFIELD: Good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Penny Scardifield, and I object to the proposed abolition of the Division of North Sydney. My strong connection and experience with the community of North Sydney has made me front up today. I am the third generation of my family to have lived in the electorate, in the suburbs of Lane Cove, Chatswood, Neutral Bay, Waverton, and for the last 11 years Kirribilli. I attended Lane Cove Public School and North Sydney Girls High. My three adult children were educated at North Sydney Dem, Monte Sant' Angelo and Shore. I have been on the North Sydney electoral roll since I was 18 years of age and I have voted in every election since. I am also a homeowner and a rate payer for the last 25 years. I have retired after running a successful professional services business in the electorate, employing several staff for many years in commercial tenancies both in St Leonards and in Crows Nest.

In 1995, I was elected to North Sydney Council as a community independent, was re-elected for a second term and retired after eight and a half years, including seven years as deputy mayor. During that time, I held board positions on numerous council committees and organisations in the community, including James Milson Retirement Village, the Nut Coat Trust and Museum, North Sydney Leisure Centre, Crows Nest Community Centre, North Sydney Family Day Care, Crows Nest Indoor Sports Centre, and also represented North Sydney on the Regional Organisation of Councils.

I do appreciate that the AEC have a very difficult task in ensuring that all Australian electorates contain a similar number of voters, and the boundary redistributions is an integral and ongoing part of this process. However, I believe your decision to abolish North Sydney, retire the name and spread the voters across three neighbouring electorates who have little in common with our community of interest is based on inaccurate projections.

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

target.

22 23

24

25

31 32

33

41 42

39

40

43 44

45

46 47

.14/08/2024

<RORY AMON:

105

Transcript produced by Epiq

Furthermore, it seems that your projected growth rate somehow has ignored the huge potential growth that is in North Sydney. I see this every day when I am out and about in the community, with developments already under construction, updated planning policies within all the different LGAs, and not to mention the State government's proposed further upscaling of densities in the suburbs around the new metro and heavy rail corridors. The New South Wales Department of Planning have already identified Crows Nest and St Leonards as strategic and priority population growth nodes, with some 24,000 new homes expected in the electorate across multiple LGAs.

Your report on page 20 shows the projected 2028 voter

enrolment for North Sydney as 112,566. I'm at a loss, not

that are published on your website show that as at June 30,

2024, North Sydney had 113,679 enrolled voters. And that's

being a statistician or an economist, to understand how

that is possible, given that the latest quarterly figures

just six weeks ago. So we're already above your 2028

The AEC proposal also appears to not give appropriate recognition to the strong economic community of interest that includes the North Sydney CBD, the third-largest in New South Wales, plus the over 25,000 small businesses in that electorate. The proposal to split the St Leonards and Crows Nest CBD into three divisions of Warringah, which is centred in Manly; Bennelong, centred in Epping; and Bradfield, centred in Lindfield; is suboptimal.

Our communities deserve to be represented by one Federal MP. I support Mr McLelland, who spoke earlier, and Ms Stoneman, who also spoke, about retaining the seat of North Sydney, and I urge you to reconsider. I think your proposal is based on somehow some flawed projections, and the original Federation seat that has existed for 123 years is the core of our community's identity and it's a source of enormous pride. We punch well above our weight, so please, North Sydney needs to be retained. Thank you for your time today.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Mr Rory Amon, state MP for Pittwater.

MR AMON: Thank you for allowing me to address this hearing today. I am Rory Amon, State Member for Pittwater, and I seek to address you regarding to two questions: one, whether the suburbs or Frenchs Forest, Killarney Heights, North Curl Curl and Dee Why, being Mackellar, and two, should the suburbs of St Ives and St Ives Chase be included in Mackellar. I propose to address each question by reference to the criteria in section 93 of the Act.

Question one: in terms of communities of interest, as I have mentioned, the suburbs of the Killarney Heights, Forestville, Frenchs Forest, Belrose, Davidson, Terrey Hills and Duffys Forest comprise an area well-known as "The Forest". They share common features of no direct surf beach; no direct surf club community; low density housing; quarter acre blocks; the same council area, Northern Beaches Council; and the area adjoins Ku-ring-gai and Garigal national parks. Each suburb has a rural fire brigade. Unifying The Forest into Mackellar means all 17 RFS brigades in the Northern Beaches area and their catchment will be represented by one member of Parliament. Currently, the Davidson brigade is split between Mackellar and Warringah as it includes Forestville and Killarney Heights, and I am a 10-year member and past president of that brigade.

In terms of travel, The Forest are shares the same bus operator, being Forest Coach Lines in region 14, and there is no train service in that area.

In terms of physical features, I've referred to the bushland nature of the forest. Having the entirety of the forest in Mackellar utilises the boundaries of the national parks, noting Garigal encompasses the entirety of Killarney Heights as well as Middle Harbour Creek. The Roseville Bridge also serves as a geographic boundary for Mackellar. As at 2028, The Forest area will have 30,000 residents: 23,000 currently in Mackellar, 7,000 in Warringah. Given the community interest shared by The Forest area suburbs, given the opportunity, it makes eminent sense to unify them into one Federal electorate.

Regarding Dee Why North Curl Curl, in terms of communities of interest, assuming 7,000 identified residents from The Forest come into Mackellar, another 7,500 residents need to be identified. This can easily be done by unifying the suburbs of Dee Why into Mackellar and

moving North Curl Curl in there as well. The current border of Pacific Parade, splitting Dee Why in half makes absolutely no sense and confuses the community. The proposed boundaries, anyone who lives in Dee Why and Curl Curl can clearly be told and understand they are in Mackellar.

In addition, the proposal will bring another surf club community into Mackellar, being North Curl Curl Surf Club, taking the total of surf club communities in Mackellar from 15 to 16, leaving five in Warringah. The entirety of the Mackellar will also continue to remain in the Northern Beaches LGA. In terms of physical features of the area of the proposed redistribution regarding Dee Why and North Curl Curl, the electoral boundary becomes Curl Curl lagoon and the North Curl Curl netball courts. Anyone who has ever lived in or been to the Northern Beaches will know that this area is descended upon by thousands of young girls, and boys at times as well, for netball every Saturday, and it is a well-loved area and well-known and identified geographic divide and feature.

In terms of means of travel, the suburbs of Dee Why and Curl Curl are both served by the same bus company, Keolis Downer, in region 8, and all the residents know and love the B-Line service. For these reasons, it makes eminent sense to unify Forest into Mackellar, unify Dee Why and include all of North Curl Curl as well.

Question two, regarding St Ives and St Ives Chase in Mackellar. Those suburbs are under a separate council, Ku-ring-gai Council, including nine other elected councils. It makes no sense to bring them into Mackellar at all. Residents in those suburbs are not regarded as being in the Northern Beaches or The Forest; they are regarded as North Shore. These suburbs include much high density, with St Ives have 1,600 apartments. At 2021, this included 25 per cent of the total dwellings in St Ives. To compare this to The Forest area, the Davidson suburb had eight apartments of 886 dwellings in 2021, being 1 per cent, and Belrose had 320 apartments of 3,090 dwellings as at 2021. Forestville had 187 apartments of 3,045, and I am okay to pass these details on if you like.

According to the 2021 census, the Bradfield electorate, home to St Ives and St Ives Chase, has a strong Jewish community of nearly 3,200 individuals. St Ives and

1 S 2 s 3 a 4 e 5 r

St Ives Chase have 1,600 of that community. Moving these suburbs to a different Federal electorate makes no sense and unnecessarily splits that strong community between two electorates. There are no surf club communities and negligible RFS communities in that area.

In terms of physical features, there is a clear divide between the Mackellar and the St Ives suburbs, being the section of Mona Vale Road from Belrose to St Ives. This is 4 kilometre stretch of road through bushland. The nearest residents in St Ives to the nearest dwelling in Mackellar is even farther away than that.

Regarding travel, these suburbs rely heavily on the North Shore rail line, primarily stations from Lindfield to Hornsby. This is not a feature of the current Mackellar electorate in any way. There is no rational basis to include these suburbs in Mackellar in circumstances where far better options exist, including The Forest, Dee Why and North Curl Curl. I do note the proposal does include to retain 18 residents from Warringah in Warringah, so that might be something the Commissioner looks at as well.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. Is there some material which may assist?

MR AMON: I am happy to hand over my original with my handwritten notes, but it's all - it'll probably assist to have it.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Julian Leeser, MP, Member for Berowra.

# <JULIAN LEESER:</p>

MR LEESER: Thank you Madam Chair and members of the Committee. I am here today to defend the work of the Committee and the proposed redistribution. I could have come here and argued for changes to make Berowra a safer electorate than you have drawn it to be, I could have started a campaign locally to encourage constituents to write in to achieve a more favourable political outcome for me, I could have argued the Liberal party's original submission. But I haven't, because I acknowledge the difficult task the committee's had and I support your unanimous recommendation.

I want to talk to you about three things today:
Firstly, how the Berowra electorate you have drawn in the proposed redistribution meets the statutory obligations and aims of the redistribution and should not be altered.
Second, I want to rebut the opportunistic campaign from the Teals that would see the Berowra electorate instead of North Sydney being abolished. And, Chair, I understand the campaign. If I had been the member of Parliament whose electorate had been abolished, I would have made submissions, I would have organised my community and supporters to make submissions, I would have done petitions and I would have had people from my community here to lobby you. You and your committee will have been this sort of thing any time that you have proposed to abolish a seat anywhere in the country.

But nothing that I have heard today and nothing that I have read in submissions would suggest that you should depart from your recommendation. Finally, I want to rebut the suggestions made by the Labor party and the campaign run by the Federal member of Bennelong that Epping and North Epping should not be part of the Berowra electorate.

So far as Berowra's concerned, there's an elegance to what your committee has done. The new Berowra boundaries well meet the Committee's statutory obligations. It meets the numerical criteria, it has provided for a Berowra which is above quota and is projected to remain above quota. It's united the Hornsby Shire in one electorate, rather than the three it's currently in. It's simplified the complementary areas of the Hills Shire in the electorate, limiting Berowra to only areas within the largely peri-urban north ward, rather than the north and east wards. It's added the community of Epping, with its very recent historical links to the Hornsby Shire, its shared school catchments, railway junctions and its shopping precinct, used by shoppers particularly from Beecroft and Cheltenham.

The proposal maintains the railway networks on the T1 line between the Hornsby railway junction the city limits at Hawkesbury River station, and the T9 railway lines between the junctions of Hornsby and Epping, and it contains the Sydney Metro stations of Cherrybrook and Epping.

The proposal has used the Hawkesbury River as a

.14/08/2024

boundary and maintained the southern boundary of the Hawkesbury to Cattai to within one Federal electorate, reducing further confusion for river communities. It also complies with the commission's policy not to cross the Hawkesbury River. It has used other waterways like Cowan Creek, Cattai Creek and Terrys Creek as natural boundaries. It has followed the Hills Council boundary on Boundary Road at Maraylya. It's used the major road, Midson Road, as a boundary separating Epping from West Epping. It's used main roads like Pennant Hills Road and Castle Hill Road as boundaries following local government boundary lines.

The redistribution has reunited the suburbs of Hornsby, Asquith and Normanhurst, which were previously split between Bradfield and Berowra. In short, the committee's proposed boundaries are simple, strong and easily recognisable.

Secondly, I'd like to acknowledge the Committee has had a difficult task in nominating an electorate for abolition. I note that the Committee didn't consider abolishing the Berowra electorate, even though several submissions suggested it. I also note that the Committee's decision to abolish North Sydney was unanimous. The suggestion from the Teals is that Berowra should be abolished and that the Hornsby Shire should be split between three electorates of Mitchell, Bradfield and Bennelong.

 Splitting the Hornsby Shire undermines one of the Committee's objectives in uniting Local Government Area boundaries. It also fails to understand the close connection between the peri-urban areas of the Hornsby Shire and suburban area, particularly the Hornsby CBD.

The Berowra electorate has always had a mix of peri-urban and suburban areas. It is what gives the electorate its character. Many people living in the peri-urban areas drive to Hornsby, particular from Galston, Arcadia and Dural, to park their cars and then take the train to the city and elsewhere for work. For most people across the Hornsby Shire, their major shopping centre is the Hornsby CBD. In addition, the popular 638 bus links people in the peri-urban areas with Pennant Hills station and a shopping link to the business precincts.

There has never, ever been any political division

1 between Berowra's peri-urban and suburban areas. For 2 instance, A ward of Hornsby Council provides both the 3 peri-urban areas of The Shire and the suburban areas from 4 Asquith to the Hawkesbury River as well as Hornsby heights. 5 Despite the Teals' argument to the contrary, there is no 6 community of interest between the Bradfield and Berowra 7 electorates. Our major councils, Hornsby and Ku-ring-gai, 8 are very different. People in the Hornsby Shire do not 9 regard themselves as being part of the North Shore. They 10 identify with the Hornsby Shire as a distinct community, while being part of broader northern Sydney. In fact, 11 12 Ku-ring-gai Council fought the New South Wales Government's 13 attempts to amalgamate Hornsby and Ku-ring-gai shires a few 14 years ago in part because the communities were so 15 different.

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Finally, let me deal with the suggestion about transferring North Epping and Epping back to Bennelong. North Epping is part of the Hornsby Shire and should be retained in one electorate. It's not possible to access North Epping without driving through Epping, which until recently was part of the Hornsby Shire. Connections between Epping and the broader Berowra community are demonstrated by Epping Station being a major junction for the T9 railway line from Hornsby, and the metro from Cherrybrook. In addition, school catchments areas at Epping Boys, Cheltenham Girls, Carlingford High and Epping Heights Public School include Epping and other existing areas within the Berowra electorate.

29 30 31

For these reasons, the Committee should maintain its original proposal. Thank you.

32 33 34

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Sally Paton. Is Sally Paton here?

35 36 37

MR ROGERS: Sally Paton?

38 39

#### <SALLY PATON:

40

41 MS PATON: Hello, I'm Sally Peyton, and I'm an architect 42 who has worked in North Sydney and in McMahon's Point. 43 I've been a resident in Greenwich for 30 years. And I'd 44 like to - not very articulate, being an architect, but I'd 45 like to actually present more of the issues of planning. So, democracy is deciding how we live, and that is

46 47

determined by planning and development issues, and what I

do know as an architect is that fragmentation leads to very poor planning and very poor allocation of public money.

I'd like to point out that St Leonards and Crows Nest is a very newly emerging CBD. Now, the problem that is has is that it's already fragmented by Local Government Area, so that's the Lane Cove Council, the North Sydney Council and Willoughby Council. It's also fragmented by state boundaries, and the Federal electorate has really been its only unifying force. If we keep North Sydney intact, we actually have a fighting chance to make this newly emerging area a great place to live. We want to make efficient, sensible, coordinated decisions about spending public money, and there is a lot of public money going into this area, huge infrastructures being already implemented, a lot of government planning about residences, and that determines how we live.

And what I know is if you live on the periphery, your needs are ignored. So this is - and we're living in a new experiment in Sydney of high density living. So I think that the - and I'm asking for these people in this new area to have a say in how their lives are going to be, how their public land is going to be used, how their transport is going to be used, how their population density is going to be apparent. So I would like to see North Sydney kept as an entity in term to safeguard, you know, our future population. I think a lot of the other issues have been addressed by other people very nicely. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next person is Kirsty Gold and after that Tina Jackson.

MS GOLD: Hello. My name is Kirsty Gold. I would like to thank the Committee for the opportunity to speak to you today, and I'd like to pay my respects to the Gadigal People, the traditional custodians of the people we are meeting on today, and pay my respects to Elders past and present.

I have lived in Mosman in the electorate of Warringah for over 21 years and my children have grown up here and attended schools in Warringah and both North Sydney. I would like to speak to you on three things today. In

<KIRSTY GOLD:

support of the committee's proposal to retain the seat of Warringah, in objection to the proposal to remove Forestville, Killarney Heights, Frenchs Forest, North Curl Curl and Dee Why out of Warringah, and in objection to the abolishment of the Division of North Sydney and in support of the Member for North Sydney's submission and proposal in submission 686 to combine Bradfield and Berowra.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

I note that the Committee considers communities of interest in its deliberations. I ask the Committee to consider that there has been new social communities of interests created since the last Federal redistribution. I have been part of this new place space community of interest that has been consciously created in Warringah by citizens who have been concerned about the quality of our representation. I am originally very proudly from regional Australia, but I can say that I've never felt such a strong sense of community than I do now. I haven't been interested or engaged in democracy before this, like many people here today, but the civic participation in democracy that now exists in the communities of Warringah and North Sydney strengthens our democratic system and breaking up these communities would be a huge loss. Preserving engaged electoral communities is crucial for maintaining the strength and integrity of our democratic system.

252627

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

I'd like to convey to the Committee that there is a real sentence of sadness and loss from the communities in Forestville, Killarney Heights, Frenchs Forest, North Curl Curl and Dee Why of being moved out of Warringah. I was speaking to a dear friend from Killarney Heights last night, who I've met through this civic revival participation. He was unable to take a day off from his job today to attend because of the short notice, and has asked me to pass on his concerns to you today. As I said, there are many others like him that can't be here today. He is incredibly sad and asked the Committee to please consider the objections received from people to remove Forestville, Killarney Heights and Frenchs Forest from Warringah, as they tend to move south and, as said by others here today, focus on services in Warringah like Warringah Mall.

42 43 44

45

46

47

I also request that the community of St Ives not be given priority over those of Waverton and Wollstonecraft, who would have no economic, social or transport connection with much of Warringah, were they to become part of our

electorate. And I note just how far geographically they are from most parts of Warringah.

In my experience, many people do not normally care or know which Federal electorate they are in. To be honest, most people living in Warringah or North Sydney, they not only know but are proud to live in these communities. The unprecedented number of submissions put forward by the community - and I beg to differ from the Member for Berowra, with respect, that it was not done by the Teals, but as was directly represented to you today by the community, it's by the communities of residents of North Sydney and others like myself and Warringah. And particularly the unprecedented number of submissions put forward by the community of North Sydney, including the thousands that signed a petition and the heart-felt emotion we've all seen here today, shows there is a very strong new community of interest in the North Sydney electorate.

With reference to that, I ask the Committee to consider the precedent of the proposed abolition of the Federal seat of Murray, now Nicholls, in Victoria in 2010, which was overturned because of a community of interest in that electorate. Given the government's significant residential, business and metro plans in the North Sydney CBD, St Leonards and Crows Nest areas, splitting this area up amongst three Federal electorates will make the management of this growth corridor very difficult.

Further, the commercial nature of these areas starkly differs from the residential nature of Warringah. I think the alternative redistribution proposal in submission 686 by the Member for North Sydney has strong merit. It provides an alternative outcome that achieves the goals of the New South Wales seat redistribution but retains communities of interest. Berowra and Bradfield are both residential areas of the Upper North Shore. This is very distinct form the Lower North Shore. In summary, I am supportive of retaining Warringah and North Sydney, and combining Bradfield and Berowra. Thank you again for your time and consideration today.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Tina Jackson.

<TINA JACKSON:

MS JACKSON: Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you

.14/08/2024

Transcript produced by Epiq

today. My name is Tina Jackson, and I'll be speaking about North Sydney and Warringah. I grew up in Wollstonecraft in North Sydney and worked in the Sydney CBD, and I then moved to Mosman, in Warringah, where I've lived for nearly 40 years. And I am here today because I am passionate about a well-functioning democracy and the extraordinary grassroots civic participation that I have been a part of since 2018, resulting in the election of two outstanding female community independent MPs in Warringah and North Sydney.

So in summary, one, I strongly urge that the electorate of North Sydney be retained and support Kylea Tink's proposal to extend North Sydney's boundaries further north to reunite the Chatswood CBD into a single division with North Sydney, Artarmon and Crows Nest and St Leonards. Rather than abolish North Sydney, a superior option is the combination of Bradfield and Berowra.

And two, I equally strongly support the retention of Warringah and its name, including the retention of its beachside suburbs of North Curl Curl in Dee Why, along with Frenchs Forest, Killarney Heights and Forestville. Instead, I commend the proposal by Zali Steggall to expand Warringah to include Kirribilli, the areas of Neutral Bay not currently part of Warringah, North Cremorne and Cammeray.

And thirdly, in making this submission, I ask the Committee to consider an important new community of interest, an electorate place-based community of interest of citizens actively engaged in our democracy. And just expanding a bit on those three points. In the lead-up to the 2022 election, I worked closely with the North Sydney community as part of Zali Steggall's Climate Act Now campaign and helped community groups who formed to elect a community independent.

I witnessed first-hand how the community came together to elect Kylea Tink. Thousands of volunteers stepping up to be the change they wanted to see. And I have seen since how the community has worked together to create their own unique community of interest, a community of interest that exists within the current boundaries of North Sydney and that will tragically disappear along with the division. The proposed abolition of North Sydney fractures a cohesive and democratically engaged community.

This is a new community of interest that I ask the Commission to consider. New to the Australian political landscape, new to previous AEC deliberations, and quite unprecedented in my lifetime. It is a community of interested citizens actively engaged in our democracy and passionate about civic participation, and it's worth underlining that this new community of interest is electorate-based. It is place-based. And many people don't even know what electorate they live in, but the people of North Sydney certainly do. And they care deeply that they are part of the North Sydney electorate and are genuinely devastated at the thought of losing it.

Kylea Tink has outlined in detail the reasons why the merging of Bradfield and Berowra is a superior alternative, including retaining and strengthening a strong economic, civic and social communities of interest, and requiring fewer consequential boundary adjustments. I commend this less destructive and divisive solution to you and I ask the Committee to prioritise the new electorate community of interest and look to extending North Sydney's boundaries further to the North to reunite the Chatswood CBD into a single division with North Sydney, Artarmon and Crows Nest St Leonards.

Turning to Warringah, its beachside suburbs could not be further removed from the bustling North Sydney CBD, Sydney's third-largest CBD, and the Crows Nest St Leonards business corridor. Warringah is a beachside electorate, and its beach suburbs of Dee Why and North Curl Curl should be retained. All of Dee Why and all of Curl Curl should be kept together in Warringah, along with Frenchs Forest, Killarney Heights and Forestville.

The new community of interest we see in North Sydney was inspired by Warringah, who led the way in electing a community MP who genuinely represents our values and interests. In terms of the more traditional community of interest and connection, the North Sydney CBD and centres like St Leonards and Crows Nest sit very uneasily in Warringah. Manly to Wollstonecraft-Waverton is a very long stretch, not only geographically but culturally and in terms of community of interest, and a superior alternative would be to retain what is currently Warringah and expand it to include Neutral Bay, Kirribilli, North Cremorne and Cammeray.

And finally, the democratic participation to elect a community independent in Warringah in 2019 and in 2022, and in North Sydney in 2022 is nothing short of extraordinary. The level of political activation and resulting community connection and cohesion cannot be overstated. For the first time, people really feel part of their electorate community. These electorates are so much more than mere boundaries. They encompass diverse communities of all ages, united by common values, who came together to elect strong, female community independents.

10 11 12

13

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

And I, too, urge the Committee to look to the precedent of the Victorian Federal seat of Murray, renamed Nicholls in 2018, whose abolition was proposed as part of the 2010 AEC redistribution.

15 16 17

CHAIR: I'm really sorry to interrupt you, but you are now into your sixth minute.

18 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

MS JACKSON: Sorry, let me conclude. I do appreciate the difficulty of the task before the Committee, but I feel not enough weight has been put on the new community of interest in the North Sydney region. And I ask that you retain North Sydney, and also just to take note of the enormity of what has been achieved in Warringah and North Sydney, the extent of the social cohesion and at a time when democracy around the world is under threat, we have in our small part of the world communities that really care about democracy, and I implore you not to demolish that. Thank you. I'm sorry for going over time.

30 31 32

CHAIR: Thanks very much. The next person is Glenda Hewitt.

33 34 35

#### <GLENDA HEWITT:

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

MS HEWITT: Can I just say I admire the stamina of the group here for sitting through so many submissions. Thank you all for staying awake. My name is Glenda Hewitt and I am a representative of Artarmon and a member of the North Sydney electorate. In this era of world political uncertainty, one of the national treasures we have in Australia is the Australian Electoral Commission, an independent body that oversees our electoral process when we look at what's happening in the world and how precious

46 that is. So I don't envy you the decisions you have to 47

make and the things you have to do, but - and the trust of

the Australian population is in your hands on this matter.

I'd also like to refute a statement I heard earlier. There is no such thing as a "Teal". There is a number of independent candidates who the media, for all their confection, have lumped together as a Teal, but they are independents. I did not collude with anybody, neither was I coerced into putting forward a submission. I did it because I felt so passionate about it, and I did it because for the first time at the last election I had a choice of being involved in the electoral process and have a clear choice. Not just a Liberal or a Labor person, I had a choice about a Liberal, a Labor or an independent and who was going to represent me properly.

I have never voted along party lines, I voted along the lines of people who are going to serve the community the best. And at the last election, it was clear to me that the person who was listening to the community and engaging with the community was our subsequently elected independent member. And to me, that people came out in force and obviously felt the same way, said there in itself, despite the geographical and the transport and the social things that bind us, there is in itself a community of interest who has taken an interest in the whole electoral process and engaged. To dismantle that, to my mind, so short-sighted and not in the interest of Australia and independence.

I also envy people who managed to write notes on their phones, because my handwriting is so disgusting, I'm having trouble reading my notes.

When this whole process started and the proposed redistribution came up, I went back to the parliamentary library, did a search and said, "What triggers a redistribution? What makes it happen that we have to look at changing the way things are?" And I thought, "Okay, it's where representation entitlement of the state changes, okay, where the divisions of the state are malapportioned, or where redistribution has not been held for seven years.

Now, I think change is good. I think we should never become so complacent that we don't consider change. That's part of democracy. That's about getting things better in the future. So, okay, representation. So the numbers. Then I went back to your numbers on the AEC website, and i

looked at them and thought, "Wait a minute. The population numbers are actually growing." I see it. I am looking at the high density developments that are proposed for the area that I live in. In the short term, our numbers are growing slowly. In the next two or three years, our numbers going to increase exponentially. So it makes no sense to make a short-term decision based on the numbers that are on paper at the moment.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

And COVID has changed the numbers significantly. That's not been taken into consideration. So we've got to look forward at what is actually happening on the ground, so that will wipe that out. The other thing that really bothers me, and this is something that I don't think anybody else has mentioned, is you know, you make a decision like this, it's going to cost a lot of money to make a change. Now, I'm on a pension and I've got to tell you, spending money for no good reason makes no sense to me, particularly if you're spending money in the short-term and obviously going to have to change it in the longer term.

21 22 23

24

25

26

So, to my mind, looking at the population numbers in the area, North Sydney has no reason to go. The changes that - the reasons for a redistribution trigger are not there, and the money spent is wasting taxpayer 's money. Thank you.

27 28 29

30

31 32

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next speaker is Cameron MacLean. Thank you. Cameron, after you've announced - I'll let you announce your name in a moment. I'm just going to tell you that the secretariat will say when you hit the four minute mark.

33 34 35

MR MACLEAN: Excellent. Shall I go?

36 37

CHAIR: Yes.

38 39

<CAMERON MACLEAN:

40 41

42

43

44

45

MR MACLEAN: Thank you. My name is Cameron Maclean. I am a current Epping ward counsellor of the City of Parramatta and a former deputy lord mayor of the City of Parramatta. The Australian Electoral Commission, AEC, has proposed changes that would see the removal of Epping, North Epping

46 and Carlingford from Bennelong, redistributing these areas between the Berowra and Parramatta electorates. This

47

.14/08/2024

proposal, if enacted, would not only disrupt the established boundaries, but it would fracture a close community of interest that exists in our community and has done so for quite some time.

As someone who has the privilege of representing Epping ward as a councillor, I have seen first-hand the remarkable strength and unity of our community. Epping is a tapestry of streets, homes and businesses, yes. But it is also a community pulsing with life and connectedness across cultural, social and economic threads. In my role as a councillor, I have engaged with numerous residents who value our strong community bonds. These ties extend from Epping to Eastwood, Ryde and throughout, the Ryde and Parramatta local government areas.

The cultural connection in our area is particularly profound. The 2021 ABS census showed that Epping and Carlingford have significant Chinese ancestries, 32.6 per cent and 40.6 per cent respectively, while Eastwood is even higher at 48.8 per cent. The Korean community is also prominent, with 7.5 per cent in Epping and 6.9 per cent in Carlingford, alongside Eastwood at 8.8 per cent.

In contrast, the demographic profile of Berowra, an electorate where Epping and North Epping might be relocated, is markedly different. For instance, Pennant Hills has only 9.3 per cent of the population identifying as Chinese and 3.6 per cent as Korean. These figures reflect a different community fabric and one that does not align with the cultural landscape of Epping and its surrounding areas. The proposed boundary changes would disrupt these established cultural networks, forcing communities that have long shared a common identity to navigate new unfamiliar surroundings.

Beyond cultural ties, the economic inter-dependencies between Epping, Eastwood and Ryde are another crucial factor. These suburbs aren't just neighbours; they are commercial partners. Moreover, a significant number of Epping and North Epping residents are employed in the employment hubs of Macquarie Park and North Ryde. These areas which fall within the Bennelong electorate are the economic lifelines for our community. The proposed redistribution would severe these connections, placing Epping and North Epping in electorates where their economic

interests might not be as well represented or understood.

Our shared infrastructure and community services further underscore the deep connections between Epping, North Epping, Carlingford and the rest of Bennelong. Many of our local Lions Clubs, Rotary Clubs, football clubs and rugby clubs, not by accident, share the name "Eastwood-Epping" in their titles. That is because they draw upon members and participants from those areas. They are not reflected as the Epping-Hornsby or the Epping-Cheltenham or the Epping-Berowra clubs. Their links do not extend that far north.

I encourage the Electoral Commission to ensure - Berowra does not cross the M2 and that North Epping and Epping remain part of the Bennelong. Not only is the member's office currently located within the centre of Bennelong, which falls in Epping, the region has much more in common with Eastwood, Macquarie Park, Marsfield and Parramatta than it does with Hornsby, Pennant Hills and Cherrybrook. In my role as a councillor, I have worked diligently to ensure that the voices of Epping residents are heard, and I have been proud to stand alongside my community in advocating for the issues affect them most. The connections between Epping and North Epping, with Eastwood and Ryde local government areas are far too important to sacrifice.

 On behalf of Jerome Laxale MP, I urge the AEC to reconsider the proposal. Let us keep our community intact, ensuring that Epping and North Epping remain within the Bennelong electorate where they have always belonged and where they will be best represented and unified. Thank you for listening to me.

CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. The next two speakers will be Sharon Leifer first, and then Don Harwin second.

#### <SHARON LEIFER:

MS LEIFER: Hi. My name is Sharon Leifer. I wasn't planning to speak today, because I have already made an anonymous submission, and I didn't want to cover those points again, but I am a resident of Mackellar for the last 21 years and I am very grateful to get this opportunity to speak to you in person as well. I have come to listen to lots of things that people have said today, and there is

just one kind of extra point that I really wanted to reiterate, and that was really about decisions about all the boundaries and changing the electorates.

It's not just a quantitative argument; it's really a qualitative argument as well. It's very much about people getting good representation. And I think we have lots of kind of party politics and everything else, lots of people talking about who said what, Teals, Liberals and everything else, and I will say that I am a member and very supportive of my local MP, Dr Sophie Scamps, just to put it out there.

But what I really wanted to say is that the quality of the representation will be significantly weakened if you split up communities like North Sydney and if you add and bolt on communities like St Ives to the Northern Beaches. And I think that should be one of the main considerations that's taken into consideration here: how will three MPs best represent North Sydney? I can't see how that's going to - you know, we've heard lots and lots of arguments about it, but the quality of that representation is just not going to be good. It causes all sorts of problems.

And the same with Mackellar. How can one MP represent one part of an electorate and then a bolt-on, completely different community? We've heard quite a lot already about how different that community is. I won't repeat all of those arguments, but in the interests of representation, which I think is one of the key things that you do, avoiding party politics but to make sure that we get quality representation for electors, I think that that should be the main thing that's considered here, and the knock-on effect from all of that. And that was the only point I wanted to make. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thanks, very much. Mr Harwin.

MR HARWIN: I wonder if those could be handed up. That's why I brought them. It will just assist in one of the points that I make. Thank you. Much appreciated.

<DON HARWIN:

MR HARWIN: My name is Don Harwin. I am appearing today in my capacity as State president of the Liberal party. I've had the pleasure of working on 11 State and Federal

.14/08/2024

 redistributions, and appearing at these gatherings before, and under Premier Berejiklian I had the pleasure of serving as Special Minister of State. So, okay, well, it's been an interesting day and I've enjoyed very much being here and the opportunity to discuss with you towards the end of it today.

May I just make a point at the outset in terms of section 72(3)(a)(1), in relation to the Member for North Sydney's objection, which is that it is substantially the same as the proposition she put at the suggestion stage, and there is virtually no difference to it, and that's something you might take into consideration in terms of the statutory requirements. In terms of projections, well, there is a healthy debate about whether we should use electoral projections at all in redistribution, because they do tend to be wrong, and the point that a number of people have made today may be correct. Of course, bearing in mind, though, that we're talking about Australian citizens, aged 18 or over, at the midpoint.

And it's all very well to have figures bandied around by my friend Rod Simpson earlier, but we need to earlier that in terms of growth, we are talking about that and nothing else. And it is always difficult in these circumstances to deal with projections, but the time to deal with projections is always at the suggestion stage, and preferably right at the beginning so that as you have had - for example, in Western Australia, are able to call a halt and - maybe I'm getting confused, maybe it was Northern Territory, but call a halt and then give everyone an opportunity to put their point of view. But I would submit to you that it may well be that your predictions aren't perfect in North Sydney, but then I kind of looked at your predictions in Sydney and thought, "Hmm".

So anyway, we'll leave that there. I just don't think that at this stage of the redistribution, you could give any weight to any arguments on that point.

Now, I think for - I'm reminded of something that Ben Raue wrote on his website on 9 July. We heard from Ben earlier this morning. His article was called, "What sort of redistribution objection can actually work? He wrote, inter alia:

While there is room for public involvement

.14/08/2024 123

Transcript produced by Epiq

in the redistribution process, it's not just a matter of asking for something loudly and en masse. You actually need to propose practical solutions ...

So my worry with the suggestions from the Member for North Sydney, is for them even to be considered, they need to do no harm, and in my view they are considerably worse than your original proposal. Your original proposal in fact puts all of the - what is arguably the strongest North Sydney community of interest, the suburbs in the North Sydney municipality, all in one seat. You could have just as easily chosen to call it "North Sydney" not "Warringah", and not have abolished North Sydney at all. I see that time go up, but I do note that Counsellor Baker spoke for 8 minutes and several others spoke for 6 or 7, so I'll try and make it as quick as I possibly can --

CHAIR: Just before you continue --

MR HARWIN: -- and move on to another topic.

CHAIR: Just before you continue, how long do you think you'll be?

MR HARWIN: I'll only be three or four minutes.

CHAIR: That's satisfactory. There is no speaker after this.

MR HARWIN: Yes, absolutely. And so, I'll quickly make the point that the harm in the proposition has, in relation to the Mackellar electorate and in relation to the Berowra electorate, has been very adequately addressed by Dr Scamps, Mr Turnbull, Mr Amon, Mr Leeser and the mayor, Mr Ngai, so I won't add anything on that.

I think it's important that you consider at the moment at this stage, as you must, everything in front of you and deciding if you are prepared to put a significantly different proposal out for a second round of objections. And I should make the point to you that in my view if you were minded to take up the suggestions of Ms Tink, you would be doing that, you would be coming up with a significantly different proposal. And I would say that also in terms of the - we haven't heard much about them, but the suggestions of NSW Labor. Again, they are a

10

11 12 13

14 15 16

21 22

23

24

29 30 31

32

42

43

44

45

46

47

.14/08/2024

37

125

And I would say the same in terms of Mr Raue's objection, which inter alia he talks about small areas being added onto seats and talks about Campbelltown, takes out Campbelltown and then puts on another small area in Bankstown Local Government Area. So I really don't know what he's fixed there, other than moving Campbelltown, an area he says he knows well.

significantly different proposal. As there hasn't been

oral argument today, I won't go through it in detail, but

objections that's been lodged, which actually does go

through a couple of them.

I would refer you to the comments that we made on the

So I would make those points, that any one of those, in my view will trigger the necessity for a second stage and a delay in finalisation of the proposal. And I don't think the conditions have been met to justify having a significantly different proposal. But in five minutes, I'll leave it there.

So Ben Raue asked what sort of redistribution actually can work, so I'll leave you on a happy note, and that's the map I've put in front of you. And it's not something that has resulted in lots of letters, just one, an objection from Central Coast Plateau Chamber of Commerce. And I am a Central Coast resident. I did notice when I was reading this, and the comments of a number of some of what I might call the psephologist commentators or participants in the process.

It was a good idea. I think Mr McSweeney thought this one was a good one worth bringing to your attention, so I'll do it because I do know the area, and it's one where it would have been - it was very easy for the Redistribution Committee to make a decision not to change the boundary between Robertson and Dobell, because both of those electorates basically meet the demographic criteria of the Act.

Now, the boundary, which is the red line on your map, is the old Local Government Area boundary between Gosford and Wyong, right? And it has tended to be the electoral boundary at both a State and a Federal level as a result of that, right? But as you can see, and I've done it deliberately by just photocopying Apple Maps, because it shows it really well in terms of how the physical features

of the area really are not the basis of the existing boundary. The basis of the existing boundary is in fact the road. The road, which is of course almost - well, it's as old as traditional Aboriginal songlines, frankly, from Brooklyn right up through Calga and then along that old road. And settlement followed the establishment of the local government boundary but the local government boundary is now gone.

And so this is the last thing. The State commissioners, even though there is only about 200 people involved, it's of no consequence to anyone, but the people who live in Kulnura. And good on the chamber of commerce for actually representing their views. There hasn't been a landslide of letters or a large number of people today, but I just felt after everything we've heard, one that's as genuine as this ought to be highlighted. And I would encourage you to just make that tiny, little, definitely insignificant change as a result of the chamber of commerce's proposal and thank you for your patience in listening to me even though I went a little over time.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. I think it's probably time to close and to thank everyone who has come today, and especially anyone who has spoken today. Very much appreciated. Now there's a question at the back of the room.

MS HEWITT: Just a quick question. Can it be noted in the minutes that the last speaker had an additional four and a half minutes to other speakers?

CHAIR: I think it appears there as of course.

MR HARWIN: Well, in fact I think I had the equivalent of all of Mrs Tink's speakers that went over time, which I took advantage of.

CHAIR: Anyway, we're going to close the meeting. Thank you.

AT 5.20PM THE MEETING WAS CLOSED

# RECORD OF INQUIRY

# AUSTRALIAN ELECTORAL COMMISSION

# NEW SOUTH WALES REDISTRIBUTION ONLINE INQUIRY

# CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY 21 AUGUST 2024

THE HON. SUSAN KENNY AM KC, CHAIR

### COMMISSION MEMBERS:

MR T. ROGERS

DR D. GRUEN AO

MS R. MAIN

MRS N. UNDERWOOD

MR B. OYETUNJI

#### TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY LEGAL TRANSCRIPTS)

1	CHAIR: Thank you Cameron. Good afternoon everyone. Welcome to
2	the resumed hearing of the augmented Electoral Commission
3	for New South Wales. I'd like to begin by acknowledging
4	the traditional custodians of the lands on which we meet
5	today and I pay my respects to their elders, both past
6	and present.
7	As some of you know, my name is Susan Kenny, and I am
8	chairperson of the augmented Electoral Commission. I'm
9	joined today by Mr Tom Rogers, the Australian Electoral
10	Commissioner.
11	The other members of the augmented Commission will
12	catch up with the inquiry via transcript. As some of you
13	will know, they are Dr David Gruen, the Australian
14	Statistician, Mr Bola Oyetunji, the Auditor-General for
15	New South Wales, Ms Rebecca Main, the Australian
16	Electoral Officer for New South Wales, and Mrs Narelle
17	Underwood, the Surveyor-General of New South Wales.
18	I would again remind you of a number of matters. I've
19	already said some of them, but it's useful to go over
20	them, I think.
21	The first is that Part IV of the
22	Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918 sets out the requirements
23	that the Commission must follow in conducting
24	redistributions. This particular redistribution for New
25	South Wales is required because New South Wales'
26	entitlement to members of the House of Representatives
27	has decreased from 47 to 46. In accordance with
28	section 66 of the Electoral Act, the Redistribution
29	Committee for New South Wales prepared a proposal for
30	redistribution of the state into these 46 federal
31	electoral divisions. As I think almost all of you are

aware, the proposal and its reasons was released by the Redistribution Committee in June this year.

2.2

2.3

2.7

In accordance with section 68 of the Electoral Act, interested individuals and organisations were invited to make written objections to the proposed redistribution and to provide written comments on those objections. As I've said before, a total of 738 objections and 235 comments on objections were received within the required time frames. The augmented Electoral Commission is required by sub-section 72(1) of the Electoral Act, to consider all objections lodged in relation to the redistribution proposal, and all comments on objections.

The resumption of this inquiry provides a further opportunity for members of the public to make submissions about those objections. This is a public inquiry conducted by the augmented Electoral Commission, it's designed to give you an opportunity to make submissions about those objections, and this session of inquiry will hear from attendees who registered prior to last Wednesday's session, but weren't able to participate due to the high number of speakers.

As I think you are aware, the Electoral Act specifies how the redistribution process is conducted and what factors must be considered. Sub-section 73(4) of the Electoral Act states, the primary consideration of the augmented Electoral Commission is that each electoral division meet certain numerical requirements in the form of a redistribution quota and the projected enrolment quota. These are mandatory requirements, but they're subject to tolerances. In other words, there is an acceptable range, but we can't go beyond those ranges.

Subject to an electoral division satisfying the numbers, sub-section 73(4) also provides we have regard to communities of interest, and we also have regard to communication and travel in electoral divisions, physical features and the area of electoral divisions. But as I've said, the critical requirement is a numerical one.

2.3

2.7

I would remind you that the inquiry today is recorded, transcripts of proceedings will be made available as part of the augmented Electoral Commission's report, and will be on the Australian Electoral Commission website once its report has been tabled in Parliament. I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that we may have some members of the media listening today. Should any media members have a question, I would ask that they speak to the AEC media team, whose contact details are available on the AEC website.

When a speaker is invited to make a presentation, we would remind the speaker, to unmute yourself, and please state your name before you commence. That will help us a great deal. We would like to ensure that all those present are able to make submissions if they wish, and to this end, we originally set a time limit of five minutes. The same rule will apply here in the interests of fairness. There are a group of eight people who are to be heard and - on this occasion, and I'd like to ensure that you remain at the five minute mark. You will hear a noise at the four minute mark, and again at the five minute mark.

If you proceed over the five minute mark, you will be muted, and I will warn you about that. I'd emphasise that this is an opportunity to present new arguments and

materials, not to read out your objection or comment on 1 objection. As I said before, all of us present have read 2 these documents carefully. And of course, they're 3 available publicly on the AEC website. When the inquiry 4 5 is concluded, we'll consider everything that has been 6 said - that's the objections, comments on objections, and 7 what has been said at this inquiry.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

We'll endeavour to make a public announcement as soon as we can. Now, that's enough from me. The first speaker, I believe, is Georgina San Roque. I would like to invite her to begin, and remind her first to unmute and state her name for the record before commencing, thank you.

MS SAN ROQUE: Thank you very much, um, I'm Georgina San Roque and I would - I do thank you for the chance to make this submission. I've lived in the North Sydney electorate for over 30 years, and I just want - really, it is quite a personal submission I'm making, but, you know, I do very much identify with it, and hope that um, well, I find the idea of it being disbanded and attached to various other electorates is - is not at all appealing, and I don't think it altogether makes sense.

Just as an illustration, my daughter went to primary and high school here, I shop in the - within the electorate, in Crows Nest, in Cammeray, in Lane Cove, and I go to the city by public transport, which is extremely convenient. Um, my problem is that just personally, I don't identify at all with the Warringah and Northern Beaches electorate. I'm very much established here in this sort of, inner, um, North Shore electorate, as it is. Um, I've been involved in, for instance, bush care in the area, which is through various different sites, and I

1 belong to a local seniors group, also.

productive that way.

2 So, it's an important community for me. In terms of the council, North Sydney Council has been very helpful 3 to my interests generally. Particularly in bushland and 4 5 natural resources - or natural areas. And, um, I feel 6 that, you know, this sort of disbandment of the 7 electorate will make a great difference, administratively, to the council. And it's really not 8 going to make fair work, and there's - there's efforts 9

I understand that the population is definitely predicted - of the North Sydney electorate, is predicted to increase considerably in the next few years, and we've certainly seen, you know, a number of um, apartments going up, more is to occur as well, and um, in that sense, I don't understand, really, why - why that would - why this proposal has really been made, because it could well have to be simply reversed in another few years. And just in conclusion, I would say that the North Sydney electorate really has a cohesion and identifies with this area, and a strong community, and um, yes, I really think it would be a great change, a fracture of those advantages. Thank you.

towards, you know, the community, at all, um, easy or

- 25 MR ROGERS: (Indistinct words.)
- 26 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. I think we've all
- 27 understood very well what you're saying. It was well-
- said, if I may say so. Now, the next speaker is Katrina
- 29 Chandler. Katrina?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

- 30 MS CHANDLER: (Indistinct), my name is Katrina Chandler, I'd
- like to thank the augmented Electoral Commission for the .SB:EY 21/08/24 AECA 5 DISCUSSION NSW Redistribution Online Inquiry

```
1 opportunity to (indistinct) this inquiry into the Federal
```

- 2 (indistinct) New South Wales. (Indistinct) these
- 3 submissions object to, on (indistinct), that there are
- 4 factors contributing to the process that were not taken
- 5 into consideration, which (indistinct) - -
- 6 MR ROGERS: Katrina, it's a little hard - -
- 7 MS CHANDLER: (Indistinct words) - -
- 8 MR ROGERS: It's hard - -
- 9 MS CHANDLER: - community and it should (indistinct) people
- 10 (indistinct) division of North Sydney (indistinct) - -
- 11 CHAIR: Katrina, I'm really sorry, can we (indistinct) - -
- 12 MR ROGERS: Katrina?
- 13 CHAIR: We can't hear you.
- 14 MR ROGERS: Katrina we can't Katrina?
- 15 CHAIR: Katrina? Someone tell Katrina, if they've got a way of
- 16 telling - -
- 17 MS CHANDLER: (Indistinct words) petition (indistinct) of over
- 2,000 signatures. I object to comment 210 (indistinct) -
- 19 -
- 20 MR ROGERS: Katrina?
- 21 MS CHANDLER: - hundreds of constituent objections - -
- 22 CHAIR: Katrina? Now, can I is Cameron or someone there who
- 23 can communicate with Katrina and tell her we can't hear
- 24 her?
- 25 MR ROGERS: Think her connection's just dropped out, is what's
- occurred.
- 27 CHAIR: You can come back.
- 28 MR ROGERS: Yes.
- 29 CHAIR: Could one of the secretariats get in touch with her and
- say, we couldn't hear her at all well, can she find
- another place to dial in from? If I can put it that way.

- 1 SECRETARIAT 1: We're looking into it now.
- 2 MR ROGERS: Meanwhile, we could go to the next person, perhaps,
- 3 Sue?
- 4 CHAIR: Yes. My list says Alex Whitehead, is Alex - -
- 5 MR ROGERS: No, I think the only one we've got here, if I'm not
- 6 wrong, is possibly Jane is there somewhere? Jane
- 7 Parker?
- 8 CHAIR: Could one of the secretariats discover who is ready to
- 9 – –
- 10 MR ROGERS: Here we go.
- 11 CHAIR: Yes.
- 12 MR ROGERS: And then Jane, if just, if that is you, could you
- go off mute, if that's possible?
- 14 CHAIR: Could one of the secretariats - -
- 15 MS PARKER: Can you hear me?
- 16 CHAIR: Yes we can.
- 17 MR ROGERS: There we go.
- 18 CHAIR: That's (indistinct).
- 19 MS PARKER: Okay, right. Sorry about that. Um, right. First of
- all, thank you very much for providing the opportunity
- 21 for me today, to speak to you, I really appreciate it, as
- I would have liked to have spoken last week, so thank you
- very much. My name is Jane Parker, I've been a resident
- of the North Sydney electorate for over 20 years. My
- 25 children have gone to schools in the electorate in both
- North Sydney LGA and Lane Cove LGA, and have played
- 27 sports with community clubs across the electorate
- including both those LGAs and Willoughby local government
- 29 area.
- 30 And so, I feel a great affinity to the area of North
- 31 Sydney. This affinity was only amplified with the ground

swell of so many people like myself feeling the need for a community independent to represent us in the Federal Parliament. This sense of community that I experienced over the last few years is nothing like I've experienced before. Um, so we are very much a community of interest. We - we - the strength of the bonds between the people and electorate has only got stronger than what was there beforehand, and I have concerns as to why North Sydney has been selected as - with the whole of the New South Wales redistribution, as the main electorate to be disbanded.

2.3

2.7

My understanding is, one of the key criteria is population (indistinct) - as part of the redistribution. And the population growth of North Sydney is expected to, you know, grow over the period. And I'm aware of other electorates that have fewer current constituents and lower projected growth. And I'd just like to highlight the population, just from one of the LGAs within the electorate, being the Willoughby LGA. The population forecasts, from 2024 - from where we are currently, to 2036, to go from 80,082 to 87,415, which is a growth of just over nine per cent.

And within that LGA, just one of the - they call the small areas - which is called St Leonards, is due to experience a growth of 64 per cent over this period, and the adjoining areas nearby to St Leonards, in the neighbouring North Sydney LGA, would be increasing by similar amounts, with new apartments online - with - the recently opened Crows Nest metro station that no doubt you've all heard about this week. So it just - my question is, I don't quite understand why North Sydney

- 1 has been chosen, when it's clearly identified that
- there's significant growth within this electorate, so if
- 3 population is one of the reasons, you know, I just don't
- 4 understand.
- 5 And there's sense of community, which is another key
- 6 criteria, I think, with the whole redistribution, is
- 7 paramount. Like, it's significant in this area, and you
- 8 know, my kids, if they were playing, you know, going to
- 9 school, and then having to play a sport, or -
- 10 (indistinct) electorate, like, the whole funding with
- applying for grants and sporting groups, it's all within,
- 12 you know, the federal electorate, and it just it
- doesn't make sense to me, so I just wanted to share those
- those thoughts.
- I can provide any details on that Willoughby
- 16 projections if you would like for your records, um,
- 17 redirect you to the webpages that have that information.
- 18 Um, but that's basically all I had to say, and thank you
- 19 for the time.
- 20 CHAIR: What I might ask the secretariat to do is speak to you
- about the material, to which you the websites to which
- you referred.
- 23 MS PARKER: Yep.
- 24 CHAIR: If one of the secretariats would do that, I'd be
- 25 grateful.
- 26 MS PARKER: Okay.
- 27 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Is there another speaker at
- this point, secretariat? No?
- 29 MR ROGERS: It looks like someone else is online there, Sue.
- Without a name, just a number.
- 31 SECRETARIAT 1: We believe that's Katrina.

- 1 CHAIR: Can you contact see who it is, and if it is Katrina,
- 2 ask her how she wishes to join in.
- 3 MR ROGERS: Katrina, can you hear us? If you can, you're on
- 4 mute.
- 5 CHAIR: We have the phone number there. It would be useful if
- one of the secretariats could call. Can we pause for a
- 7 moment whilst we see where she may be Katrina may be,
- 8 and - -
- 9 MS CHANDLER: (Indistinct words).
- 10 MR ROGERS: Never mind.
- 11 CHAIR: Katrina? Or is it there's another speaker available?
- 12 MR ROGERS: There's no other speaker, but we'll just try and
- 13 contact her, Sue, if you can just slight pause for
- everybody.
- 15 MS PARKER: Sorry, can you hear me? It's Jane.
- 16 MR ROGERS: Hi Jane.
- 17 MS PARKER: Sorry if I could contact Katrina if she's
- 18 having technical issues, then she could email me - -
- 19 MR ROGERS: All right hang on - -
- 20 MS PARKER: - the words.
- 21 MR ROGERS: Hang on, hang on. We've got her back on again, just
- hang on for a second. Katrina, are you there?
- 23 MS CHANDLER: Hello, hi.
- 24 CHAIR: I'm sorry about - -
- 25 MS CHANDLER: I'm so sorry about I am so sorry, I'm just in a
- 26 tricky spot right now, trying to work and - -
- 27 CHAIR: No, no, please don't apologise.
- 28 MS CHANDLER: Okay, thank you for trying so hard, I just
- 29 couldn't get my phone unmuted. I'm not used to working
- 30 off a phone, I'm so used to being in front of the
- 31 computer, so it's a bit tricky.

- 1 CHAIR: I empathise, I can tell you. Would you like to begin?
- 2 MS CHANDLER: Yes, sure, (indistinct) - -
- 3 CHAIR: Remember to say your name, though, first.
- 4 MS CHANDLER: Of course, I will. Thank you so much. Okay, good
- 5 afternoon, my name is Katrina Chandler, I would like to
- 6 thank the augmented Electoral Commission for the
- 7 opportunity to speak at this inquiry and to the federal
- 8 redistribution of New South Wales. Having read many
- 9 submissions, objections, and comments, it is clear to me
- 10 that there are factors contributing to the process that
- were not taken into consideration when the Commission put
- 12 forward their draft proposal to abolish the Division of
- North Sydney. There is clearly a very strong community of
- interest, shown by people living on the Lower North
- 15 Shore.
- 16 Having lived in the Division of North Sydney before
- moving to Warringah, I can attest to this strong
- community spirit in the business centres, sporting
- 19 (indistinct) and community groups that have grown and
- strengthened over many decades on the Lower North Shore.
- 21 This is also shown by the hundreds of objections lodged
- with the Commission, including a petition with over 2,000
- 23 signatures. I object to comment 210, calling this a
- 'paper wall', as it undermines hundreds of constituent
- objections, who were not aware of the Commission's
- proposal to abolish the Division of North Sydney.
- Everyone who has spoken at the hearing or lodged an
- objection or comment has done so with their free will, as
- an engaged citizen in democracy, and this is not
- something to destroy, as it is needed for a healthy
- democracy, and is a clear, new important type of

community interest. The growing business district of
Crows Nest and St Leonards is an essential hub in the
division of North Sydney. The newly opened metro
reinforces the transformation of long-term economic
transport and housing development impact in the area,
which highlights the short-sightedness of dividing the
division into three, um - three, at this thriving and
growing centre.

2.3

2.7

In addition, is that it is a major health precinct in New South Wales, best served by one Federal MP. Your proposal has taken a pizza cutter approach, instead of acknowledging that Crows Nest is a major growing and economic centre, and so I ask that you please re-examine your proposal. I am support - I am in support of Kylea Tink's objection, OB686, as it offers a solution to increasing electors by merging Bradfield and Berowra, which have similar communities of interest. By merging Berowra and Bradfield, there will be one central business and health centre, Hornsby, servicing the Upper North Shore.

The Upper North Shore is a distinct community of interest, in contrast with the Lower North Shore. There are many similarities on the Upper North Shore, so it would be reasonable to join Berowra and Bradfield.

Residents in Wahroonga and Turramurra identify themselves as part of the same community as Hornsby and Waitara residents, all as Upper North Shore. They have similar demographics, shared public transport connections, and communities of interest in the area.

I would also like to add that the redistribution process favours major parties, as it was clear they knew .SB:EY 21/08/24 AECA 12 DISCUSSION NSW Redistribution Online Inquiry

that there was an expectation to provide an alternative solution to boundaries in their original submission. I hope that the Commission is able to demonstrate that the strong public opinion shown to retain the division of North Sydney and the alternative put forward by Kylea Tink should carry equal weight to other stakeholders such as the major parties.

2.2

2.3

2.7

In 2010, the proposed abolishment of the Victorian electorate of Murray was reversed at this stage of the process on economic grounds. Not too dissimilar to the fact that Crows Nest and St Leonards is a growing and important economic centre. I would also like to speak on behalf of The Honourable Anthony Whealy KC, who wasn't able to attend the hearing last week due to health reasons. Anthony is the former judge of the New South Wales Supreme Court and Court of Appeal, and the chair of the Centre for Public Integrity.

Anthony's arguments: 'I've been a member of the North Sydney community for over 28 years. The community is very proud of its history, its churches, its schools, its community and business groups. They fulfil our lives as local citizens. We are best served by one federal MP. From a personal perspective, I would be devastated by the proposed destruction and subdivision of our electorate. This is a feeling that I know is shared by all of our community. From a public interest point of view, the arguments in support of a boundary redistribution do not take into account extensive planned housing in North Sydney, Willoughby and Lane Cove LGAs.

The anticipated growth thoroughly supports retention rather than abolition and redistribution. Crows Nest and .SB:EY 21/08/24 AECA 13 DISCUSSION

- 1 St Leonards ought properly be viewed as a growing
- 2 commercial and residential centre, and an important
- 3 health precinct, that would be best served by one federal
- 4 MP, not three. They are now inextricably linked by public
- 5 transport, including the new Metro.'
- 6 Thank you very much for your time. Hello?
- 7 MR ROGERS: Great.
- 8 CHAIR: All right, Katrina, thank you very much indeed.
- 9 MR ROGERS: Sue, I as I understand it, that's the last
- speaker, we've attempted to contact the other registered
- 11 speakers - -
- 12 MS CHANDLER: Hello?
- 13 MR ROGERS: And - -
- 14 CHAIR: Hello?
- 15 MR ROGERS: Hello.
- 16 MS CHANDLER: Hi, did you hear me?
- 17 CHAIR: I can hear you - -
- 18 MR ROGERS: Yes Katrina, yes, thank you very much.
- 19 MS CHANDLER: Oh sorry, it's quite hard to tell.
- 20 CHAIR: Thank you very much for your time. Yes, I apologise,
- 21 but we're - -
- 22 MS CHANDLER: Thank you.
- 23 CHAIR: - very grateful for your presentation today. So, I
- 24 take it that - -
- 25 MR ROGERS: That's it, Sue.
- 26 CHAIR: That's it.
- 27 MR ROGERS: Just hold for one we're doing one final check,
- Sue, if you just wait for one second, please.
- 29 SECRETARIAT 1: Yes, we do have somebody else. They've just
- 30 used the wrong link, we're trying to get them in using
- 31 the right link or calling them directly, so it should

- 1 hopefully have them up soon.
- 2 MR ROGERS: (Indistinct) online now?
- 3 SECRETARIAT 1: Yep.
- 4 MR ROGERS: I think it's Jane, Sue.
- 5 CHAIR: This is Jane Hearn, or Jane Parker?
- 6 MR ROGERS: Jane Hearn.
- 7 CHAIR: Jane, can you hear me? Not at this point it seems.
- 8 MR ROGERS: Jane, if you are there, you are on mute.
- 9 CHAIR: Does the secretariat have any contact details for Jane
- 10 Hearn? That they could use?
- 11 MR ROGERS: I think that I think the secretariats are doing
- just that.
- 13 CHAIR: Good.
- 14 MR ROGERS: Using whatever means they've got. No success. Jane,
- if you're they're calling I think they've called her
- directly.
- 17 CHAIR: And I think the link has been resent as well.
- 18 MR ROGERS: Yes.
- 19 CHAIR: So, we'll give it a minute or two, to see if that
- works.
- 21 MR ROGERS: Might I be bold enough to suggest and forgive me
- for not quite understanding the technology perhaps
- actually if we push Jane Hearn out of the meeting, and
- 24 then phone her on that number, that - -
- 25 CHAIR: I'm very happy to do that, it might work. I'm just
- going to go on mute while the secretariats do that.
- 27 MR ROGERS: Great, I'm just going to do the same. Jane, if you
- can hear us, could I ask you to unmute? Your phone is on
- mute, we can see you in the room, but we just can't hear
- you because you're on mute.
- 31 CHAIR: I actually can't see Jane on mute - -

- 1 MR ROGERS: No, you can see her (indistinct) - -
- 2 CHAIR: I can't see I can see a phone number.
- 3 MR ROGERS: Yes.
- 4 CHAIR: And it is on mute.
- 5 MR ROGERS: Okay, so - -
- 6 CHAIR: All right, so, no success.
- 7 MR ROGERS: Okay.
- 8 CHAIR: That's a shame. We'll give it five minutes, just in
- g case there's another speaker or she wishes to return from
- somewhere else.
- 11 SECRETARIAT 2: You can address me directly (indistinct) - -
- 12 MS HEARN: (Indistinct) now, I'll be coming through my - -
- 13 SECRETARIAT 2: It will be - -
- 14 MS HEARN: - microphone. (Indistinct) - -
- 15 SECRETARIAT 2: (Indistinct) 30 seconds.
- 16 SECRETARIAT 1: Give us one moment.
- 17 SECRETARIAT 2: So just make sure you state your name clearly
- at the start. All right. So I'll put you on now.
- 19 CHAIR: Hello?
- 20 MS HEARN: Yes, hello, it's Jane Hearn here.
- 21 CHAIR: Thank you.
- 22 MS HEARN: Hello?
- 23 MR ROGERS: Sue, you're on mute.
- 24 MS HEARN: Good afternoon (indistinct) - -
- 25 CHAIR: Sorry Jane I was on mute. Can I ask you to state your
- 26 name and continue, please?
- 27 MS HEARN: Thank you. My name is Jane Hearn, and my sorry,
- we've got background noise my name is Jane Hearn, I am
- a long term resident of Wollstonecraft and the Waverton
- area, which is on what is proposed to be the most
- 31 southern point of the new proposed Wahroonga seat. Um, I

have made a comment, which was, I think, numbered as no.184. The point - a couple points that I would like to make this afternoon is to emphasise the dislocation of Waverton and Wollstonecraft from Wahroonga. I know that this has been mentioned on a number of occasions, but I want to really ensure that the Commission doesn't underestimate the impact, particularly of Military Road, which is - runs through Mosman down to the Spit Bridge in the Middle Harbour.

2.3

2.7

The point I'd like to make is that the seat of North Sydney is already fragmented by the Wahroonga Freeway and Military Road. Whilst on paper, and looking at maps, and - some of these areas may not seem to be very far apart, and perhaps easily accessible, but I'd like to really emphasise the point that in a high-density urban area such as this, although as the crow flies, one might have proximity to something, in fact, the physical barriers are in some cases virtually insurmountable.

The reason - so the patterns of movement that have been mentioned already, I would like to endorse what was said earlier today, I guess, in some of the comments, that the typical movements of people in this area is not along - up towards Manly or Wahroonga, but is indeed, sort of up that - sort of railway line, sort of, to the north of Sydney.

And the - we're discussing this with neighbours, who've became aware that their seat was possibly going to be abolished. We assumed that would mean that if it was abolished, that we would join what is currently the seat of Bradfield, so that there was some coherence in the north-south direction, and that we would - because that

is where the connections are. And did not, in fact,

expect - we were quite surprised to find that Wahroonga

and expanding Wahroonga was the proposal.

It's been said to me, not to worry about this, because there will be an electoral office in Mosman, and I have to say that from a Waverton and Wollstonecraft point of view, anybody on this side of the freeway, that that is of no assistance. Now, you know, this is obviously a self-interested comment, but I would like to make the point also, that Waverton, Wollstonecraft, Crows Nest, North Sydney, is home to a very large number of renters. People who are new migrants, who transit through this area, people who are medical staff that service the health precinct at St Leonards, but actually live in the North Sydney electorate.

Now, not all of those are electors, and I understand that - the numerical calculation and the achieving the - or ensuring the 'one vote, one value', is a primary consideration. But I would like to make the point that when we talk about communities of interest, very often, the people who do not participate in these processes are the permanent residents who have lived here for decades, pay tax, but do - don't vote, and are not eligible for - to be a candidate - - -

- 25 SECRETARIAT 1: One minute remaining.
- 26 MS HEARN: Sorry?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

- 27 SECRETARIAT 1: One minute remaining.
- MS HEARN: Okay, thank you. I will finish by saying that I've
  now read the Tink submission, which I'd like to support,
  except in relation to Kirribilli. There is a large public
  housing community in Kirribilli, which needs easy access

- 1 to a North Sydney federal member.
- 2 And New South Wales has also reformed the strata
- 3 redevelopment laws that I would recommend some
- 4 consideration of the impact of redevelopment strata,
- 5 because this area has a lot of older strata schemes that
- 6 are ripe for amalgamation, which in fact, has already
- 7 happened in North Sydney, which is also
- 8 contributes to the planning and population growth
- 9 considerations that I think have been brought to your
- 10 attention. Thank you.
- 11 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed, Jane. That was helpful. Is
- there anyone else who wishes to speak? Are the
- secretariats aware of anyone else?
- 14 SECRETARIAT 1: There's one person we couldn't get in contact
- 15 with, so at this point, that that was all the speakers
- 16 for today.
- 17 CHAIR: All right, so we've spoken you said there was one
- person we can get in contact with, is that - -
- 19 MR ROGERS: Could not get in contact with.
- 20 CHAIR: Could not get in contact with, thank you. All right,
- 21 well, if that's the case, then we can take it no further,
- I think. And we must thank sincerely all those who've
- contributed today for their helpful observations. And as
- I indicated earlier, we'll try and make a public
- announcement as soon as practicable. And we are indeed
- very grateful that all for all your contributions.
- 27 Having said that, I think it's time to call it to a
- 28 close. But thanks so much.
- 29 MR ROGERS: Thanks everybody.
- 30 - -