



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL
TERRITORY**

Submission OB12

Anonymous 2

RESPONSE TO PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION

Summary

Reading the proposed redistribution, a number of concerns arose for me, which shall be addressed in the following sections, and as such, I felt the need to put in this response with a counter-proposal of my own. This proposal has the following benefits over the current proposal:

- **No two-way exchanges:** The current proposal suggests moving electors in Crace and surrounds from Fenner to Canberra, whilst also suggesting moving electors in South Belconnen from Canberra to Fenner, and similarly, suggests moving electors in Molonglo Valley and Norfolk Island from Bean to Canberra, whilst also suggesting moving electors in North Woden from Canberra to Bean. I feel that this situation leaves too many electors swapping divisions in unnecessary trades, and so my proposal avoids this.
- **Fewer electors transferred:** In a similar vein to the above point, I have ensured that my proposal involves less transfer of electors between divisions overall. My proposal would transfer 23,780 electors (or 7.39% of total electors) between divisions, compared to 31,778 electors (or 9.87% of total electors) in the current proposal.
- **Most enrolments closer to quota:** As seen in Table 2, all divisions would be left with a current enrolment closer to the quota in my proposal than under the current proposal, and the Division of Canberra would be left with a projected enrolment closer to the quota as well.
- **Same two districts split:** The reality of districts being split between divisions is unfortunate, but unavoidable. However, changing which districts are split creates even more confusion than maintaining more-or-less the status quo in my view. This proposal keeps Gungahlin intact, whilst maintaining Belconnen and Woden Valley as split districts.
- **District-specific benefits:** Will be discussed in detail in later sections.

Care has also been taken to ensure that each division covers two town centres, although this is not a benefit over the current proposal, as the current proposal also accomplishes this goal.

Table 1: SA2s affected by this proposal

SA2s not listed are unaffected by either proposal

SA2	Status-quo	AEC proposal	My proposal
Changes I agree should be made			
Garran	Canberra	Bean	Bean
Hughes	Canberra	Bean	Bean
Woden Red Hill (part of SA1 80106106908)	Canberra	Bean	Bean
Agreement that it should be moved, but not on the destination			
Arboretum	Bean	Canberra	Fenner
Coombs	Bean	Canberra	Fenner
Denman Prospect	Bean	Canberra	Fenner
Molonglo	Bean	Canberra	Fenner
Molonglo - East	Bean	Canberra	Fenner
Whitlam	Bean	Canberra	Fenner
Wright	Bean	Canberra	Fenner
Changes I would make			
Belconnen	Fenner	Fenner	Canberra
Page	Fenner	Fenner	Canberra
Scullin	Fenner	Fenner	Canberra
Changes to which I object			
Crace	Fenner	Canberra	Fenner
Curtin*	Canberra	Bean	Canberra*
Hawker	Canberra	Fenner	Canberra
Kenny	Fenner	Canberra	Fenner
Lyons*	Canberra	Bean	Canberra*
Macquarie	Canberra	Fenner	Canberra
Mitchell	Fenner	Canberra	Fenner
Norfolk Island	Bean	Canberra	Bean
Weetangera	Canberra	Fenner	Canberra

*I do not object to Curtin or Lyons being in Bean, but in the context of this broader proposal, such a change would push Canberra's projected enrolment below the quota, so they are not changes that I have made

Table 2: Enrolment numbers

Deviations closer to zero are highlighted in purple

Proposed electorate	Enrolment as of 12 August 2025				Projected enrolment as of 8 April 2030			
	Number		Percentage Deviation		Number		Percentage Deviation	
	AEC	Me	AEC	Me	AEC	Me	AEC	Me
Bean	112,947	108,236	+5.27%	+0.88%	116,904	112,166	+1.8%	-2.33%
Canberra	100,138	106,798	-6.67%	-0.46%	112,369	113,590	-2.15%	-1.09%
Fenner	108,794	106,845	+1.4%	-0.42%	115,252	118,769	+0.36%	+3.42%
Total	321,879				344,525			

Belconnen District

I oppose the transfer of Hawker, Macquarie and Weetangera from Canberra to Fenner—in fact, I support the *expansion* of Canberra into the Belconnen District with the addition of the Belconnen town centre, as well as Page and Scullin. This not only avoids the need to split the Gungahlin District (as I oppose in the sections above and below), and ensures town centre balance between divisions with Molonglo Valley moved to Fenner, for which I argue below, but it also:

- Brings all suburbs with a direct road connection to the City along Belconnen Way into the fold of Canberra
- Defines a more natural border (i.e. compare Kingsford Smith and Southern Cross Drives to Redfern Street)
- Unites the many UC students living in student accommodation in Belconnen with their peers living on-campus in Bruce and with ANU students on-campus in Acton

Gungahlin District

As addressed in the summary, I strongly oppose the new splitting of a district currently intact if avoidable. I also have to disagree with the assertion that Crace has better transport connections to Canberra than to Fenner. I support Crace, Kenny and Mitchell remaining in Fenner.

Molonglo Valley District

Whilst I support Molonglo Valley leaving Bean, I suggest that it would find a better home in Fenner as opposed to Canberra. As an area of new development and rapid expansion, Molonglo Valley has more in common with the young suburbs of Ginninderry or North Gungahlin than it does with the leafy, established suburbs that make up the bulk of Bean or Canberra. Furthermore, as a beautifully diverse district with a flourishing immigrant community (one of two districts in the ACT

with >40% immigrant population, the other being Gungahlin), Molonglo Valley has strong demographic proximity to the communities of Gungahlin in Fenner, and I am concerned that leaving this district out of Fenner risks unnecessarily splitting and diluting the votes of such communities.

Despite these arguments, I do admit that the geographic connection is questionable. That said, I would argue that the factors that are claimed in the current proposal to bring proximity to Canberra Central—namely the construction of the Molonglo River Bridge, and the future development of Bandler and Sulman, including the Bindubi St extension—actually bring more proximity to Belconnen than to Canberra Central, and even with the above changes, the Belconnen District is still majority Fenner by population (40,346 Fenner electors, 55.2%, to 32,772 Canberra electors). This argument is further strengthened if the committee decides to push ahead with transferring South Belconnen suburbs into Fenner. Thus, I believe that the arguments in favour of moving Molonglo Valley to Fenner outweigh any arguments for Bean or Canberra.

Norfolk Island Territory

I oppose the transfer of Norfolk Island from Bean. The justification that the territory has “transport connections to mainland Australia through Canberra Airport” rings hollow when considering that commercial flights to Norfolk Island are only offered from Sydney and Brisbane Airports, and not Canberra Airport. This proposal also does not require Norfolk Island to be transferred to better balance populations. Therefore, I firmly believe that the transfer of Norfolk Island is wholly unnecessary and best avoided.

Woden Valley District

Whilst I am not opposed to the transfer of Woden Valley as a whole from Canberra to Bean, the numbers unfortunately did not work out with the rest of this proposal, therefore, I am proposing to transfer Garran, Hughes and the Woden Valley arm of Red Hill into Bean, but to maintain Curtin and Lyons in Canberra for the time being. I chose these suburbs mainly due to transport connections—the 60/61 loop, the 72, the 76, the 77 and the 902 all serve to connect Garran and, to a lesser extent, Hughes deep into Bean territory down Yamba Dr, whereas Curtin and Lyons have, I feel, stronger connections (if only by comparison) to Molonglo Valley and Canberra Central districts.

Name Change

I support the proposal by Malcolm Bourke in the original round of submissions to revert the name of the southern division in the ACT from Bean to Namadji. On top of the very valid reasons provided by Mr. Bourke as to why Bean is a bad name—that its namesake, Charles Bean, was a deeply racist man who only lived in Canberra for six years of his life—I believe there are several reasons why Namadji would be a good name:

- It is a local Indigenous name.
- Namadji has been the name of a similarly located division in the past.
- Namadji has broad name recognition, whereas Charles Bean is by no means a household name.
- In a similar vein, it is more geographically expressive. Of the very few Canberrans who have heard of Charles Bean to begin with, even fewer could tell you that he lived in Tuggeranong between the years 1919 and 1925. Meanwhile, almost everyone could point out Namadji on an unlabelled map of the ACT and make an educated guess as to which division has that name.

Final comments

Thank you for your time in considering my response, and those of others who have made submissions. I would be more than happy to speak further on this proposal if need be.