



TASMANIAN GOVERNMENT GAZETTE

PUBLISHED BY
AUTHORITY
ISSN 0039-9795

SATURDAY 10 MAY 2008

No. 20 842

Legislative Council

REDISTRIBUTION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995

SECTION 21 NOTICE

SECOND FURTHER REDISTRIBUTION PROPOSAL

IN accordance with Section 21 of the *Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995*, the Redistribution Tribunal now publishes its second further redistribution proposal. The substance of the Tribunal's findings or conclusions concerning the initial redistribution proposal and objections and the further redistribution proposal and objections appears below.

In the opinion of the Redistribution Tribunal, the second further redistribution proposal is not significantly different to the further redistribution proposal.

Note: the second further proposal differs from the further proposal only in that the proposed division of Great Western Tiers is now named Western Tiers.

RICHARD BINGHAM,
Chairperson of the Redistribution Tribunal, 10 May 2008

REDISTRIBUTION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995

SECTIONS 25 & 26 NOTICE

DETERMINATION OF BOUNDARIES AND NAMES

IN accordance with Section 25(1) of the *Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995*, the Redistribution Tribunal hereby determines the names and boundaries of the 15 Legislative Council electoral divisions into which the State of Tasmania is to be distributed.

The names and boundaries are as shown on the maps recorded in the Central Plan Register (CPR), Department of Primary Industries and Water in Hobart, being the maps numbered CPR 8163, 8164, 8165, 8166, 8167, 8168, 8169, 8170, 8171, 8172, 8173, 8174, 8175, 8176 and 8178.

The reasons for the Tribunal's determination and the substance of the Tribunal's findings or conclusions concerning the initial redistribution proposal and objections and the further redistribution proposal and objections appear below.

Section 28 of the *Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995* provides that the determination of the Redistribution Tribunal is final and conclusive and may not be challenged or appealed against.

RICHARD BINGHAM,
Chairperson of the Redistribution Tribunal, 10 May 2008.

Liz Gillam
Member

Peter Murphy
Member

Cassandra Short
Member

Bruce Taylor
Member

The Reasons for the Determination, and the Substance of the Tribunal's Findings or Conclusions Concerning the Initial Redistribution Proposal and Objections

With the exceptions described below, the Tribunal adopted the initial redistribution proposal published by the Redistribution Committee on 9 February 2008, and the reasons published by that Committee.

Additions to Wellington

Three objectors disagreed with the Committee's proposal to join Sandy Bay and Dynnyrne north of the University of Tasmania to the Division of Wellington. All preferred that all or part of South Hobart be added to Wellington.

The Tribunal was persuaded that there is a greater community of interest between South Hobart and the balance of Wellington than exists for Sandy Bay and Dynnyrne.

One option was to join only that part of South Hobart east of the Cascade Brewery to Wellington. The Tribunal took the view that this approach would isolate the balance of South Hobart, and preferred to use Sandy Bay Rivulet for the length of its course from Fern Tree to the River Derwent as a natural boundary between Nelson and Wellington.

Additions to Elwick

The initial proposal transferred the part of Moonah bounded by Main Rd, Derwent Park Rd and Brooker Hwy to Elwick, while retaining Lutana in Wellington. One objector suggested reversing this transfer, while another called for both areas to remain in Wellington, and for a substantial area of West Moonah to be added to Wellington. Adoption of the latter suggestion would not have complied with either the allowed variation from the quota, or the allowed variation from 2012 average division enrolment (ADE).

The Tribunal noted that, following its decision relating to South Hobart, Wellington already had a 2012 enrolment very slightly over 2012 ADE, and that the community of interest of Lutana, Moonah and West Moonah was clearly with each other, more than with Hobart City suburbs to their south.

Accordingly, the Tribunal decided to transfer both Lutana and Central Moonah to Elwick, so establishing the Hobart City/Glenorchy City boundary as the basis for the Wellington/Elwick boundary.

There are two minor exceptions to this municipal boundary: one house in Ripley Rd, West Moonah actually located in Hobart City, and a cluster of houses in Mowbray Ct and the northern extremity of Girrabong Rd, Lenah Valley, actually located in Glenorchy City. Keeping in mind the criterion relating to "means of communication and travel", the Tribunal allocated these houses according to the balance of their respective localities.

Elwick's northern boundary

The above decision put Elwick's enrolment 7.9% above the quota (although this is expected to reduce to 2.4% above 2012 ADE). There was little scope for Elwick to accommodate excess enrolment from its northern neighbour Derwent, so the Tribunal decided to reinstate the existing Elwick/Derwent boundary, and notes that this is consistent with one objector's preference for an east-west boundary in the vicinity of Claremont.

Derwent, Pembroke and Rumney

The Tribunal received an objection to the proposal to add the southern part of Central Highlands municipal area to Rowallan, and was persuaded by the objector that the electors affected had cultural, commercial and sporting links almost exclusively with Southern Tasmania. Accordingly, the Tribunal decided to reinstate the existing boundary between Derwent and Rowallan.

Two decisions described above left Derwent with no transfer of its high enrolment to either Rowallan or Elwick, so the Tribunal looked to Hobart's eastern shore, and saw an opportunity to consolidate Clarence City in the Divisions of Pembroke and Rumney. The Tribunal decided to transfer Otago from Derwent to Pembroke, and Grasstree Hill/Dulcote from Derwent to Rumney.

In this context, the Tribunal notes that it was not greatly persuaded by an objector who argued against any additions to Pembroke.

Frankford

One objector argued for the transfer of part of the West Tamar municipal area, centring on Frankford township, from Rowallan to Rosevears so as to unify West Tamar municipal area in Rosevears. The Tribunal accepted this suggestion.

The North West

One objector argued for the addition of Port Sorell to Mersey, Forth/Turners Beach to Montgomery, eastern Burnie to Murchison, and West Coast municipal area to Rowallan. The Tribunal considered that this suggestion did not comply with either the allowed variation from the quota, or the allowed variation from 2012 ADE, and also believed that the West Coast municipal area's clear community of interest lay in the direction of Burnie and other North West Coast settlements.

Names of divisions

Seven of the 12 objections to the initial redistribution proposal dealt exclusively with the names of the divisions, Paterson, Wellington and Rowallan, and another objection also addressed the issue.

The Tribunal notes that use of the names Launceston and Hobart was discontinued by the 1998-99 Redistribution Committee and Tribunal in the exceptional circumstance of the reduction from 19 to 15 of the number of members of the Legislative Council. That Committee was "cautious, being aware that using existing names for new divisions could signal possible transition arrangements in some eyes." Where that Committee proposed new names, "names of well-recognised geographical features closely associated with proposed divisions were used."

The current Tribunal is not constrained by a change in the number of members of the Legislative Council and, while accepting the principle of naming divisions for geographic features, has been persuaded that neither Paterson nor Rowallan connote a well-recognised feature. In the case of Wellington, the Tribunal has been persuaded that Mount Wellington is a feature common to a number of Hobart divisions, and does not adequately distinguish the division bearing its name.

The Tribunal has accepted the argument that the best-recognised geographic features of Paterson and Wellington are, respectively, Launceston and Hobart's central business districts, and accordingly decided to name these divisions Launceston and Hobart.

The Tribunal also acknowledges the historical significance of Hobart and Launceston as Australia's second and third oldest cities, and the long history of these names being associated with electoral divisions.

The Tribunal noted an objection to the name Rowallan and initially proposed to rename this division as Great Western Tiers, for a geographical feature which dominates the horizon over much of the division.

The Reasons for the Determination, and the Substance of the Tribunal's Findings or Conclusions Concerning the Further Redistribution Proposal and Objections

The Tribunal received two objections to the further redistribution proposal.

One objection dealt with the number of members of the Legislative Council, a matter which was clearly beyond the power of the Tribunal to consider because Section 13 (1) of the Act requires the Tribunal to redistribute the State into the number of Divisions specified in the *Constitution Act 1934*.

The second objection argued that the proposed name Great Western Tiers should be replaced by Western Tiers. After considering the evidence, the Tribunal concluded that, although official nomenclature supported the use of Great Western Tiers, it is a somewhat cumbersome name, and that the escarpment is frequently referred to as Western Tiers in everyday usage.

The Tribunal has decided to name the division Western Tiers. No other changes were made to the further redistribution proposal published on 12 April 2008.

REDISTRIBUTION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995

SECTION 29 NOTICE

TRANSITION ARRANGEMENTS:

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

PUBLIC HEARING

THE Redistribution Tribunal is to hold an inquiry, the subject of which is to be —

"Matters relating to transition arrangements to implement the redistribution of the State in respect of the Legislative Council."

**The public hearing will commence at
10:00 AM on Wednesday 21 May 2008
on the 2nd floor, Telstra Centre, 70 Collins St, Hobart**

Any person is invited to appear at the hearing, and/or lodge a written submission relating to the transition arrangements no later than 5:00 PM on Monday 19 May 2008.

Written submissions can be sent to the Tribunal by post, facsimile or email at the addresses shown below.

Those who wish to be heard at the inquiry and/or intend to lodge submissions are asked to contact the Tribunal's assistant, Mr Julian Type, as soon as possible.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

THE Redistribution Tribunal is required to determine the allocation of members to the new Legislative Council divisions, the periodical cycle of elections, and other matters, if any, associated with the implementation of the redistribution.

RICHARD BINGHAM,
Chairperson of the Redistribution Tribunal, 10 May 2008.

Redistribution Secretariat:

2nd floor, Telstra Centre, 70 Collins St, Hobart	Reply Paid 300, GPO Box 300, Hobart 7001
Freecall 1800 801 701	Fax (03) 6224 0217
Website - www.electoral.tas.gov.au	Email - lc redistribution@electoral.tas.gov.au

Disclaimer

Products and services advertised in this publication are not endorsed by the State of Tasmania and the State does not accept any responsibility for the content or quality of reproduction. The Contractor reserves the right to reject any advertising material it considers unsuitable for government publication.

Copyright

The Tasmanian Government Gazette and Tasmanian State Services are subject to the Copyright Act. No part of any material published in the Tasmanian Government Gazette or the Tasmanian State Services Notices may be reproduced except in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Printed by Print Applied Technology Pty Ltd under authority of the Government of the State of Tasmania