

Name: Fergus Calwell

I write in support of the VEC's preferred option, Option A.

Firstly, regarding the "one vote, one value" principle:

- the data provided on pages 31-33 of the preliminary report indicates that, of the three options, Option A ensures the least deviation from average voter-to-councillor ratio;
- having fewer wards (in this case 4, as opposed to 5 or 11) lessens the risk of the deviation of any one ward falling below or reaching above the 10% deviation limit.

And secondly, regarding community representation:

- the four proposed wards as cartographically outlined on page 31 provide for a better subdivision of the council area than the proposed wards for Options B and C, because:
 - the Balwyn shopping district remains in the one ward; and
 - the ward boundaries are mostly major roads, making them easier to remember;
 - having multi-member wards allows for representation of local residents whose preferred candidates would not receive a majority of votes in a single-member ward contest (ie a greater number of voters will be represented by councillors for whom they voted).
- Lastly, I have one suggested amendment to the ward boundaries under Option A. Given the optimum in avoiding deviation from the average voter-to-councillor ratio and in preserving easily identifiable ward boundaries (such as main roads), I think Option A would be improved by adjusting the boundary between the proposed Belmore and Ferndale wards to run along east along Prospect Hill Road (as currently suggested), then north along Highfield Road and then east along Canterbury Road, because:
- the slight removal of voters from Belmore Ward and the slight addition of voters to Ferndale Ward would bring the deviation from the average voter-to-councillor ratio for both wards closer to zero; and
 - such an adjustment would mean all ward boundaries in the entire council area are main roads.