

Electoral Representation Review – Boroondara City Council – Preliminary Submission  
Philip Mallis - North Balwyn - 18-02-2019

To whom it may concern,  
Please find my submission attached.  
Yours faithfully,  
Philip Mallis

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to lodge this submission for the 2019 subdivision review for Boroondara City Council. Please find details below.

## CONTENTS

---

1	Number of councillors.....	2
2	Electoral structure.....	2
2.1	Ward areas.....	2
2.1.1	Proposed changes.....	2
2.1.2	Deviations from online map boundaries .....	6
2.1.3	Summary .....	6
2.2	Ward subdivisions .....	6
3	Comment at public hearing .....	7
4	Other comments.....	7

## 1 NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS

I believe that the current number of councillors (10) is appropriate.

Please see the ‘Ward subdivision’ section for content related to the number of councillors per ward.

## 2 ELECTORAL STRUCTURE

### 2.1 WARD AREAS

I have proposed several changes to ward boundaries. Reasons for the boundary changes generally fall into one of two general categories:

1. More closely align to communities of interest
2. Bring the number of voters closer to the 10 percent requirement for the average number of voters per councillor across the municipality.

Table 1 shows the current and proposed number of voters, councillors and deviations:

Ward	Councillors	Voters (current)	Voters (proposed)	Deviation (current)	Deviation (proposed)
Bellevue	1	12,321	12,426	-7.61%	-6.82%
Cotham	1	12,612	13,104	-5.43%	-1.74%
Gardiner	1	14,056	12,946	+5.40%	-2.92%
Glenferrie	1	14,866	14,196	+11.48%	+6.45%
Junction	1	14,962	12,196	+12.20%	-8.55%
Lynden	1	13,087	13,460	-1.86%	+0.93%
Maling	1	13,045	14,467	-2.18%	+8.48%
Maranoa	1	11,975	13,730	-10.20%	+2.96%
Solway	1	12,952	13,164	-2.88%	-1.29%
Studley	1	13,481	13,668	+1.09%	+2.49%

#### 2.1.1 Proposed changes

As a former councillor of Boroondara and a resident of North Balwyn for over 19 years, I feel that I have relevant experience and knowledge in the functional and spatial characteristics of the municipality.

Table 2 below summarises the proposed boundary changes (to be read in conjunction with the Boundary Builder map). A rationale is provided for each proposal.

**Table 2 – Summary of proposed changes and rationales**

Ward	Boundary change	Rationale
Bellevue	North: none	Municipal boundary
	East: none	Municipal boundary
	South: realign boundary to follow High Street	The present boundary along Boorool Road and Harp Road is not legible. However, given that the

		Harp Village shopping precinct would be divided into two wards, this change may not be necessary.
	West: realign boundary to Princess Street and Asquith Street	The present boundary along Willsmere/Kilby Road divides an area of contiguous residential built form. These two areas on either side of the Road are part of the same community of interest. Additionally, this change brings all northern parklands into Bellevue Ward for administrative efficiency.
<b>Cotham</b>	North: realign boundary to follow High Street	<i>See Bellevue Ward – South for rationale.</i>
	East: realign boundary with Maranoa Ward further west	These changes would have the current boundary with Maranoa Ward shifted west from Buchanan Avenue. While this does serve as a good barrier at present, moving this boundary west to Severn Street would provide Maranoa Ward with additional electors. Current boundaries further south along Sevenoaks and other streets would also shift further west to account for the shift to Severn Street and maintain legibility.
	South: extend part of ward across Mont Albert Road	This change would move 838 voters from Junction into Cotham Ward to accommodate for future growth around Camberwell Junction. The new boundary would also affect Maling Ward.
	West: align boundary to Ridgeway Avenue and Glenferrie Road	This change allows for the entire Kew Junction Activity Centre to be located in the same ward (Studley). This also improves legibility by straightening boundaries and using Glenferrie Road as a more obvious divider.
<b>Gardiner</b>	North: realign boundary to Glenferrie Road, Tooronga Road and Pleasant Road	These changes shift the boundary to three significant roads. This avoids the present confusing deviations through minor side streets and creates more legible boundaries. It also preserves Camberwell Junction being in a single ward (Junction).
	East: realign boundary to Burke Road, Toorak Road and Summerhill Road	These changes shift the boundary to three significant roads. This avoids the present confusing deviations through minor side streets and creates more legible boundaries.
	South: realign boundary to Ferndale Park and Glen Iris Road	This change moves the boundary slightly to include 1,414 voters who would otherwise fall within Lynden Ward and create a deviation imbalance above 10 percent.

	West: <i>no change</i>	<i>Municipal boundary</i>
<b>Glenferrie</b>	North: <i>no change</i>	Barkers Road forms a logical boundary between communities of interest.
	East: <i>no change</i>	<i>Municipal boundary</i>
	South: realign boundary to Riversdale Road	This change shifts the boundary back to Riversdale Road, a major east-west thoroughfare to improve boundary legibility. Other boundary changes means that this changes does not result in an overall increase in voters within the Ward.
	West: realign boundary to High Street South	This change redistributes 1,714 voters from Glenferrie into Studley Ward. High Street South is also a logical boundary, being a main road.
<b>Junction</b>	North: distribute voters to Cotham Ward at Mont Albert Road	<i>See Cotham Ward – South for rationale.</i>
	East: place all of Boroondara Park within Maling Ward	The present change is aligned to the old railway. Rather than have Boroondara Park split between two wards, it is proposed to place it all within Maling Ward and move the boundary with Junction Ward slightly west.
	South: realign boundary to Trafalgar Road, Seymour Grove, Pleasant Road and Tooronga Road	<i>See Gardiner Ward – North for rationale.</i>
	West: <i>no change</i>	Auburn Road forms a logical boundary between communities of interest.
<b>Lynden</b>	North: realign boundary to Riversdale Road	This change moves 765 voters between to Prospect Hill Road and Riversdale Road from Lynden to Maling Wards. This change is proposed for boundary legibility, as the latter thoroughfare is more of a barrier between communities of interest than the former.
	East: <i>no change</i>	<i>Municipal boundary</i>
	South: realign boundary to Toorak Road	This change moves 1,836 voters between Toorak Road and Bath Road from Lynden to Solway Ward. This change is proposed for boundary legibility, as the latter thoroughfare is more of a barrier between communities of interest than the former.

	West: extend ward to Burke Road and Toorak Road	This change adds 3,713 to Lynden Ward from Junction and Gardiner Wards. This was done to account for voter imbalance and maintain boundary legibility.
<b>Maling</b>	North: <i>no change</i>	Whitehorse Road forms a logical boundary between communities of interest.
	East: <i>no change</i>	<i>Municipal boundary.</i>
	South: realign boundary to Toorak Road	<i>See Lynden Ward – North for rationale.</i>
	West: realign boundary in Boroondara Park and Mont Albert Road	<i>This change is aligned to the Cotham Ward – South proposal.</i>
<b>Maranoa</b>	North: <i>no change</i>	Doncaster Road forms a logical boundary between communities of interest.
	East: <i>no change</i>	<i>Municipal boundary</i>
	South: <i>no change</i>	Whitehorse Road forms a logical boundary between communities of interest.
	West: extend ward boundary further west to Severn Street and Nungerner Streets	<i>See Cotham Ward – East for rationale.</i>
<b>Solway</b>	North: realign boundary to Toorak Road	<i>See Lynden Ward – South for rationale</i>
	East: <i>no change</i>	<i>Municipal boundary</i>
	South: <i>no change</i>	<i>Municipal boundary</i>
	West:	<i>See Gardiner Ward – East for rationale</i>
<b>Studley</b>	North: <i>no change</i>	<i>Municipal boundary</i>
	East: realign boundary to Princess Street and Asquith Street	<i>See Bellevue Ward – West for rationale</i>
	South: realign boundary to High Street South	<i>See Glenferrie Ward – East for rationale.</i>
	West: <i>no change</i>	<i>Municipal boundary</i>

As few activity centres as possible are divided between multiple wards. This assists with administrative and other functions. All three major centres (Kew Junction, Camberwell Junction and Glenferrie) would all be located within the same ward.

Boundaries would mostly follow major roads, railways and other features that serve as dividers between communities. They also help to make the boundaries more legible for the public.

The three wards with the highest project population growth (Junction, Glenferrie and Studley) have all had their elector numbers significantly reduced. Other wards with limited projected growth, such as Maranoa and Maling, have had their elector numbers increased. This is to avoid future significant boundary changes.

#### 2.1.2 Deviations from online map boundaries

Owing to the technological constraints of the online Boundary Builder tool, the following deviations apply to my boundary proposals:

- The Studley/Cotham Ward boundary currently shown as being Davis Street, Kew, should instead follow Sackville Street eastwards and thence up Thomas Street to Cotham Road.
- The Studley/Cotham Ward boundary currently shown as being Wellington Street – Charles Street – Cotham Road – Ridgeway Avenue, Kew, should be Wellington Street – Glenferrie Road – Cotham Road – Ridgeway Avenue
- The Studley/Cotham Ward boundary currently shown as being Barkers Road – Lots Avenue – Coleridge Street – Wellington Street, Kew, should be Barkers Road – Glenferrie Road – Cotham Road

#### 2.1.3 Summary

Overall, I believe that these changes achieve several aims. They:

1. Address the present issue of voter distribution with Glenferrie, Junction and Maranoa Wards;
2. Future-proof wards of the highest proposed population growth to minimise the need for future boundary changes; and
3. Address several small alignment issues where communities of interest are divided.

## 2.2 WARD SUBDIVISIONS

I believe that single-member wards are most appropriate. This system has served the community well for over 20 years. There does not appear to be a compelling reason to change.

Among the principal reasons for the current single-member system are:

- **Boundaries for Boroondara's communities of interest:** unlike many other municipalities, Boroondara has many neighbourhood centres. Small but relatively cohesive local communities form around these nodes, which provide retail, recreational and other facilities to nearby residents. Having smaller wards means that these communities are more accurately represented at a political level.
- **Local representation:** smaller electoral units mean closer contact with a local councillor.
- **Greater accountability:** together with local representation, having a single representative responsible for a defined geographic area achieves several aims. It is easier for voters to

identify their local councillor, it establishes a single point of contact for voters and eliminates confusion over councillor responsibilities over the same area.

I would note that during my four years serving as a councillor, not one constituent ever expressed a desire to abolish the present single-member system. Indeed, there were several who showed support for this arrangement.

In summary, I support remaining with the present single-member ward system. The reasons outlined in the 2008 VEC Report remain just as valid now as when it was written. There has not been any significant change that presents a compelling case to move to a multi-member, unsubdivided or other ward system.

### 3 COMMENT AT PUBLIC HEARING

---

I do not wish to speak about my submission at a public hearing.

### 4 OTHER COMMENTS

---

May I commend the VEC on the Boundary Builder tool. It is easy to use and a very good way of visualising submission information.

I would suggest an 'export' function to allow maps to be viewed elsewhere. Otherwise, once the 'Finish Map' button is clicked, a submitter cannot return to view the map on which they are making comments.

Thank you for considering my submission.