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1 Recommendation

The Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) is required under the legislation for the electoral representation review to make a recommendation to the Minister for Local Government as to the number of councillors and the electoral structure that provides fair and equitable representation for the voters of Banyule City (s.219D Local Government Act 1989).

The VEC recommends that the Banyule City Council consist of seven councillors elected from seven single-councillor wards.

This recommended structure is indicated in the map at the back of this Report. This structure is the same as the VEC’s preliminary alternative structure.

2 Background

2.1 Legislative basis

The Local Government (Democratic Reform) Act 2003, which amended the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act), was passed by the Parliament in Spring 2003. The amendments included provisions for independent electoral representation reviews of all Victorian councils. In accordance with this new legislation, the Banyule City Council received notice pursuant to s.219C of the Act from the Minister for Local Government that an electoral representation review was to be conducted for Banyule City. The notice appeared in the Victoria Government Gazette on 4 January 2007.

Under the legislation, a council is required to appoint an electoral commission to conduct an electoral representation review. On 7 February 2007, the Banyule City Council advised that it had appointed the VEC to conduct the review.

The purpose of an electoral representation review is to recommend an electoral structure that provides fair and equitable representation for the persons who are entitled to vote at a general election of the Council. Matters to be considered by the review are:

a) the number of councillors;
b) the electoral structure of the municipality (whether the municipality should be unsubdivided or divided into wards; and, if the municipality is to be subdivided, the number of wards and the number of councillors to be elected for each ward); and
c) if the recommendation is for the municipality to be divided into wards, boundaries for the wards that will:
   i. provide for a fair and equitable division of the municipality; and
   ii. ensure equality of representation, through the number of voters represented by each councillor being within 10% of the average number of voters represented by all councillors.

2.2 The VEC and electoral representation reviews

The VEC has ten years’ experience in working on municipal ward boundaries, being contracted by councils to prepare options for their consideration. VEC staff have also worked for the Electoral Boundaries Commission in State redivisions. In doing this work, the VEC has used sophisticated mapping software, conducted field research and
has developed expertise in preparing electoral boundaries that both comply with legislative approximate equality requirements and respect communities of interest.

The VEC has engaged Mr Terry Maher to provide expertise in the field of local government. Mr Maher commenced his career in local government in 1963. Mr Maher has extensive municipal experience, having been employed by the Melbourne City Council and the former Ringwood and Essendon Councils. He also held the position of Chief Executive at Knox City Council from 1995-2001, and at Croydon City Council from 1986-1994. Mr Maher was also interim Chief Executive of the Monash City Council at the time of municipal restructure. In 2002, Mr Maher was appointed by the Minister for Local Government to conduct a Commission of Inquiry into Surf Coast Shire Council which was completed in April 2003. He now provides consulting services to the public sector, and more specifically Local Government.

2.3 Municipality profile

Banyule is located 15 kilometres north-east of Melbourne and covers an area of 62 square kilometres. Comprising 20 suburbs, the city is primarily a residential area, renowned for its open spaces and plentiful parklands, especially along the Yarra and Plenty River valleys.

There are industrial areas in Heidelberg West, Greensborough/Briar Hill and Bundoora, as well as institutions such as the Austin and Repatriation Medical Centre and the Simpson Army Barracks. Banyule also has a range of educational, health and leisure facilities.

The Yarra River runs along the City’s south border while the west is defined by Darebin Creek.

Banyule offers a range of shopping centres from the large regional shopping complex at Greensborough, to local shopping villages at Eaglemont, Ivanhoe, East Ivanhoe, Heidelberg, Macleod and Montmorency.

The population of Banyule is estimated at 117,492. One of the key drivers of demographic change in Banyule is the age structure of the population and the growing number of empty nesters. The housing choices of this group will affect the demographic and residential makeup of the City over the next three decades.

(Sources: Department of Sustainability and Environment Victoria in Future 2004; Department of Sustainability and Environment Melbourne in Fact 2001; Department of Sustainability and Environment Victoria Population Bulletin 2006; Department of Sustainability and Environment Know Your Area; Banyule City Council website)

2.4 Current electoral structure

Banyule City is a subdivided municipality with seven councillors in seven wards.

3 Electoral representation review process

Section 219D of the Local Government Act 1989 specifies that the purpose of an electoral representation review is to achieve “fair and equitable representation for the persons who are entitled to vote at a general election of the Council.” To achieve this, the VEC proceeds on the basis of three main principles:
1: to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is within 10% of the average number of voters per councillor for that municipality

Populations are continually changing – they grow in some areas and decline in others. Over time, these changes can lead to some wards having larger or smaller numbers of voters. As part of an electoral representation review, the VEC needs to correct any imbalances that have come about. The VEC also tries to make sure that the boundaries it sets will continue to provide equitable representation until the next review is due in eight years, by taking account of likely future changes.

2: to take a consistent, State-wide approach to the total number of councillors

Regarding the number of councillors, the VEC has adopted as a guide the numbers of councillors in similar-sized municipalities of similar categories within Victoria. In addition, the VEC considers any special circumstances that warrant the municipality having more or fewer councillors than similar municipalities.

3: to ensure that communities of interest are as fairly represented as possible

Every municipality contains a number of communities of interest. The electoral structure should be designed to take these into account where practicable. This is important for assisting the elected councillors to be effective representatives of the people in their particular municipality.

The VEC bases its recommendations on a number of factors, including the following:

- internal research specifically relating to the municipality under review;
- the VEC’s experience from its work with other municipalities and in similar reviews for State elections;
- the VEC’s expertise in mapping, demography and local government; and
- careful consideration of all input from the public in both written and verbal submissions made during the course of the review.

Input from the public is an important part of the process, but it is not the only factor considered. The VEC seeks to ensure fair and equitable representation for all voters of the municipality. This means carefully considering all views expressed in submissions from the public, and also considering other factors, such as the best possible representation for the various communities of interest in the municipality under review.

In considering public submissions, the VEC values the local knowledge and local perspectives that are presented. The VEC believes it important to consider the issues and information presented in submissions, as well as the arguments for particular structural models. In reaching its recommendations, the VEC seeks to combine the information gathered through public submissions with its own research in order to achieve what it considers to be a fair and equitable result until the next review period. The VEC does not make its recommendations based on a “straw poll” of the number of submissions supporting a particular option.

Further details about issues considered by the VEC can be found in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 of this Report and in the Guide for Submissions (Appendix 9.4).
4 Public involvement

4.1 Public information

The VEC informed the community about the electoral representation review through:

- advertising in newspapers;
- conducting an information session in Ivanhoe on 26 February 2007, to outline the review process and to respond to questions from members of the community;
- communicating with the Banyule community through the use of media releases and the VEC website;
- developing an information sheet for residents of Banyule City and having it distributed with the February Council newsletter;
- publishing all preliminary submissions on the VEC website;
- establishing a helpline for responding to community questions;
- distributing a Guide for Submissions;
- releasing a Preliminary Report on 3 April 2007 and making the Report available at the Banyule City Council offices, at the VEC office and on the VEC website;
- publishing all submissions in response to the Preliminary Report on the VEC website; and
- conducting a public hearing in Ivanhoe on 30 April 2007.

4.2 Advertising

In accordance with s.219F(4) of the Act, the VEC published the following advertisements for the electoral representation review:

- a public notice of the review, detailing the process, appeared in the *Diamond Valley Leader* and the *Heidelberg Leader* on 13 and 14 February 2007;
- a general advertisement covering several electoral representation reviews, including the Banyule review, appeared in the *Herald Sun* and *The Age* on 7 February 2007; and
- a notice that the Preliminary Report had been released appeared in the *Diamond Valley Leader* and the *Heidelberg Leader* on 3 and 4 April 2007.

See Appendix 9.1.

4.3 Media releases

Media releases designed to supplement the paid advertising were distributed to the *Diamond Valley Leader*, the *Heidelberg Leader* and the *Heidelberg and Valley Weekly* newspapers. See Appendix 9.2.

4.4 Information leaflet

An information leaflet about the review was distributed to households within the City. See Appendix 9.3.
4.5 **VEC website**

The VEC used its website to deliver information and to provide transparency in the review process. All preliminary submissions and submissions in response to the Preliminary Report were posted to the website to facilitate public access to this information. The VEC website can be viewed at www.vec.vic.gov.au

4.6 **Helpline**

The VEC established a helpline to assist with public enquiries concerning the electoral representation review process.

4.7 **Guide for Submissions**

The VEC developed and distributed its Guide for Submissions to help those persons interested in making submissions. A copy of the Guide is attached. See Appendix 9.4.

5 **Preliminary Report**

In accordance with s.219F(6) of the Act, the VEC produced a Preliminary Report containing its preferred and alternative options for the Banyule City Council. In developing these options, the VEC considered preliminary submissions made by various persons and groups, as well as various other relevant factors.

5.1 **Preliminary submissions**

The VEC received submissions from 19 people or organisations by the closing time for submissions (Tuesday, 13 March 2007 – 5.00 pm). One person made two submissions. Of the 19 submitters:

- nine supported seven single-councillor wards;
- one preferred either five or seven single-councillor wards;
- one supported nine single-councillor wards;
- four advocated three three-councillor wards;
- one suggested an unsubdivided structure;
- one proposed five two-councillor wards; and
- two specified preferred numbers of councillors (one supported 9, the other 11) without specifying electoral structures.

Most submissions supporting single-councillor wards expressed a preference for the current ward boundaries, with minor adjustments to account for voter numbers. It was argued that the current structure captures communities of interest well and has clear, logical boundaries. It was suggested in some submissions that an increase to nine councillors would have little impact on representation and that seven had proven sufficient for the complexity of issues in Banyule City.

Other submitters suggested that the Council needs more councillor input and that the extent of socio-economic issues in Olympia Ward and planning issues in Griffin Ward are currently demanding on single councillors.

Various arguments regarding single-councillor wards, multi-councillor wards and proportional representation in general were put forward. Several submissions supported an increase in the number of councillors because it would enable electoral structures that they preferred.
One submitter suggested that it may be possible to reduce the number of councillors to five with a consequent reduction in costs. Another submitter argued for five two-councillor wards because that structure would allow councillors to be close enough to the electorate to deal with local issues but also enable councillors to see the bigger picture.

Heidelberg, Ivanhoe and Watsonia were listed as the major hubs in the municipality that should not be split. A number of submissions referred to the special needs of residents in Heidelberg West and Bellfield and highlighted their demographic differences from the rest of the municipality. It was argued that they needed a single councillor devoted specifically to them because of these issues. Several submissions also emphasised the different character of the current Griffin Ward and one suggested that the Greensborough area has a younger population and is experiencing population growth.

One of the submissions suggested that each of the current wards is quite different demographically, and that the municipality could be differentiated by factors such as employment status, income, age, disadvantage and non-English speaking background.

Appendix 9.5 contains details of those persons and groups making preliminary submissions. Copies of the submissions can be downloaded from the VEC website, www.vec.vic.gov.au

5.2 VEC research

In addition to information provided in submissions, the VEC conducted its own research. This included research into the demographics of the municipality, using a number of data sources including the 2001 Census. The VEC also took into account changes predicted by the Department of Sustainability and Environment and the Department of Infrastructure. Summaries of some of this research were published in the Guide for Submissions, the Preliminary Report and in Section 2.3 of this Report.

Development projections based on information presented by the Council were also taken into consideration. Extensive fieldwork was conducted throughout the municipality by the VEC.

5.3 Recommended options

Having considered the issues outlined in the preliminary submissions and all other relevant factors, the VEC proposed two preliminary options for public comment.

The preferred option was:

- That Banyule City Council consist of nine councillors elected from nine single-councillor wards.

The alternative option was:

- That Banyule City Council consist of seven councillors elected from seven single-councillor wards.

6 Response submissions

In accordance with s.219F(7) of the Act, the VEC invited written submissions in response to the Preliminary Report. The VEC received 58 response submissions by the closing time
Of these, 12 were responses to a survey put out by one of the submitters, which may or may not have been included in his summary of results.

Of the remaining 46 submissions:

- 4 supported the preliminary preferred option;
- 37 supported the preliminary alternative option;
- 1 supported the alternative option with modifications;
- 3 supported three three-councillor wards; and
- 1 did not express a preference.

Those submissions supporting the preliminary preferred option mostly did so because they believed that an increase in the number of councillors was warranted. Some also felt that the current Hawdon Ward is too large and that the preliminary preferred option, which reduced its size, was better for that reason. One submitter conducted a survey regarding the proposed new Hawdon Ward, which showed a large proportion of respondents in favour of it. The submission did not indicate how many people responded to that survey.

Other submitters expressed a number of concerns about the preliminary preferred option, including that:

- it would split and combine suburbs in a way that does not match with communities of interest (see further below);
- the boundaries would be too similar to the boundaries of the different councils before the 1994 amalgamation and that would create tensions;
- the increase in the number of councillors would lead to a rate increase without providing additional benefits; and
- change would confuse people, especially about where to vote and especially if the current names were used in a different structure.

The following specific concerns about the preliminary preferred option and communities of interest were raised in the submissions:

- it was argued that Ivanhoe East, Eaglemont and Ivanhoe (especially the heritage areas) had a community of interest that should not be split – but the preliminary preferred option divides the heritage areas across four wards;
- it would split Ivanhoe East in two;
- it would split the Rosanna commercial hub in two;
- Rosanna should be with Macleod, with which it has a strong community of interest (e.g. through football clubs and church community), rather than with Heidelberg and Eaglemont, with which it shares little community of interest;
- Apollo Parkways (between Plenty River and Diamond Creek Road) belongs with that part of Greensborough to the east of Diamond Creek Road, as it is physically cut off from Greensborough to the west of the Plenty River, with which it is combined in the preliminary preferred option; and
- Watsonia shares more community of interest with Bundoora than with Macleod, but the preliminary preferred option includes it with Macleod.
Differing views were expressed in some submissions regarding some communities of interest. Some submitters supported and some opposed the changes to the boundaries for Olympia Ward in the VEC’s preliminary preferred option. Some considered that Yallambie and Viewbank are quite different, whereas others suggested that they were similar.

Submitters favouring the preliminary alternative option argued that it did not split the communities of interest which would be split by the preliminary preferred option and that it was working well. One was also concerned about Council meetings taking longer with more councillors.

Those submitters supporting three three-councillor wards did so based on general beliefs about the benefits of proportional representation rather than issues specific to Banyule.

A number of submissions expressed concern about the involvement of one of the local members of parliament in the review process. The Local Government Act does not put any restrictions on who can send a submission to the VEC. The VEC emphasises, however, that it is an independent statutory authority, not subject to ministerial direction or control. In conducting an electoral representation review, the VEC is completely independent of both the Council and the Government. All submissions are considered on the strength of the arguments contained within them and not based on who wrote them.

A list of those persons and groups who made response submissions is provided in Appendix 9.5. Copies of the submissions can be downloaded from the VEC website, www.vec.vic.gov.au

7 Public hearing

A public hearing was held in the Conder Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe, on 30 April 2007 from 6.30. All people and groups who had made submissions in response to the VEC’s Preliminary Report were invited to speak to their submissions, and 21 chose to do so. Members of the public were invited to attend, and there was a total audience of 41 people (including those making presentations). Speakers raised a number of issues in addition to points raised in written submissions.

Speakers disagreed as to whether the number of councillors needs to be increased. Some argued that councillors’ workloads currently were too great. Others suggested that the current number was doing an adequate job.

Regarding communities of interest, one speaker believed that these were not geographically confined, as people may live in one area, but play sport in another, shop in another and go out for entertainment in yet another. Other speakers emphasised that there were major differences between different areas within the municipality. One submitter argued that, as the councillor of a single-councillor ward, it is easier to represent 12,000 voters with common concerns than 10,000 voters with different and potentially contradictory concerns. One person was also concerned that the smaller wards in the preliminary preferred option would make it harder for councillors to work on cross-ward issues.

There were a number of different views expressed about the ward boundaries. Many speakers expressed concerns about the boundaries in the preliminary preferred option, as outlined in the response submissions. Differing views were expressed about whether Ivanhoe west of Waterdale Road belonged more with Ivanhoe (with which it is placed in the preliminary preferred option) or with Bellfield and Heidelberg West (with which it is placed in the preliminary alternative option). Different views as to whether Viewbank
related more to Yallambie (with which it is placed in the preliminary preferred option) or Lower Plenty (with which it is placed in the preliminary alternative option) were also expressed.

8 Findings and recommendation

The Act states that the purpose of the electoral representation review is to consider two matters. The first matter is the number of councillors for the municipality and the second matter is the electoral structure of the municipality.

8.1 Number of councillors

Issues considered by the VEC

The legislation provides that a council must consist of between 5 and 12 councillors (s.5B(1)). It does not, however, prescribe the matters to be considered by the reviewer in recommending the number of councillors for a municipality.

The VEC has therefore been required to identify the appropriate matters to take into account when considering the number of councillors.

In terms of voter numbers, Victorian municipalities vary from approximately 4,000 to over 167,000. The VEC applies the legislative provisions relating to numbers of councillors in a logical way, with those councils that have the largest number of voters having the most councillors, and those councils that have the least number of voters having the fewest councillors.

In most cases, the electoral structure and the number of councillors were established by the Commissioners when local government was restructured between 1993 and 1995. Commissioners did not have the benefit of a State-wide reference when considering the appropriate number of councillors for their respective municipalities. The result was a degree of disparity in councillor numbers for similar types of municipalities. The VEC has produced a table that lists each municipality and the number of councillors. The table differentiates between rural, regional and metropolitan councils in recognition of the different circumstances and needs between these categories of councils. The table has been a valuable reference point in considering the appropriate number of councillors and was made available to the public in the Guide for Submissions. The information has enabled the VEC to compare a council being reviewed to councils with similar voter numbers and areas.

The VEC also considers whether the number of voters in the municipality is anticipated to increase or decline in the period between reviews (approximately eight years). Population forecasts produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Victorian Department of Sustainability and Environment have been used to assist the VEC in making its assessment.

In addition, the VEC considers any special issues or circumstances that may require a council to have more or fewer councillors than would otherwise be the case. Public submissions provide valuable information regarding any such issues or circumstances.
The VEC’s findings

The VEC’s preliminary options

In its Preliminary Report, the VEC put forward nine as its preferred number of councillors and seven councillors as an alternative option.

In coming to its preliminary options for the number of councillors, the VEC followed the process outlined above. There are over 90,000 voters in Banyule City, which makes it a similar size to Frankston and Glen Eira. As these municipalities have nine councillors, it was considered that nine would be appropriate for Banyule as well. Although the VEC notes that there are many differences between Banyule, Frankston and Glen Eira, the VEC does consider, as a starting point to its considerations, that the number of voices on council needs to be related to the number of voters in the municipality. The VEC considers this principle one of the elements of providing fair representation.

In addition to a comparison with municipalities of a similar size, the VEC also considered any special circumstances that may exist within Banyule. Although little population growth is expected for Banyule between now and the next review, there is substantial diversity within the municipality. Suburbs within the municipality have very different characters and needs. This sort of diversity may lead to an increase in councillors’ workloads and an increase in the number of different voices that are required at the Council table to ensure that there is a fair level of representation. This reinforced the VEC’s view that nine is the most appropriate number of councillors.

The VEC published a preliminary alternative option with seven councillors because it considered that there might be aspects of that structure (most notably how it grouped the municipality’s communities of interest) which would enable it to meet the principles of fair and equitable representation more adequately than the nine councillor option.

The options are tested

The vast majority of the response submissions supported the preliminary alternative option with seven councillors. Many of those submissions stated that there would not be an advantage to an increase in the number of councillors, although most submitters did not provide any reasons for this other than that they believed that the current council structure with seven councillors was working well. The VEC does not consider this a reason to suggest that an increase in the number of councillors will lead to ineffective decision making, and does not believe that this counters the VEC’s view that the number of councillors should be related to the number of voters. The VEC notes that there were a number of submissions at both the preliminary and response phases that suggested that an increase was required.

However, a number of submissions favouring the preliminary alternative option provided clear arguments that the preliminary preferred option split communities of interest to a significantly higher degree than the preliminary alternative option (see further in section 8.2). The VEC considers keeping communities of interest together as far as possible to be a very important criterion. As one submitter explained, better representation in a single-councillor ward comes from representing a larger number of people with similar needs from the council than a smaller number with more diverse needs. Based on these factors, the VEC considers that the preliminary alternative
option, with seven councillors, is the most likely to provide fair and equitable representation for Banyule City.

Some submitters were concerned about the VEC having a policy of providing a councillor to voter ratio of 1:10,000 in all metropolitan areas. This is not the case. In metropolitan municipalities reviewed so far, the VEC’s recommendations have provided a range of councillor to voter ratios from 1:6,902 (City of Maribyrnong) to 1:11,138 (City of Whitehorse). The VEC has a policy of providing more councillors to municipalities with larger numbers of voters, but the variation in the numbers of voters in Melbourne’s municipalities means that a consistent ratio is impossible.

Moreover, whilst the VEC takes the number of voters as a starting point in determining how many councillors to recommend, it also considers any other factors which may mean that more or fewer councillors are required than would be suggested by the voter numbers alone. For example, in the case of some municipalities (e.g. the City of Yarra), the diversity of the population and associated social issues required a larger number of councillors than would be suggested by the voter numbers alone. In the case of Banyule City, the VEC considers that capturing communities of interest effectively requires a smaller number of councillors than the voter number suggests.

8.2 Electoral structure

Issues considered by the VEC

Provisions within the Act allow for a municipality to be unsubdivided, with all councillors elected “at large” by all voters, or for a municipality to be subdivided into a number of wards. If wards have only one councillor, councillors are elected using preferential voting. Under an unsubdivided or a multi-councillor ward structure, councillors are elected through proportional representation. With each system, voters mark their ballot papers the same way.

If the municipality is subdivided into wards, there are three options available:

- single-councillor wards;
- multi-councillor wards; and
- a combination of both single-councillor and multi-councillor wards.

Boundaries for wards must:

- provide for a fair and equitable division of the municipality; and
- ensure equality of representation, through the number of voters represented by each councillor being within 10% of the average number of voters per councillor for the municipality.

In addition to the legislative requirements, a number of other factors were considered when evaluating subdivided structures. These factors included:

- communities of interest (Communities of interest are groups of people who share a range of common concerns. They may occur where people are linked with each other geographically, economically or through having particular needs.);
- spreading developing areas over a number of wards;
- using logical boundaries such as main roads, physical features and existing boundaries for easy identification of wards; and
- taking account of likely population changes.
In developing ward boundaries, the VEC aims to achieve the best possible balance between these criteria.

The VEC’s findings

In conducting electoral representation reviews, the VEC follows an extensive process of consideration as required by legislation. At the preliminary stage, the VEC considers preliminary submissions along with a wide variety of other information in order to develop a preferred and (in most circumstances) an alternative electoral structure option for the municipality in question. The VEC then makes the options available in its Preliminary Report, to be assessed by the public in response submissions and at the public hearing. Having considered the feedback, the VEC then makes a recommendation.

The VEC followed this process during the Banyule City Council review. The initial stages of consideration resulted in both a preferred and an alternative electoral structure, which were put to the public in the VEC’s Preliminary Report.

Communities of interest

There are a number of clear differences between the suburbs within Banyule City. The Heidelberg West, Bellfield and Heidelberg Heights area stands out from other parts of the municipality on a number of indices of disadvantage. In contrast, Lower Plenty, Eaglemont, Ivanhoe, Ivanhoe East, St Helena, Eltham North and Yallambie stand out as the wealthier suburbs. Lower Plenty particularly stands out in having larger parcels of land. Yallambie, although generally characterised by wealthier residents, has an unusually high proportion of renters.

Data from the 2001 Census indicate that Heidelberg West, Bellfield, St Helena and Eltham North have higher proportions of families with children, whereas Heidelberg, Heidelberg Heights, Rosanna, Macleod and Watsonia have larger proportions of older voters. Recent arrivals to Australia are found in larger proportions in the south-west of the municipality, particularly Heidelberg West, Bellfield and Heidelberg Heights.

This diversity means that the Council must respond differently to the needs of some geographic areas of the municipality, through both its service delivery and its representation. The challenge is therefore to consider a structure which best aligns electoral representation to the needs and aspirations of the community.

Should the municipality be unsubdivided?

In reaching its preliminary options, the VEC considered a number of possible structures. Firstly, it considered whether or not the municipality should be unsubdivided. The VEC recognises that there are geographically distinct communities of interest within the municipality, as outlined above. Lower Plenty and the Heidelberg West, Heidelberg Heights and Bellfield area stand out in particular. Where such differences occur, the VEC considers that fair and equitable representation is more likely to be achieved by dividing the municipality into wards.

The VEC also notes that the City contains over 90,000 voters. The introduction of an unsubdivided municipality with such a large number of voters would make it extremely difficult and costly for candidates to canvass the whole municipality. In addition, it could result in a large number of candidates listed on ballot papers, making it difficult for voters to make choices. For example, at the 2005 election there were 42 candidates across all wards. If all of those candidates were to stand for
election in an unsubdivided municipality, all 42 would appear on the one ballot paper and voters would have to number each box with a preference from 1 to 42 (unlike voting for the Victorian Upper House and Australian Senate, voters do not have the option of voting above the line in local government elections). The VEC does not consider that this would be practicable.

How should the City be divided? Single-councillor or multi-councillor wards?

The VEC examined a number of options to subdivide the municipality. In choosing between the various options, the VEC considered many factors, as outlined above. A number of submissions provided very detailed descriptions of where they believed ward boundaries should be drawn in order to capture communities of interest effectively. The VEC found these suggestions a helpful starting point for its considerations, and appreciates the efforts made by submitters.

Several submissions provided details of the communities of interest within the municipality and data from the 2001 Census also indicate some substantial demographic differences between areas. Importantly, one area – the Heidelberg West, Heidelberg Heights and Bellfield area – stands out as having a distinct community of interest compared to the rest of the municipality.

The VEC considers that in such circumstances it is important to ensure that such areas are represented on the Council. In multi-councillor wards where such an area becomes a minority, there is a possibility that the community may be overshadowed by more vocal and organised communities. In this case the VEC considers that a single-councillor ward structure provides the best opportunity for the area to be adequately understood and represented.

The different communities of interest within the municipality, especially in this area, are reasonably small in area and geographically defined. In these circumstances, single-councillor wards can be meaningful in terms of capturing and differentiating communities of interest.

The VEC produced a number of multi-councillor ward models during its deliberations, but found that these inevitably mixed together quite different areas with little community of interest.

Whilst the VEC considers there to be a number of benefits to multi-councillor wards, the VEC considers that in this instance single-councillor wards are most likely to provide fair and equitable representation.

The VEC’s preliminary options

Based on the above consideration, the VEC presented two single-councillor ward options in its Preliminary Report – the preliminary preferred option with nine and the preliminary alternative with seven. The VEC noted that there were some disadvantages to the preliminary preferred option, most notably in the way that it split Eaglemont and Ivanhoe East, but was of the view that the advantages of having nine-councillors (as outlined in Section 8.1) and single-councillor wards outweighed these matters.

Nonetheless, the VEC also put out a seven ward option, which it considered better captured communities of interest, to stimulate further public debate. This option was very similar to the current structure, but with adjustments to the boundaries of
Olympia, Griffin, Ibbott and Hawdon Wards to provide more equality of voter numbers.

The options are tested

As noted above, a number of arguments were put forward in response submissions and at the public hearing against the preliminary preferred option. The VEC does not consider that the level of confusion caused by changing the electoral structure or the increase in costs would outweigh the benefits of having a level of representation appropriate to a municipality of Banyule’s size.

The VEC does, however, consider it important to avoid splitting communities of interest, and a number of examples where communities of interest were split were raised in response to the Preliminary Report (see Sections 6 and 7). In particular, the VEC sees the importance of keeping Ivanhoe East, Eaglemont and Ivanhoe together and of keeping Rosanna and Macleod together.

The VEC was less convinced about the importance of keeping Apollo Parkways with that part of Greensborough east of Diamond Creek Road rather than that part of Greensborough to the west of the Plenty River. Similarly, whilst it considers that Yallambie and Viewbank (which would be combined in the preferred option) are quite different, the VEC also considers that Viewbank and Lower Plenty (which would be combined in the alternative option) are quite different. The VEC also considered the boundaries of the Olympia Ward proposed in the preliminary preferred option to be preferable, as it kept all of Ivanhoe together.

In comparing different electoral structures, particularly when they consist of single-councillor wards, it is important to note that it is rarely possible to capture communities of interest perfectly. What the VEC must do is to determine which does a better job overall. In this case, the VEC considers that, on balance, the preliminary alternative option captures communities of interest better than the preliminary preferred option. The VEC considers that the splitting of communities of interest in the preferred option would make it harder for those communities to achieve fair representation, and that this outweighs the benefits from an additional two councillors. For these reasons, the VEC recommends to the Minister for Local Government the preliminary alternative option of seven single-councillor wards.

8.3 Recommendation

Having taken into account all relevant factors, including the submissions and presentations at the public hearing, the VEC recommends that Banyule City Council consist of seven councillors to be elected from seven single-councillor wards.

Steve Tully
Electoral Commissioner
9 Appendices

9.1 Public notices of the electoral representation review

Electoral Representation Review
Banyule City Council

The Minister for Local Government has given notice under section 219C of the Local Government Act 1989 that there is to be an electoral representation review of the Banyule City Council. The Council has appointed the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) to conduct the independent review.

What is the review about?
The aim of the review is to ensure fair and equitable electoral representation for voters in Banyule City. The VEC will recommend to the Minister for Local Government:
• the appropriate number of councillors;
• whether the City should be unsubdivided or divided into wards; and
• if the City is to be divided into wards, how many wards there should be, the number of councillors per ward and the ward boundaries.

What will the VEC consider?
The VEC will consider the numbers of councillors and the electoral structures of comparable municipalities, communities of interest, demographics and growth potential. Arguments and information in public submissions will assist the review.

Any person or group may make a written submission to the VEC regarding electoral representation for Banyule City. The VEC recommends consulting its Guide for Submissions first.

Key Steps in the Review
Step 1 – Information session, Monday, 26 February 2007 – 6.00 pm
• Condor Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe
Step 2 – Preliminary submissions. Deadline: Tuesday, 13 March 2007 - 5.00 pm
Step 3 – Preliminary Report, released: Tuesday, 3 April 2007
Step 4 – Response submissions. Deadline: Thursday, 26 April 2007 - 5.00 pm
Step 5 – Public hearing, Monday, April 30 2007 - 6.30 pm
• Condor Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe
• People may speak in support of their response submissions if they have requested to do so in those submissions.
• The VEC will lodge a Final Report, containing its recommendations, with the Minister for Local Government.

For a Guide for Submissions or further information, call 13 18 32 or visit www.vec.vic.gov.au
Electoral Representation Reviews

The Minister for Local Government has given notice under section 219C of the Local Government Act 1989 that there are to be electoral representation reviews of the following councils:

- Manningham City Council
- Whitehorse City Council
- Darebin City Council
- Banyule City Council
- Kingston City Council
- Knox City Council
- Bayside City Council

The councils have appointed the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) to conduct the reviews.

What are the reviews about?

The aim of the reviews is to ensure fair and equitable electoral representation for the voters of these municipalities. For each municipality, the VEC will recommend to the Minister for Local Government:

- the appropriate number of councillors;
- whether the municipality should be unsubdivided or divided into wards; and
- if the municipality is to be divided into wards, how many wards there should be, the number of councillors per ward and the ward boundaries.

Under an unsubdivided or a multi-councillor ward structure, councillors are elected through proportional representation. Under a single-councillor ward structure, councillors are elected using preferential voting. With each system, voters mark their ballot papers in the same way.

What will the VEC consider?

The VEC will consider the numbers of councillors and the electoral structures of comparable municipalities, communities of interest, demographics and growth potential. Arguments and information in public submissions will assist the review.

Any person or group may make a written submission to the VEC regarding electoral representation for these municipalities. The VEC recommends consulting its Guide for Submissions first.

Making a submission

Further information about making a submission can be found in the Guide for Submissions. Submissions can be made by mail, fax or email. Submissions must reach the VEC by 5.00 pm on the following dates:

- Manningham City Council 5 March 2007
- Whitehorse City Council 6 March 2007
- Darebin City Council 13 March 2007
- Banyule City Council 13 March 2007
- Kingston City Council 19 March 2007
- Knox City Council 19 March 2007
- Bayside City Council 19 March 2007

For a Guide for Submissions or further information, call 13 18 32 or visit www.vec.vic.gov.au
Electoral Representation Review
Banyule City Council

Preliminary Report
The Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) is conducting an electoral representation review for the Banyule City Council. The review aims to achieve fair and equitable electoral representation for persons who are entitled to vote at the Council’s general election. Having considered a range of information, including ideas contained in public submissions, the VEC has now released a Preliminary Report including its recommendations.

What are the recommendations in the Report?
The Banyule City Council currently has a subdivided municipality with seven councillors in seven wards.

Preliminary preferred option
The Report recommends that the Banyule City Council consist of nine councillors, to be elected from nine single-councillor wards.

Preliminary alternative option
The Report also outlines an alternative option of a Council consisting of seven councillors, to be elected from seven single-councillor wards.

The maps on the right show the preferred option and alternative option. The preferred option will be recommended to the Minister unless response submissions provide convincing arguments and evidence in support of an alternative option. People favouring the preferred option should also provide arguments and evidence explaining their reasons.

Where is the Report available?
Copies of the Preliminary Report are available from:
- the Banyule City Council offices, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe;
- the VEC website, www.vec.vic.gov.au; and
- the VEC on 13 18 32.

Response submissions on the Report
Any person or group may make a response submission to the VEC about its Preliminary Report. Submissions can be:
- posted to the VEC at Level 8, 505 Little Collins Street, Melbourne Vic. 3000;
- emailed to banyule.review@vec.vic.gov.au; or
- faxed to (03) 9629 9330.

The VEC recommends obtaining a copy of the Report and consulting its Guide for Submissions first. These documents can be obtained free of charge from the VEC.

Submissions must include the following information about the person or group making the submission:
- name;
- address;
- telephone contact number; and
- whether the person or group making the submission wishes to speak at a public hearing in support of their submission.

Submissions must reach the VEC by Thursday, 26 April 2007 – 5.00 pm. Late submissions will not be accepted.

Submissions will be available to the public at the VEC office and on the VEC website.

Public hearing, Monday, 30 April 2007 – 6.30pm
The hearing will be held at:
- Corner Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe.

The hearing is open to the public, but only those people who have indicated in their submission that they would like to speak in support of their submission will be heard at the hearing.

Final Report, Monday, 21 May 2007
After considering a variety of sources of information, including arguments and evidence contained in submissions and provided at the public hearing, the VEC will prepare its Final Report making recommendations to the Minister for Local Government.

Electoral representation review publications are available in large print on request.

Further information 13 18 32 or visit www.vec.vic.gov.au
9.2 Media releases

Media Release

For release from 13 February 2007

REPRESENTATION REVIEW GETS UNDERWAY

The electoral representation review for the Banyule City Council has begun. The review, conducted by the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC), will consider the number of councillors for the municipality and the municipality’s electoral structure.

“Anyone interested in the review should attend the public information session on Monday, 26 February 2007,” said the Victorian Electoral Commissioner, Mr Steve Tully.

The details for the information session are:
- Monday, 26 February 2007, 6:00 pm
- Condor Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe

In conducting its review, the VEC will consider a range of information including arguments and evidence in public submissions.

Any person or group may make a written submission to the VEC about the review. Submissions do not have to be elaborate documents. A letter is perfectly acceptable, as long as it deals with the matters covered by the review. The VEC recommends consulting its Guide for Submissions, which outlines the issues involved.

A leaflet with information about the review is being delivered with the council newsletter.

Key dates for the City of Banyule representation review are:
- Tuesday, 13 March 2007 - 5.00 pm – Deadline for preliminary submissions. Submissions can be mailed, faxed or emailed to the VEC.
- Tuesday, 3 April 2007 – The VEC’s Preliminary Report will be released containing its preferred options.
- Thursday, 26 April 2007 - 5.00 pm – Deadline for response submissions about the Preliminary Report.
- Monday, 30 April 2007 - 6.30 pm – Public hearing. People will be able to speak in support of their response submissions if they have requested to do so in those submissions.

Any new electoral arrangements resulting from the review process would apply at the next Council election.

For more information, telephone the VEC on 13 18 32 or visit the VEC website www.vec.vic.gov.au

– ENDS –

For further media information:

Chris Gribbin
Victorian Electoral Commission
Tel: 9299 0737
Media Fact Sheet

City of Banyule

The map below shows the current ward boundaries and the voter numbers and deviations from the average number of voters per councillor as at 2 January 2007.
Media Release

For release from Tuesday, 3 April 2007

BANYULE CITY COUNCIL ELECTORAL REPRESENTATION REVIEW: PRELIMINARY REPORT RELEASED

The Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) today released its Preliminary Report on electoral representation for the Banyule City Council. The VEC’s preliminary preferred option is for Banyule City to consist of nine councillors, to be elected from nine single-councillor wards. An alternative option of a council consisting of seven councillors elected from seven single-councillor wards is also included in the Preliminary Report.

The Report has been released and is available on the VEC’s web site at www.vec.vic.gov.au. The Report is also available at the Banyule City Council offices, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe, and at the VEC office, Level 8, 505 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, Vic. 3000.

People have until 5.00 pm, Thursday, 26 April 2007 to lodge submissions with the VEC regarding its Preliminary Report.

People who wish to speak publicly in support of their submissions will have an opportunity to do so at a public hearing at:
    Condor Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe
    on Monday, 30 April 2007 at 6.30 pm.

The VEC’s Final Report and recommendations will be lodged with the Minister for Local Government on Monday, 21 May 2007.

Any person who requires additional information can visit www.vec.vic.gov.au, contact the VEC on 13 18 32, or write to the VEC at Level 8, 505 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, Vic. 3000.

– ENDS –

Media releases are available from the VEC website http://www.vec.vic.gov.au/rrreleases.html

For further media information:
Chris Gribbin
Victorian Electoral Commission
Tel: 9299 0737
Media Fact Sheet

MAPS OF RECOMMENDED OPTIONS FOR BANYULE CITY COUNCIL

PRELIMINARY PREFERRED OPTION:
Nine councillors, to be elected from nine single-councillor wards.

FIRST PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVE OPTION:
Seven councillors, to be elected from seven single-councillor wards.
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9.3 Information leaflet

Electoral Representation Review of the Banyule City Council

Legislation requires every Council to have an independent electoral representation review every eight years. The Minister for Local Government has given notice of the first representation review for Banyule City. The Council has appointed the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) to conduct the review.

What will the review recommend?
The VEC will make a recommendation to the Minister for Local Government as to:
- the appropriate number of councillors;
- whether the City should be unsubdivided or divided into wards; and
- if the City is to be divided into wards, how many wards there should be, the number of councillors per ward and the ward boundaries.

How to make a submission
Get the Guide for Submissions by telephoning the VEC on 13 18 32 or by checking our website at www.vec.vic.gov.au

Send your submissions to the VEC in one of the following ways:
- post to Level 8, 505 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, Vic. 3000; or
- email to banyule.review@vec.vic.gov.au; or
- fax to (03) 9629 9330.

Current structure of Banyule City
- Banyule City is a subdivided municipality with seven single-councillor wards. Councillors are elected by preferential voting.
- The map below shows current ward boundaries and voter numbers as at 2 January 2007.

Key steps in the review
Step 1 Information session, Monday, 26 February 2007 – 6.00 pm
Condor Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe

Step 2 Preliminary submissions. Deadline: Tuesday, 13 March 2007 - 5.00 pm

Step 3 Preliminary Report, released: Tuesday, 3 April 2007

Step 4 Response submissions. Deadline: Thursday, 26 April 2007 - 5.00 pm

Step 5 Public hearing, Monday, April 30 2007 - 6.30 pm
Condor Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe
People may speak in support of their response submissions if they have requested to do so in those submissions.


For a Guide for Submissions or further information, call 13 18 32 or visit www.vec.vic.gov.au

Electoral Representation Review publications are available in large print on request.
CHECKLIST:

Before you send in your submission:
- Have you included your name, address and telephone contact number?
- Do you understand that your submission will be made public?
- Have you given reasons for the model(s) you are suggesting?

If you are making a response submission to the Preliminary Report:
- Have you focused your discussion on the models proposed in the Preliminary Report?
- Have you indicated whether or not you would like to speak to the submission at the public hearing?

In writing your submission, you might like to consider the following questions (you do not need to answer every question in order to make a useful submission):

The number of councillors:
- Have you suggested a number between 5 and 12 (as required by legislation)?
- If the number of councillors you have suggested varies substantially from the numbers in similar-sized municipalities of a similar type, have you explained why?

The electoral structures:
- Have you indicated whether you want the municipality to be subdivided or unsubdivided?
- Have you explained why your preferred structure would best suit your municipality?

If you think that the municipality should be subdivided into wards:
- Have you indicated whether you want single-councillor wards, multi-councillor wards or a combination of both?
- Have you suggested ward names and given reasons for those names?
Background

What is an electoral representation review?

An electoral representation review examines the electoral structure of a local council. It considers:

- the number of councillors in a municipality;
- whether a municipality should be unsubdivided or subdivided into wards; and
- if it should be subdivided, what the ward boundaries should be.

In addition, the review must make sure that, within each municipality, the number of voters represented by each councillor in each ward is within 10% of the average number of voters per councillor. That way, each person’s vote has the same value.

Another important element to these considerations is that, according to the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act), wards with only one councillor must elect that councillor using preferential voting, and wards with two or more councillors must elect them via proportional representation. If a municipality is unsubdivided, then all of its councillors must be elected using proportional representation.

When do representation reviews take place, and who conducts them?

The Local Government Act specifies that:

- electoral representation reviews must be conducted before every second council election; and
- a council must appoint an Electoral Commission to undertake the review.

On completion of the review, the Electoral Commission makes a recommendation to the Minister for Local Government, who then has the power to act on it.

This system of electoral representation reviews came into effect at the end of 2003 as a result of amendments to the Act. The first representation review for each municipality under this system takes place at a time specified by the Minister for Local Government by a notice in the Victoria Government Gazette. The first representation reviews to be carried out under the amended Act took place in 2004.

On 4 January 2007, the Minister for Local Government gave notice under section 219C of the Local Government Act that an electoral representation review is to be conducted for the Banyule City Council. The Banyule City Council has appointed the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) to conduct the review.

How did the current electoral structures come about, and on what were they based?

The electoral structures currently in place in municipalities across Victoria are diverse. Whilst over half of the metropolitan and regional councils have undergone reviews, most of the remaining municipalities still operate under structures established by the commissioners appointed during the restructurings of the 1990s. The commissioners did not have any State-wide reference available to them when considering the appropriate number of councillors and electoral structures for their municipalities. As a consequence, there remain substantial differences between similar municipalities across Victoria. Subsequent to these reforms, individual councils conducted electoral reviews.
**What is the purpose of a representation review?**

Section 219D of the *Local Government Act 1989* specifies that the purpose of a representation review is to achieve “fair and equitable representation for the persons who are entitled to vote at a general election of the Council.”

To achieve this, the VEC proceeds on the basis of three main principles:

1: to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is within 10% of the average number of voters per councillor for that municipality

Populations are continually changing—they grow in some areas and decline in others. Over time, these changes can lead to some wards having larger or smaller numbers of voters. As part of a representation review, the VEC needs to correct any imbalances that have come about. The VEC also tries to make sure that the boundaries it sets will continue to provide equitable representation until the next review is due in eight years, by taking account of likely future changes.

2: to take a consistent, State-wide approach to the total number of councillors

Regarding the number of councillors, the VEC has adopted as a guide the numbers of councillors in similar-sized municipalities of similar categories within Victoria. In addition, the VEC considers any special circumstances that warrant the municipality having more or fewer councillors than similar municipalities.

3: to ensure that communities of interest are as fairly represented as possible

Every municipality contains a number of communities of interest (see page 8). The electoral structure should be designed to take these into account where practicable. This is important for assisting the elected councillors to be effective representatives of the people in their particular municipality.

**What can't a representation review do?**

The review cannot deal with the external boundaries of the municipality, or such matters as whether the municipality should be divided into two separate municipalities or amalgamated with another municipality.

**On what does the VEC base its recommendations?**

The VEC bases its recommendations on a number of factors, including the following:

- internal research specifically relating to the municipality under review;
- the VEC’s experience from its work with other municipalities and in similar reviews for State elections;
- the VEC’s expertise in mapping, demography and local government; and
- careful consideration of all input from the public in both written and verbal submissions made during the course of the review.

Input from the public is an important part of the process, but it is not the only factor considered. The VEC’s recommendations are not made by a “straw poll” of the number of submissions supporting particular models. The VEC seeks to ensure fair and equitable representation for all voters of the municipality. This means carefully considering all views expressed in submissions from the public, but also considering other factors, such as giving representation to communities of interest (including those communities of interest which may not be particularly vocal).

**About the VEC**

The Victorian Electoral Commission is an independent statutory authority established under Victoria’s *Electoral Act 2002*. The VEC is not subject to ministerial direction or control in the performance of its responsibilities. The VEC’s main functions include:

- conducting parliamentary elections and by-elections;
- conducting local government elections and by-elections (when appointed by councils);
- conducting representation reviews for councils;
- maintaining an accurate and up-to-date register of electors and preparing rolls for elections; and
- contributing to public understanding of elections and electoral matters through information and education programmes.

In performing these functions, the VEC acts as an independent, impartial authority, acting transparently and with integrity.
The review process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 4 January 2007</td>
<td>The review begins; the VEC begins conducting research and preparing material for the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>Notification of the public; a notice detailing the process for the review and calling for submissions is placed in the Herald Sun, The Age, the Diamond Valley Leader, and the Heidelberg Leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 26 February 2007</td>
<td>Information session; an information session on the review process is held at Condor Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe. Anyone interested in making a submission is advised to attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 13 March 2007</td>
<td>Closing date for preliminary submissions; preliminary submissions are your chance to contribute your views and local knowledge about any issues relevant to the review. See details in the next section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 3 April 2007</td>
<td>Preliminary Report released; based on the VEC's research, including information presented by the public, the VEC formulates a series of different models for how the electoral structure of Banyule City could be arranged. The models that best fit the VEC's aim of fairness and equity of representation are presented and explained in the Preliminary Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 26 April 2007</td>
<td>Closing date for response submissions on the Preliminary Report; anyone or group, including the Council, may make a submission to the VEC about the Preliminary Report. Your submission is your chance to present any additional arguments regarding which of the VEC's models you believe best represents the voters of Banyule City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 30 April 2007</td>
<td>Public hearing; a public hearing is held at Condor Room, The Centre Ivanhoe, 275 Upper Heidelberg Road, Ivanhoe. People who state in their response submissions to the Preliminary Report that they want to speak in support of their submissions may do so at this public hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 21 May 2007</td>
<td>Final Report; after considering any written submissions relating to the Preliminary Report, and information provided at the public hearing, the VEC prepares a Final Report making recommendations to the Minister for Local Government. For details of how to get a copy of the Final Report, see below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Making a submission

Any person or group, including the Council, may make a submission to the VEC. Submissions do not have to be elaborate documents; a short letter is perfectly acceptable, as long as it addresses matters within the scope of the review (see the checklist inside the front cover of this document).

When can people make submissions?

The VEC accepts submissions at two stages of the review process:

Preliminary submissions should address matters relating to the number of councillors and the electoral structure of the municipality. At this stage, people can suggest any possible models within the constraints as explained in the "Matters to consider" section of this document. The most helpful submissions are generally those that provide clear explanations or evidence for particular viewpoints. Preliminary submissions must be received at the VEC by Tuesday, 13 March 2007 – 5.00 p.m. Late submissions will not be accepted.

Response submissions on the Preliminary Report can comment on any issues relating to the review, but are more helpful if they comment on the preferred option and/or the alternative option(s). Alternative models will not generally be considered at this stage, as there is no further opportunity to put those models to the public for comment. Response submissions should indicate whether the person making the submission wishes to speak at a public hearing in support of his or her submission. Response submissions must be received at the VEC by Thursday, 26 April 2007 – 5.00 p.m. Late submissions will not be accepted.

There will be a public hearing for people who want to speak in support of their response submissions on Monday, 30 April 2007 – 6.30 p.m. People wishing to speak must request to do so in their response submissions.

Where should submissions be sent?

Submissions can be sent to the VEC in the following ways:

- posted to Level 8, 505 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, Vic. 3000;
- emailed to banyule.review@vec.vic.gov.au; or
- faxed to (03) 9629 9330.

Submissions must include the name, address and telephone contact number of the person making the submission. Without this information, the submission will not be accepted.

Public access to submissions

Once lodged, submissions will be available to the public at:

- the VEC office at Level 8, 505 Little Collins Street, Melbourne; and
- the VEC website www.vec.vic.gov.au

The VEC will publish all submissions received by the due date on its website. The name and locality of the person making the submission will also be published. The person's telephone number, street address and signature will not be published. The reason for making submissions available to the public is to ensure transparency in the electoral representation review process.
Communities of interest

An important part of achieving “fair and equitable representation” is making sure that communities of interest are appropriately represented. Communities of interest are groups of people who share a range of common concerns or aspirations. They are different from “interest groups” or “pressure groups” which may only have one issue in common (or a very limited number of issues). The communities of interest to which people belong are often also an important part of their social identity.

Communities of interest may occur where people are linked with each other geographically (e.g., a town or valley) or economically, such as where people work in similar industries (e.g., tourism) or where people work in mutually-dependent industries (e.g., fruit growers, transporters and canners). Communities of interest may also appear where people share a number of special needs because of similar circumstances (such as new immigrants, who may have little English, require assistance with housing and need help finding employment). Communities of interest may also include ethnic groups, retired people, the unemployed or many other groupings of people.

Communities of interest are important in electoral representation reviews when they have similar needs from their local government. In such cases, it is important to endeavour to ensure that communities of interest have the opportunity to be fairly represented on councils. There are a number of ways to take account of communities of interest, depending on how they are distributed geographically. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If:</th>
<th>then fair representation may best be achieved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a community of interest is compact geographically</td>
<td>creating a ward with boundaries reflecting that community of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a community of interest is a widespread minority</td>
<td>creating multi-councillor wards with proportional representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there are numerous minority communities of interest within a municipality</td>
<td>combining the communities of interest, so that any elected councillor would be responsible to all of these groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also many other ways to take communities of interest into account.
Should the municipality be unsubdivided or divided into wards?

A municipality can either be unsubdivided, with all councillors elected "at large" by all of the voters, or it can be subdivided into a number of wards. Both electoral structures have advantages and disadvantages, and which structure is best for any individual municipality will depend on the municipality's particular circumstances.

Banyule City is currently divided into seven wards, with one councillor representing each ward.

The following tables list characteristics that are commonly considered to be associated with the different possible electoral structures and may be of use in deciding which structure most suits your municipality.

The table at the end of this document lists all of Victoria's municipalities and their electoral structures.

Unsubdivided municipalities

Unsubdivided municipalities must elect their councillors by proportional representation (see more on this point below).

The possible features of an unsubdivided municipality can be portrayed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Features</th>
<th>Less Positive Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotes the concept of a municipality-wide focus, with councillors being elected by and concerned for the municipality as a whole, rather than parochial interests.</td>
<td>May lead to significant communities of interest and points of view being unrepresented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives residents and ratepayers a choice of councillors to approach with their concerns.</td>
<td>May lead to councillors being relatively inaccessible for residents of parts of the municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each voter has the opportunity to express a preference for every candidate for the Council election.</td>
<td>May lead to confusion of responsibilities and duplication of effort on the part of councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removes the need to define internal ward boundaries.</td>
<td>May be difficult for voters to assess the performances of individual councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results in a single, less expensive voter roll for elections as compared with separate voter rolls for individual wards.</td>
<td>Large numbers of candidates might be confusing for voters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options for division into wards

If the municipality is to be divided into wards, there are three options:

- single-councillor wards;
- multi-councillor wards; and
- combinations of single and multi-councillor wards.

The Local Government Act specifies that wards with only one representative must elect that representative via preferential voting, whereas multi-councillor wards and unsubdivided municipalities must elect their representatives via proportional representation. As far as voters are concerned on the day, it makes no difference. In practice, ballot papers look the same and are filled out in the same way, regardless of whether the candidates are being elected by proportional representation or by preferential voting. Whether a ward elects councillors via proportional representation or preferential voting can sometimes make a difference as to whether or not communities of interest are fairly represented.

Single-councillor wards

The possible features of single-councillor wards can be portrayed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Features</th>
<th>Less Positive Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillors are more likely to be truly local representatives, easily accessible to residents and aware of local issues.</td>
<td>Councillors may be elected on minor or parochial issues and lack a perspective of what policies benefit the municipality as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major geographical communities of interest are likely to be represented.</td>
<td>Ward boundaries may divide communities of interest, and may be difficult to define.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is less likely that one particular point of view or sectional interest will dominate the Council.</td>
<td>Voters may have a restricted choice of candidates in elections for individual wards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small populations in each ward may make ward boundaries more susceptible to change caused by demographic shifts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-councillor wards

A multi-councillor ward structure results in fewer but larger wards than a single-councillor ward structure.

The possible features of multi-councillor wards can be portrayed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Features</th>
<th>Less Positive Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This structure supports the accommodation of a whole community of interest (such as a sizeable town or group of suburbs) within a ward.</td>
<td>Very local issues may be overridden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on issues may be broader than for single-councillor wards (though councillors may be more locally focussed than in an unsubdivided municipality).</td>
<td>Groups may form within the council based on multi-councillor wards, leading to possible division between councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors may be more accessible than in an unsubdivided municipality.</td>
<td>In very large wards, councillors may not be accessible for residents in parts of the ward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electors have a choice of councillor to approach.</td>
<td>Skulption or gaps may occur if councillors do not communicate or share their workloads effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors may share workloads more effectively.</td>
<td>Ward boundaries are likely to be easy to identify and less susceptible to change as a result of population growth or decline than for single-councillor wards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easier for candidates to be elected as part of a voting ticket than as individuals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combination of single-councillor and multi-councillor wards

The possible features of a combined system can be portrayed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Features</th>
<th>Less Positive Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A large community of interest can be included within in a multi-councillor ward, and a smaller community of interest can be included within a single-councillor ward. This structure accommodates differences in population across a municipality, and allows small communities to be separately represented.</td>
<td>Election in single-councillor wards may expect that their councillors will be more influential than their numbers suggest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear ward boundaries are more likely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting systems

The voting system is another important factor to take into account when considering whether to have single-councillor wards, multi-councillor wards or unsubdivided municipalities. In single-councillor wards, councillors must be elected by preferential voting. In unsubdivided municipalities and multi-councillor wards, councillors must be elected by proportional representation. Under either system, people still vote in the same way. The only differences are the way that the votes are counted.

When there are single-councillor wards, the preferential system applies. Under the preferential system:

- a candidate must achieve an absolute majority (50% plus one) of the formal votes to be elected;
- if a candidate obtains an absolute majority of the first-preference votes, then that candidate is elected;
- if no candidate obtains an absolute majority of first-preference votes, preferences have to be distributed:
  - the candidate with the lowest number of first-preference votes is declared to be a defeated candidate, and that candidate's votes are distributed to the remaining candidates according to the second preferences on the ballot papers;
  - the process of excluding the lowest candidate and distributing that candidate's preferences to the remaining candidates continues until one candidate has an absolute majority of votes, and is declared elected.

Under this system, the way in which voters allocate their preferences can be just as important as where they place their first-preference votes. Candidates advise voters (through how-to-vote cards and candidate statements) about how to order their preferences, and may negotiate with other candidates about the order of preferences. In some cases, candidates have informal “running mates” to help with the flow of preferences to them.

When there are multi-councillor wards or unsubdivided municipalities, proportional representation applies. The basis of proportional representation is that candidates are elected in proportion to their support. Under the proportional representation system:

- to be elected, a candidate must obtain a “quota”, which is calculated by dividing the total number of votes by one more than the number of vacancies, and then adding one (for example, in an election for 3 vacancies with 800 votes cast, the quota would be 201);
- when a candidate receives more votes than a quota, the surplus votes are distributed to the continuing candidates at a reduced value, calculated by dividing the surplus votes by the total votes for the candidate (for example, if a candidate achieved 300 votes and the quota was 201 votes, the candidate’s surplus would be 99, and ballot papers would be transferred to the remaining candidates at a value of 99 divided by 300);
- when all surplus votes have been distributed and there are still vacancies to be filled, preferences are distributed from the lowest-scoring candidates until a candidate has a quota.

This system means that any candidate who obtains a quota, either through first-preference votes or through the flow of preferences, is elected. In effect, candidates representing large minorities are likely to be represented as well as candidates representing majorities.
Proportional representation has a number of key differences to the exhaustive preferential system, which applied, in unsubdivided municipalities and multi-councillor wards at elections prior to 2004. Proportional representation may return quite different results to the old system. Proportional representation should return candidates that are more representative of voters’ choices and makes it more difficult for candidates to be elected as part of a ticket.

How should ward boundaries be drawn?

Getting the numbers right

If Banyule City is to remain divided into wards, the ward boundaries must comply with legal requirements. Section 219D of the Local Government Act 1989 requires that:

- the number of voters represented by each councillor must be within 10% of the average number of voters per councillor for that municipality; and
- the ward boundaries must provide a fair and equitable division of the municipal district.

Where there are multi-councillor wards, the number of voters represented by each councillor for such wards is taken to be the total number of voters for the ward divided by the number of councillors for the ward. For instance, if there are 3 councillors and 12,000 voters for a ward, the number of voters represented by each councillor will be 4,000, that is 12,000 divided by 3.

Ward boundaries must meet the approximate equality requirement set by the Act. The number of voters represented by each councillor cannot be more than 10% outside the average number for all councillors. In Banyule City at present, Griffin Ward is extremely close to the 10% limit.

Other considerations

The Act does not prescribe any more details to define what constitutes a fair and equitable division of the municipality. However, the following criteria are useful in considering and (where possible) deciding on proposed ward boundaries:

- the boundaries should take account of communities of interest;
- the boundaries should follow clear lines, such as major roads, rivers and other natural features;
- growing areas should not be concentrated into one ward, but should be spread over several wards; and
- the boundaries should take account of likely population changes, by setting the number of voters in wards with high growth potential somewhat below the average, and the number of voters in wards with little growth potential somewhat above the average. This approach will help ensure that the boundaries stay within the 10% tolerance for a longer period, avoiding the need for frequent redrawing of boundaries.

In developing ward boundaries, the VEC aims to achieve the best possible balance among these criteria.

What should wards be called?

There is a variety of possible approaches to the naming of wards, including:

- **Place names:** A number of municipalities name their wards after localities in the wards. This approach is useful where ward boundaries closely align with localities. However, it can lead to people in smaller localities within a ward feeling overlooked, and may cause confusion if the locality that a ward is named after cuts across a ward boundary;
- **Compass directions:** This is the current approach in, for example, the City of Whittlesea, where the wards are East, North and West. It is straightforward. It is of most use where the location of the wards is closely aligned to compass directions;
- **Names of historic buildings:** This is a way of celebrating the municipality’s heritage;
- **Names of natural features:** Using the names of natural features such as hills or streams can be a way of identifying wards without the complications of locality names. The features would need to be well known and relevant to the particular wards;
- **Names of pioneers and former prominent citizens:** This is a way of recognising important former residents. It is most appropriate when the person is closely associated with the area covered by the ward; and
- **Aboriginal names:** This is a way of recognising the municipality’s Aboriginal heritage. However, the use of Aboriginal names could be seen as being tokenistic if the names are not relevant to areas within the municipality.
Banyule City at a glance

Banyule is located 15 kilometres north east of Melbourne and covers an area of 62 square kilometres. Comprising 20 suburbs, the city is primarily a residential area, renowned for its open spaces and plentiful parklands, especially along the Yarra and Plenty River valleys.

There are industrial areas in Heidelberg West, Greensborough/Briar Hill and Bundoora, as well as institutions such as the Austin and Repatriation Medical Centre and the Simpson Army Barracks. Banyule also has a range of educational, health and leisure facilities.

The Yarra River runs along the City's south border while the west is defined by Darebin Creek.

Banyule offers a range of shopping centres from the large regional shopping complex at Greensborough, to local shopping villages at Eaglemont, Ivanhoe, East Ivanhoe, Heidelberg, Macleod and Montmorency.

The population of Banyule is estimated at 117,492. One of the key drivers of demographic change in Banyule is the age structure of the population and the growing number of empty nests. The housing choices of this group will affect the demographic and residential makeup of the City over the next three decades.

(Sources: Department of Sustainability and Environment Victoria in Future 2004; Department of Sustainability and Environment Melbourne in Fact 2001; Department of Sustainability and Environment Victoria Population Bulletin 2006; Department of Sustainability and Environment Know Your Area: Banyule City Council website)

Getting copies of the Preliminary and Final Reports

Copies of the Preliminary and Final Reports will be available from the VEC website, www.vec.vic.gov.au, by contacting the VEC on 13 18 32, and at the Banyule City Council offices.

When the Preliminary Report is released, a notice in the Diamond Valley Leader and Heidelberg Leader will specify how people can make a written submission in response to the Report.

The Preliminary Report will be available from Tuesday, 3 April 2007.

The Final Report will be released on Monday, 21 May 2007.

The Current Structure

Banyule City is a subdivided municipality with seven single-councillor wards. Councillors are elected by preferential voting.

The map below shows the current ward boundaries and the voter numbers and deviations from the average number of voters per councillor as at 2 January 2007.

A break-down of voter numbers by Census Collector District is available from the VEC website – www.vec.vic.gov.au – or by calling the VEC on 13 18 32. This can be used to see more precisely where voters are located within the municipality.

[please see supplement for updated figures]
Past reviews of similar municipalities

Banyule City is a densely-populated metropolitan municipality. There are no rural or semi-rural areas, and the entire municipality is within the Urban Growth Boundary. In some respects, Banyule City is similar to the cities of Glen Eira and Frankston, where the VEC conducted reviews in 2004-2005. The number of voters in Banyule is also similar to the number of voters in these municipalities. When the VEC conducted those reviews, it made the following recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Before review</th>
<th>Final recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Glen Eira</td>
<td>nine councillors elected from three three-councillor wards</td>
<td>nine councillors elected from three three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Frankston</td>
<td>seven councillors elected from seven single-councillor wards</td>
<td>nine councillors elected from three three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both the cities of Glen Eira and Frankston, the VEC had concerns about the appropriateness of single-councillor wards for capturing communities of interest in a densely-populated urban area. In both cases, the VEC believed that larger, multi-councillor wards were appropriate for capturing broader communities of interest that were not confined to small areas. The VEC also considered nine an appropriate number of councillors given the numbers of voters in these municipalities.

In contrast, the VEC considered single-member wards to be appropriate in the City of Maribyrnong because of the importance of guaranteeing local representation for the municipality’s less advantaged communities. The City of Maribyrnong is diverse, with communities with quite different needs adjacent to each other. The numbers of voters within each community of interest were also such that it was possible to draw boundaries around them that complied with the 10% voter number variation allowed by legislation.

The reports from these and other reviews can be accessed at the VEC website – www.vec.vic.gov.au – or by calling 13 18 32.

In conducting the Banyule City Council review, considerations such as these and the structures of similar municipalities will be the starting point. Through its own research and the submission process, the VEC will also look for factors specific to the municipality that make its situation different to those other municipalities.

---

1 – statistics from 2001 Census
2 – Department of Sustainability and Environment revised estimates 2005 Population Bulletin 2006
3 – based on Department of Sustainability and Environment Victoria in Future 2004 estimates
### Table: Profiles of municipalities

Estimates as at 1 January 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Municipalities</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Number on roll</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maribyrnong†</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48,311</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,902</td>
<td>2 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarra†</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62,824</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,980</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobsons Bay†</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64,243</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9,178</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayside*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67,702</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,522</td>
<td>2 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroondah</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76,287</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,898</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonnington†</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79,205</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,801</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Phillip</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80,702</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,529</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaro Valley</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62,756</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,822</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manningham*</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>65,748</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10,719</td>
<td>4 two-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston†</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>86,659</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,629</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayside*</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>88,672</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,647</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>90,652</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8,241</td>
<td>1 two-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Eira†</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>94,754</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10,528</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>96,343</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,704</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>105,316</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15,045</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox*</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>108,716</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12,060</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland†</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>108,995</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9,909</td>
<td>2 four-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehorse*</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>111,384</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11,138</td>
<td>1 three-councillor or ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brimbank†</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>117,420</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10,675</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash†</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>119,721</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10,884</td>
<td>1 two-councillor or ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boronia†</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>125,347</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,535</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* under review
† reviewed 2003/2005

### Metropolitan/Rural Fringe Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Number on roll</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardinia†</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>41,465</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,924</td>
<td>2 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimmera</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>45,075</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>57,920</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,274</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham†</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>79,169</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,797</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittlesea</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>90,065</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,007</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume†</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>101,620</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,291</td>
<td>3 two-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarra Ranges</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>103,239</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,471</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington Peninsula†</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>136,374</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12,386</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey†</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>143,611</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13,056</td>
<td>1 single-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* under review
† reviewed 2003/2005

### Regional Municipalities with Urban Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Number on roll</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ararat</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>9,222</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benalla</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>11,029</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill</td>
<td>6,116</td>
<td>14,420</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>3 two-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hovell†</td>
<td>4,249</td>
<td>14,703</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta†</td>
<td>3,639</td>
<td>20,595</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warakurna‡</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>23,340</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga†</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>24,289</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura†</td>
<td>22,082</td>
<td>35,754</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton†</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>40,276</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,754</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>51,724</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,747</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>70,757</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,862</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo†</td>
<td>2,999</td>
<td>80,691</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,543</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>166,874</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13,906</td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* under review
‡ reviewed 2003/2005
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Councils</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Number on roll</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queenscliffe</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>581</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool</td>
<td>9,107</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>815</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindmarsh</td>
<td>5,102</td>
<td>6,596</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>942</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towong</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buloke</td>
<td>8,004</td>
<td>6,249</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>694</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroit</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>6,909</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrenees</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>7,216</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loddon</td>
<td>6,694</td>
<td>7,881</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathbogie</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>8,909</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannawarra</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>9,216</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>9,802</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Grampians</td>
<td>5,728</td>
<td>10,558</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Goldfields</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>10,938</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>4,812</td>
<td>11,176</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigo</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>11,982</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Gipsland</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>13,271</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrindindi</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>13,672</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookwell</td>
<td>6,652</td>
<td>13,830</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henty</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>13,833</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyne</td>
<td>3,877</td>
<td>13,980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Alexander</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>14,764</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Plains</td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>14,870</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenelg</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>18,168</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colac Otway</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>20,370</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorabool</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>21,016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moama</td>
<td>6,065</td>
<td>22,133</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>2,862</td>
<td>23,572</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Coast</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>25,831</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gippsland</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>26,489</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,943</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to a data entry error, the voter numbers published in the Guide for Submissions for Banyule were incorrect. Below is a map with the correct figures as at 23 February 2007. The voter numbers by Census Collector District spreadsheet has been updated on the website.
9.5  List of people and groups making submissions

**Preliminary submissions**
G. M. Anker Hughes  
G. E. Baker  
Banyule City Council  
David Cuthbertson  
The Diamond Valley Greens  
Roger Fyfe  
Andrew J. Gunter  
Rowan Harrison  
Edith Knight  
Craig Langdon MP  
Macleod Progress Association Inc.  
Edward L. Manuel (twice)  
Alan Marks  
W. Mertens  
Cr Peter McKenna  
Peter and Helen Murphy  
Proportional Representation Society of Australia (Victoria-Tasmania) Inc.  
Anthony van der Craats  
Roberta and Kym Wyman  
Steve Gore  
Greensborough Chamber of Commerce  
(Steven Briffa)  
Greensborough Chamber of Commerce  
(Noella Jacobs)  
Clinton Greenwood  
Andrew J. Gunter  
Rowan Harrison  
R. I. Howey  
Stephan Koenig  
Ben Lacarruba  
Elaine and John Lane  
Craig Langdon MP  
Ray Lundberg  
Karen Joy McColl  
V. R. McFall  
Amanda McKenna  
Heather McKenna  
Cr Peter McKenna  
Lachlan McLean  
Cr Tom Melican  
David Mulholland  
Cr Jenny Mulholland  
Doug Munro  
Geva Murano  
Peter and Helen Murphy  
Karen Nichol  
P. N. Novoa  
Julianna Oorloff  
Jacqueline Palmer  
Mario Paolucci  
Enza Peers  
David Romano  
Rosanna Traders Association (Robyn Dewar-Oldis)  
Rosanna Traders Association (Noella Jacobs)  
Proportional Representation Society of Australia (Victoria-Tasmania) Inc.
Wesley Turnbull
Sara Varallo
Virginia C. Verberne
Carole Waldron
Mark Watson
Noel Withers
Roberta and Kym Wyman

and a petition with 11 names
Banyule City Council
Map of Recommended Option
Seven Councillors, Seven Wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Voters</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Area (sq km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakewell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,223</td>
<td>-5.03%</td>
<td>8.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,898</td>
<td>+0.21%</td>
<td>8.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,633</td>
<td>-1.85%</td>
<td>9.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimshaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,743</td>
<td>-0.99%</td>
<td>6.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawdon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,408</td>
<td>+4.17%</td>
<td>14.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibbott</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,627</td>
<td>+5.87%</td>
<td>7.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,562</td>
<td>-2.40%</td>
<td>8.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for all Electorates</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,094</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5.03% to +5.87%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average per Councillor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12,871</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8.93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map prepared by the Victorian Electoral Commission. Vicmap spatial data provided by Department of Sustainability and Environment Parks digital data used with the permission of Parks Victoria. Copyright © 2007 - State Government Victoria. Disclaimer: This content is provided for information purposes only. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy and authenticity of the content, the Victorian Government does not accept any liability to any person for the information provided.