

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 7 August 2023 5:13 PM
To: Port Phillip ERAP Submissions 2023
Subject: submission from Margaret Bride

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Local council electoral review – Preliminary report – Port Phillip City Council

I write as a resident of Port Melbourne. I am pleased that this review recommends a return to single member wards because I think that reinforces the sense of responsibility that a councillor has for their constituents.

I strongly favour Model 3.

The City of Port Phillip's strategic plan acknowledges the importance of local communities and fosters this sense of local identity. Only Option 3 respects this as far as the community of Port Melbourne is concerned.

Traditionally *Port Melbourne* has been the area bounded by the beach, Pickles Street, Boundary Road and the Yarra River. I recognise that the requirement that each ward have roughly the same population would not allow for these to be the boundaries. However in both models 1 and 2 the boundary slices right through the Port Melbourne community, using Graham Street to separate Port Melbourne/ Gateway Ward from Kirrip Park Ward.

Option 3 includes most of traditional *Port Melbourne*. Even Option 3 takes out a small section of traditional Port Melbourne from Rouse Street, along the beach to Pickles Street and north-west to Graham Street. It puzzles me as to the logic of this enclave being in Gasworks Ward.

Each of the three models uses a different name for our area: *Sandridge, Gateway, Port Melbourne*. I would not like to see *Gateway* used again. Either of the other two are traditional to the locality although my sense of historical identity makes me personally favour *Sandridge*

Margaret Bride
[REDACTED]

Port Melbourne
3207
[REDACTED]