Electoral structure review - Moonee Valley City Council - Response Submission Samantha Byrne - Keilor East - 08 November 03:28 pm

From:	Samantha Byrne	
Sent:	Wednesday, 8 November 2023 3:28 PM	
To:	Moonee Valley Submissions 2023	
Subject:	Samantha Byrne- Submission MVCC	
Attachments:	MVCC Response Submission.pdf	

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.

Hi,

Please see the attached submission. Please note, I have requested to discuss my submission within the attachment at the hearing.

Kindest Regards,

Samantha Byrne Keilor East

Moonee Valley City Council Electoral Structure Review-

Response Submission

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to submit my response submission regarding the Moonee Valley City Council electoral structure review. I do not hold a specific preference for either Model 1 or Model 2, and I believe that combining elements from both models can result in an enhanced outcome that adheres to the established constraints. Consequently, I have amalgamated features from each model to create three additional preferred models. Among these, Proposed Model A (based off Model 1), when discussed with the various members of the community, appeared to be the most favoured choice by a significant margin. It effectively addresses what appear to be the most contentious concerns, including the preservation of unity in Strathmore and Strathmore Heights, the avoidance of Avondale Heights' separation, and the expansion of its intended ward size.

To maintain transparency, I currently serve as a Councillor representing the Rose Hill Ward. This submission is based on my own views, and not necessarily that of Moonee Valley Council. It's important to note that my familiarity with suburbs in the North-West and Central areas of the municipality is more extensive than my knowledge of the Southern region.

I am thankful for your attention to these suggestions and would like to convey my intention to engage in discussion of these models during the public hearing.

I have categorised my submissions into five sections:

Subtle adjustments to existing models

- 1. Suggestions for Model 1
- 2. Suggestions for Model 2

Broader recommendations for existing models

- 3. Preferred Model A (based off Model 1)
- 4. Preferred Model B (based off Model 1)
- 5. Preferred Model C (based off Model 2)

Subtle adjustments to existing models

I would like to emphasize that I maintain a neutral stance concerning the choice between the current Model 1 and Model 2 proposals and seek to contribute constructive suggestions to enhance both configurations.

1. Suggestions for Model 1:

Enhanced Inclusivity of Strathmore Heights in Essendon Fields Ward: To better reflect the demographic distribution, it is advisable to incorporate the entire Strathmore Heights area into the Essendon Fields Ward. This could be achieved by establishing a clear and logical border along the prominent Melrose Drive/Matthews Ave. Such an adjustment would unite Strathmore Heights residents in areas such as Collier Place and Collier Court (+71), within the same ward as their fellow suburban residents, fostering community cohesion.

Boundaries in Canning Ward: The selection of Brees Road as a boundary appears suboptimal due to its lack of significance as a major road. Additionally, this boundary separation affects only a small portion of Keilor East, potentially leading to confusion among residents. To address these concerns, it is advisable to extend the East Keilor portion of the Canning Ward boundary up to Rachelle Road (+442 residents). This adjustment anticipates minimal growth in the Canning Ward, considering the transition of many households to single-person dwellings. I have further explored a solution to this boundary issue in my preferred models.

Consideration of Name Change for Roberts Ward: The current name, "Roberts Ward," may not effectively represent the ward's geographical and demographic characteristics. To minimise potential community discord, I recommend choosing a name that resonates with both Airport West and Niddrie. Options such as "Steele Creek Ward" or "Matthews Ward" should be considered to better align with the areas within the ward.

2. Suggestions for Model 2:

Boundary Adjustment for Milleara and Rosehill Wards: The existing boundary between Milleara and Rosehill Wards appears unconventional and is not be the most desirable option. To enhance community cohesion, it is recommended that the entire Avondale Heights area be retained within a single ward while incorporating a portion of the Keilor East. The below would be a better option, ensuring a higher number of enrolled voters in Milleara Ward compared to Rosehill due to lower forecasted growth. Current Model 2: Milleara: 10, 065 (-2.82%), Rosehill: 10,189 (-1.63%). Suggested: Milleara: 10,494 (+1.32%), Rosehill: 9760 (-5.77%). Keeping the entirety of Avondale Heights together is an important consideration in keeping communities of interest together. As mentioned for in 'Suggestions for Model 1', I have further explored a solution to this boundary issue in my preferred models.



Consideration of reducing the size of Napier Ward: Presently, Napier Ward exhibits a deviation of population of +9.02%. I anticipate that this figure will soon surpass 10%, especially given the projected development in the Essendon and North Essendon areas. Hence, it would be advisable to proactively downsize the ward.

Consideration of Name Change for Milleara Ward: The proposed name "Milleara Ward" may cause confusion, as it is the same as employed in our strategic planning document, MV2040, however covers a different area. The name "Canning Ward," as used in Map 1, would be more fitting and less prone to misinterpretation.

Consideration of Name Change for Buckley Ward: The current name, "Buckley Ward," is at odds with the ward's geographical composition, primarily encompassing the former Rose Hill Ward, which could lead to confusion. A more suitable name, such as "Steele Creek Ward" or "Hoffmans Ward," aligning with the prominent road that bisects the area, is recommended.

Consideration of Name Change for Queens Lake Ward: To mitigate potential confusion and better reflect the geography, it is advisable to rename "Queens Lake Ward" as "Queens Park Ward."

Broader recommendations for existing models

Considering the factors discussed earlier, I have utilised the online tool to craft three preferred models. These models incorporate broader recommendations that, in my perspective, would substantially improve the sustainability of the restructuring initiative and garner community support. It is worth noting that while Model 1 indicated it mainly followed suburb boundaries and Model 2 emphasizes the utilisation of infrastructure and natural features, I have based these below models on what I consider the most critical distinction between the two models, being their alignment around the airport.

3. Preferred Model A (based off Model 1)

This model is predominantly founded on Model 1, emphasizing the amalgamation of Strathmore and Strathmore Heights. Preferred Model A effectively addresses any concerns I have identified in the current models or that have been brought to my attention- with exception to any minor changes in the Southern end of the municipality. The main points for this being the preferred model are:

- Airport West connects with the Keilor Road/North Essendon Neighbourhood (as per MV2040) which ensures this ward will have either side of the Route 59 tram until it reaches the North Essendon Junction.
- Boundaries are clearer and easier to explain then the current model 1
- Increases the size of Canning Ward, which is due to have significantly low growth compared to other areas
- Avondale Heights is coupled with lower sections Essendon West and Aberfeldie, which share the common interest of the Maribyrnong River corridor. The eastern border is that of Fawkner Street, which is a prominent road from Buckley Street to the Maribyrnong River. Buckley Street is a very strong, easily identified northern border.
- Segregates the Valley Lake estate from East Keilor (Rosehill) to be incorporated into Niddrie (Buckley), a more coherent arrangement due to the Valley Lake estate's historical association with Niddrie as the former Niddrie Quarry
- Naming options: Queens Park Ward, Airport Ward, River Ward, Fairbairn Ward, Myrnong Ward, Hoffmans Ward, Windy Hill Ward, Matthews Ward, Rose Hill Ward





4. Preferred Model B (based off Model 1)

This model is primarily based on Model 1, with Strathmore and Strathmore Heights together. The main points for this being a preferred model are:

- Airport West is linked with Keilor East via the train line and the prominent Milleara Road.
- Segregates Keilor East, a suburb that cannot be accommodated within a single ward, into distinct wards while preserving the integrity of other neighbouring suburbs.
- Offers more transparent and straightforward ward boundaries compared to the existing Model 1.
- Expands the geographical area of the Canning Ward, anticipating limited future growth.



5. Preferred Model C (based off Model 2)

This model is primarily based on Model 2, with Airport West and Strathmore Heights together, however some boundaries are similar to Model 1 or adjusted slightly. For the majority, I have only used main or well-known roads as boundaries. The main points for this being a preferred model are:

- Increases the size of Canning Ward, which is due to have significantly low growth compared to other areas
- Boundaries are clearer and easier to explain then the current model 2
- Reduces Napier Ward deviation which is currently too high considering their expected growth along the Mount Alexander Road and Keilor Road corridor



Aberfeldie Park	1	10,601	+2.35%
Airport Ward	1	9,628	-7.04%
Canning Ward	1	10,747	+3.76%
Fairbairn Ward	1	9,731	-6.05%
Myrnong Ward	1	10,840	+4.66%
Napier Ward	1	10,888	+5.12%
Queens Park W	1	10,456	+0.95%
Rosehill Ward	1	9,974	-3.70%
Steele Creek W	1	10,352	-0.05%

I appreciate your consideration of these recommendations to optimise the ward configuration for the benefit of our community. Your attention to these suggestions would undoubtedly contribute to a more coherent and representative system.

Thank you for your time and dedication to this vital matter. I look forward to accepting the opportunity to discuss options at the public hearing.

Kindest Regards,

Samantha Byrne

