

From: [Kasuni Mendis](#)
To: [Casey Submissions 2023](#)
Subject: City of Casey Electoral Structure Review
Date: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 11:12:47 PM
Attachments: [VEC electoral structure review - CRRA submission.docx](#)

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 Whom It May Concern,

I send this submission on behalf of the Casey Residents and Ratepayers Association Inc.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Kind Regards,

Kasuni Mendis
President of the CRRA



**Casey Residents and Ratepayers Association
Inc A0062545N**

PO Box 17, HALLAM, VIC 3803
crramediaandcomms@gmail.com

*Submission to the Victorian Electoral Commission regarding
The City of Casey electoral structure review*

1. The Casey Residents and Ratepayers Association Inc (CRRA) is an independent community organisation within the City of Casey that seeks to represent the residents and ratepayers of Casey. By doing so, we aim to continually help make the City of Casey a better place to live.
2. The CRRA welcomes the opportunity to participate in this review via this submission. We submit the following thoughts as our opinion on the Model that will be best suited to represent the interests of residents and ratepayers at the City of Casey Council.
3. Firstly, the CRRA believes that it would be beneficial for there to be 11 councillors over there being 12. We accept there are very logical reasons for needing 12 councillors, such as the high population growth that would mean a councillor has a high amount of voters they are representing, and the difficulties of campaigning to such a large voting base in an equitable manner amongst candidates- fundamentally we agree with these reasons. In our experience however, Casey Council has been the subject of internal politics amongst councillors and we are concerned that an even number of councillors could result in deadlocks and internal fighting. We believe an odd number is the best way to prevent this and as such we recommend an option that allows for 11 councillors, and is fair and equal for number of voters represented.
4. Thus, option 3 is not a feasible option for the CRRA, for several reasons. Firstly, it has 12 councillors. Secondly, we do not believe the distribution is equal among the voting base for each ward even taking into account future growth in wards such as Grices, Tooradin, Cranbourne Gardens and Quarters Ward. Thirdly, we see some of the ward distributions as illogical and in irregular shapes that do not take into account suburbs or communities of interest. For example, Brechin Ward spans half of Narre Warren, and half of Narre Warren South, splitting both communities in half.
5. Between option 1 and 2, the CRRA favours option 2. As recognized by the Preliminary Report, this model creates ward boundaries based on suburb/locality boundaries, more effectively grouping communities of interest. Where possible, main roads have been used to split suburbs if required. The CRRA also feels this ward boundary delineation better distributes voters in a fair manner, although Springhill Ward could take more

voters from the growth area wards of Pelican Point, Botanic Gardens and Quarters Ward to account for growth in the southern part of Casey.

6. Option 1 is not feasible as it has many oddly shaped wards, that often encompass many suburbs, thereby splitting similar communities in half, namely River Gum, Merinda, Cranbourne Gardens, and Selandra Ward.
7. With these reasons in mind, the CRRA believes Option 2 is the more favourable option out of the 3 presented by the electoral representation advisory panel.
8. Finally, with regards to the naming conventions of wards, the preference of the CRRA is that wards are named after either localities, known features, or known Aboriginal names. Notionally the CRRA is approving of the names given in Model 2, however Pelican Point and Grasmere wards could have more defining names.