

**From:** Barbara Chevalier  
**Sent:** Thursday, 4 August 2011 8:45 PM  
**To:** Elections  
**Subject:** B.Chevalier: Submission to AEC opposing move of Lyneham, O'Connor and Turner from Molonglo electorate  
**Attachments:** Submission to AEC BChevalier 4.8.11.pdf

I attach my **objections to proposed changes to ACT Legislative Assembly electoral boundaries.**

I have lived in O'Connor since 1975 and oppose the proposal to move the suburbs of Lyneham, O'Connor and Turner from the electorate of Molonglo to the electorate of Ginninderra. Of the two proposals under consideration, **I support the one that maintains the integrity of Canberra's Inner North**, in which Crace and Palmerston would be transferred from Molonglo to Ginninderra.

I make supporting points in the attached document.

Sincerely,

Barbara Chevalier

#### **Objection to proposed changes to ACT Legislative Assembly electoral boundaries**

I have lived in O'Connor since 1975 and oppose the proposal to move the suburbs of Lyneham, O'Connor and Turner from the electorate of Molonglo to the electorate of Ginninderra. Of the two proposals under consideration, **I support the one that maintains the integrity of Canberra's Inner North**, in which Crace and Palmerston would be transferred from Molonglo to Ginninderra.

I make the following points in brief, in the knowledge that others have made similar points providing detailed evidence and argument.

1. The inner-north area of Canberra—Civic, Campbell, Reid, Ainslie, Braddon, Dickson, Hackett, Acton, Turner, O'Connor and Lyneham—has formed a natural family of suburbs, socially, geographically and historically. Lyneham, O'Connor and Turner (LOT) are quintessentially "inner north" in local sense of place.
2. I seriously wonder what the impact on voting patterns of splitting LOT from the rest of the inner north will be – in particular on the number of Greens MLAs in the ACT Legislative Assembly. Potentially splitting the Green vote is an issue of considerable import for a Sustainable Canberra, and not merely a matter of numbers or political naivety. Are there any vested political interests in play?
3. Given that future growth will require further redistributions, it makes more sense for newer suburbs to coalesce as they grow than splitting older suburban constellations – both to minimize changes, to leave the existing aggregations intact, and to maintain stability in boundaries and electoral arrangements.
4. Older and newer suburbs will have different ages of infrastructure and compositions of population which in turn result in different 'communities of interest' with respect to natural, urban and social planning.

Sincerely  
Barbara Chevalier.