

Electoral  
Arrangement  
& Divisional  
Boundary Review

---

**2019 FINAL DETERMINATION**  
IPSWICH CITY COUNCIL

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Background .....	2
<b>ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENT REVIEW .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Table 1 - Current and Projected Multi-Member Divisional Enrolment & Quota.....	4
<b>DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Determining the quota .....	5
Proposed Determination.....	6
Comments on the Proposal.....	6
<b>FINAL DETERMINATION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Table 2 – Summary of Enrolment for the Final Multi-Member Divisions.....	9
<b>RECOMMENDATION.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	Maps of Council Divisions for 2020 Elections
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	Minister's Referral & Council Administration's Report
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	Proposed Determination Report
<b>APPENDIX D</b>	Comments on the Proposal Notice & Public Submissions

## INTRODUCTION

The *Local Government Act 2009 (Qld)* (the Act) provides for an independent body known as the Local Government Change Commission (Change Commission) to assess whether proposed changes to Queensland's local councils are in the public interest.

The Change Commission has finalised its assessment of the Ipswich City Council's electoral arrangements and divisions on Friday, 18 October 2019. This report outlines the recommended divisional arrangement and boundaries and sets out the reasons for the Change Commission's decisions. Maps of the final boundaries are attached at Appendix A.

The Change Commission for this review consisted of:

- Mr Pat Vidgen PSM, Electoral Commissioner; and
- Mr Wade Lewis, Casual Commissioner.

The casual commissioner was appointed by the Governor in Council on 1 November 2018.

## Background

On 7 May 2019, the Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs, The Honourable Stirling Hinchliffe MP referred an electoral arrangement and divisional boundary review of the Ipswich City Council. The Minister's referral is available to view at Appendix B.

The Minister advised that the Council Administration had undertaken consultation with the Ipswich community and commissioned a report regarding Ipswich's electoral arrangements and divisional boundaries. The *City of Ipswich Divisional Boundary Review Report* (the Report) was included in the Minister's referral and he requested the Change Commission review the recommended option from the Report.

The change proposed was for the Council to have multi-member divisions, instead of the current single-member divisional arrangement. A single-member division has one councillor representing it, whereas a multi-member division can have more than one councillor per division. The Minister recommended four (4) divisions with two (2) councillors per division to allow for future population growth and to offer greater flexibility to increase the number of Councillors as population requires without requiring frequent boundary changes.

The Ipswich City Council and its electors are in a unique situation given recent political circumstances, including the Council's dissolution and subsequent management by an Interim Administrator and Interim Management Committee. While acknowledging the recommended electoral arrangements and boundaries are a significant change to the status quo, the Change Commission also notes that the current Council Administration has no perceived benefit regardless of the outcome of this review.

## ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENT REVIEW

On 9 July 2019, the Change Commission published its electoral arrangement decision, recommending the Ipswich City Council be redivided into four (4) multi-member divisions with two (2) councillors representing each division (see Appendix C). Ipswich will therefore have nine councillors in total (eight (8) councillors and a mayor).

In reviewing the proposed change for the Ipswich City Council, the Change Commission was cognisant that it represents a significant alteration to the long-standing electoral arrangements. It noted in the proposed determination report that there would need to be compelling reasons to assess such a change as being in the public interest and that it looked for evidence that:

- there was demonstrated community support for the proposed change;
- the proposed arrangement would be more workable than the existing one, especially when considering Council's current and projected enrolment, and the likely need to accommodate rapid growth in some areas; and/or
- the proposed change was consistent with the 'local government principles' set out in section 4 of the Act, such as decision-making in the public interest, and ensuring democratic representation, social inclusion and meaningful community engagement.

The Change Commission determined that while both single-member and multi-member divisions provide the community-specific representation that is important to Ipswich residents, multi-member divisions are more likely to meet all the criteria outlined above.

On the strength of the evidence presented in the Report, including the results from extensive public consultation, multi-member divisions were found to be the preferred option. While there was clear support shown for both single-member and undivided electoral arrangements, there was also significant opposition to both systems. On the other hand, multi-member divisions were found to be supported by a greater number of people:

- nearly 90% of respondents ranked multi-member divisions as either their first or second preference;
- 75% of respondents who preferred undivided arrangements, voted multi-member divisions second; and
- nearly 90% of respondents who preferred single-member divisions, voted multi-member divisions second.

The Change Commission also noted that multi-member divisions provide greater scope to have more councillors representing rural areas within the Council area, offering the opportunity for more inclusive representation and engagement with the community. The Change Commission considers this relevant given its awareness that a key community concern in the region is a perceived lack of rural representation under the current arrangements.

The following points about rural representation paraphrase public comments in the Report:

- rural areas need their own representation;
- people living in urban areas, have little understanding of the reality of life in rural or semi-rural areas;

- small towns need a voice, if they do not have someone allocated to them that lives in the area, they will be forgotten;
- without divisional councillors, it's less likely that a councillor will be elected from the smaller communities and the urban councillors will not understand the needs of the rural sector; and
- Ipswich has a mix of country and city and needs divisions to meet everyone's needs.

Having fewer divisions has enabled the Change Commission to place larger amounts of rural areas within them and means that residents in these areas are being directly represented by more councillors. Indeed, under the Change Commission's final boundaries, rural communities in Ipswich will have half the divisional councillors directly representing their areas.

The Change Commission deliberated on the number of multi-member divisions that would best meet the needs of the Ipswich local government area. It was decided that four (4) divisions, with two (2) councillors each, would cater for the current council size, while providing scope to add additional councillor/s to all or some of the divisions as communities expand and elector numbers increase.

Table 1 shows the Council's enrolment quota as at 31 January 2019 and the projected quota for 31 March 2024 under a four division multi-member arrangement.

<b>Table 1 - Current and Projected Multi-Member Divisional Enrolment &amp; Quota</b>		
	<b>31 January 2019</b>	<b>31 March 2024</b>
<b>Number of divisions</b>	4	4
<b>Councillors per division</b>	2	2
<b>Enrolment</b>	128,049	165,213
<b>Average enrolment per division</b>	32,012 <i>(16,006 voters per councillor)</i>	41,303 <i>(20,652 voters per councillor)</i>
<b>Average enrolment (+10%) per division</b>	35,213	45,433
<b>Average enrolment (-10%) per division</b>	28,811	37,173

## DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW

The Change Commission is responsible for periodically reviewing the internal boundaries of divided councils so that each division has relatively the same number of enrolled voters. This upholds the key democratic principle of 'one vote, one value', by ensuring each person's vote carries the same weight.

In conducting its assessment of the Ipswich City Council, the Change Commission was legally required to ensure each division of the Council has a reasonable proportion of enrolled voters, herein referred to as 'quota'. Community interests, such as uniting entire suburbs within divisions and selecting easy-to-identify boundaries, have also been considered.

Assessments are conducted in any way the Change Commission deems appropriate, unless the Minister has provided specific directions.

The process for this review is as follows:

1. Review the Report and make an electoral arrangement determination
2. Publish the Change Commission's electoral arrangement decision and divisional boundary proposal
3. Invite comments on the proposed divisional boundaries
4. Publish the Change Commission's final determination report
5. Final determination report provided to the Minister for Local Government, for implementation by the Governor in Council
6. New boundaries come into effect at the 2020 Local Government Quadrennial Election

### Determining the quota

A quota is determined by dividing the total number of enrolled voters by the number of councillors (other than the mayor), plus or minus 10%. The Change Commission also considers projected enrolment, so the divisions remain in quota for as long as possible.

Current enrolment data has been sourced from Queensland's electoral roll and projected enrolment data from the Queensland Government Statistician's Office of Queensland Treasury. Projections are based on the timing of future local government quadrennial elections.

Enrolment information is based on Statistical Areas Level 1 (SA1). SA1s are geographical units used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) for the release of census data. According to the ABS most SA1s have a population of between 200 to 800 persons with an average population of approximately 400 people.

Current and projected enrolment data is available for download on the Ipswich City Council webpage on the Electoral Commission of Queensland's (ECQ) website.

## Proposed Determination

The Ipswich City Council has 128,049 voters and is currently divided into ten (10) single-member divisions. As at 31 January 2019, Division 9 had far exceeded the enrolment quota and was 25.88% above the average enrolment, thereby initiating this review.

Having reviewed the findings and recommendations of the Council Administration's community consultation in the *Report*, the Change Commission published its electoral arrangement decision and divisional boundary proposal on 9 July 2019. The proposed boundaries brought enrolment in each multi-member division into quota, while also catering for the significant growth projected in certain parts of the region. The Change Commission made a concerted effort to unite suburbs within divisions where practicable and create clearly definable boundaries by following suburb boundaries or roads.

One of the key community concerns identified by the Council Administration and in the *Report* was that rural communities did not believe they had adequate representation. The proposal sought to address these concerns, with the proposed Divisions 1 and 4 including a mix of urban and significant portions of rural areas. In doing so, this means four councillors, or half of the elected divisional councillors, will have some responsibility for rural suburbs and communities.

## Comments on the Proposal

Comments on the proposal were invited from 9 July 2019 to 30 July 2019. Advertisements were placed in the Queensland Times, on the ECQ website and its social media platforms. Emails were also delivered to 46,840 Ipswich voters (those with up-to-date email addresses on the electoral roll), notifying of the publication of the proposal and of the opportunity to provide feedback. Seventy-six (76) comments were received during this timeframe, with three (3) late submissions also received. These comments are available to view at Appendix D.

The Change Commission notes that the comments expressed a variety of views, with some clearly for or against the proposed boundaries, while others objected to certain parts of the proposal or had alternative boundary recommendations. Close to a third of the comments expressed their support and some of the paraphrased feedback includes:

- fully support the concept of more than one councillor in each area and that the number of divisions proposed is appropriate;
- support the four (4) division, eight (8) councillor model;
- the proposal addresses concerns and issues that have been with us for a long time;
- the number of divisions proposed, and mathematical calculations used to formulate the boundaries is appropriate;
- the balance of voters across divisions appears to be as good as anyone could achieve, offering a voice to both urban and rural voters;
- it will ensure that more people get the Councillor they want;
- the combination of old boundaries with new will help dissolve the toxic culture from previous administrations;

- having two Councillors per division will bring greater transparency to the division and will make Councillors more accountable; and
- the proposed boundaries are clear, address the long-standing issues and concerns and will facilitate the renewal necessary for local government to rehabilitate itself.

More than fifty of the comments expressed opposition to the electoral arrangement decision and/or the proposed boundary changes. Key themes to emerge concerned the size and combination of urban and rural areas within the divisions. Other comments objected to the introduction of multi-member divisions, or requested the existing divisional boundaries be retained. Some suggested different arrangements should be implemented such as being undivided, having more divisions or adding more councillors. Some of the paraphrased feedback includes:

- oppose multi-member divisions, as we will lose the local face to face interaction required to re-build confidence;
- need smaller divisions with more members on the ground;
- leave the boundaries as they are and stop attempting to short-change us;
- give us back our Council the way we voted at the last election;
- two representatives in each division isn't enough to ensure accountable democracy;
- local areas will be forgotten and only CBD areas cared for;
- satisfied with the way the council is being run under an administrator;
- the limited number of divisions unfortunately means the divisions are very diverse;
- the divisions are too large to manage and will create representation issues;
- the change will dilute the care that a councillor provides within the division;
- the change should not be able to happen without a democratic vote;
- Divisions 1 and 4 are too large and two councillors are not enough;
- few individual candidates will have the money to fund such a large campaign;
- two councillors per division might not be enough and three might work better;
- happy with the current administration, please abolish local government;
- Council should operate at a strategic level and an undivided council would mean councillors act in the best interests of all residents; and
- potential for rural areas to not receive the attention and support they require with representatives focusing on urban areas.

Regarding those comments recommending the number of divisions or councillors be increased, the Change Commission notes that it settled upon the number of divisions and councillors as it provides scope to increase representation as Ipswich continues to grow. It is also noted that the average enrolment per councillor under the four multi-member divisions is similar to neighbouring Logan City Council at around 16,000 voters per councillor. The Change Commission was therefore not persuaded that representation would be insufficient.



Rural representation was also raised as a significant concern, and particularly having rural areas combined with more urban and residential suburbs. The Change Commission modelled scenarios where the rural suburbs were held together in one division, however noted that to meet the enrolment quota, it was still necessary to include some urban areas. Therefore, while acknowledging the divisions do encompass some diverse areas, the Change Commission is of the view that having rural areas in two divisions and represented by half of the Council, will give these areas a greater chance at being heard. It is noted however, that regardless of the boundaries, it will be the task of the elected councillors to provide adequate representation to their constituents.

One comment provided extensive boundary realignment suggestions, while a few other submitters also offered alternative suggestions such as moving entire suburbs to other divisions. The Change Commission modelled but did not implement these suggestions, noting the proposed boundaries were at the upper and lower limits of the enrolment quota and to move suburbs or make more extensive realignments would have required significant changes to be made without the possibility of further public consultation.

A submitter also recommended renumbering the proposed divisions, while the Council's Interim Administrator recommended describing Ipswich's divisions by name rather than number in an email on 21 August 2019 (see Appendix D). The Change Commission was not persuaded of the need to renumber the divisions or rename them, noting that only the Brisbane City Council has named wards (divisions) at this time. As a result, the Change Commission agreed upon retaining the proposed boundaries as the final boundaries.

A few of the comments discussed the Council Administration's Report and survey findings and were critical of the Change Commission's use of these findings in coming to its electoral arrangement decision. Some of the feedback included:

- the survey had a predestined conclusion in favour of multi-member divisions;
- the results of the Report were based on a small number of respondents in comparison to the population of the Ipswich City Council; and
- the survey results ignored the primary vote and counting preferences.

While acknowledging these concerns, the Change Commission notes that it supported an electoral arrangement change to multi-member divisions because the multi-member arrangement was found to be the most acceptable system for the largest number of Ipswich voters. The most polarising views regarding the Council's electoral arrangements as noted in the Report related to single-member divisions and undivided electoral arrangements.

It is also noted that while the participation rates are fairly low on a population basis, the Council Administration undertook a significant advertising and consultation campaign. Similarly, the Change Commission also received relatively few comments on its proposal, despite contacting close to 50,000 Ipswich voters by email in addition to its other advertising methods.

### Out of Scope

Some of the comments raised matters that were unable to be considered by the Change Commission. For example:

- change the suburb boundaries rather than dividing the suburbs into different divisions;
- the Council should become undivided;
- catchment areas to be based upon GDP average to ensure votes are apportioned according to average meaningful income producing households;
- rename the Council as Ipswich Regional Council or Ipswich Shire Council;
- implement different processes for electing Council representatives, the Mayor and for determining the method in which Councillors should be paid;
- reduce dumping fees to minimise rubbish being dumped on private land;
- concerns with the emergency rates being charged to their area; and
- concerns with the first-past-the-post voting system.

A number of these concerns are matters for residents to raise with Council, such as dumping fees or emergency rates. Other matters relate to Queensland legislation which is determined by the Queensland Parliament, such as the voting system or how the boundaries should be determined. The Change Commission notes the Act designates a formula for determining how many voters must be in each electoral division which is its primary consideration.

## FINAL DETERMINATION

After assessing the material submitted and having considered the requirements of the Act, the Change Commission is recommending the proposed divisional boundaries become the final divisions for the Ipswich City Council.

The Change Commission is satisfied the final boundaries meet the enrolment requirements of the Act, unite suburbs within individual divisions where practicable, and balance the number of representatives responsible for rural and urban areas as evenly as possible in keeping with community sentiment.

It is noted that the implementation of this recommendation is expected to result in the following divisional enrolment:

<b>Division</b>	<b>Enrolment as at 31/01/2019</b>	<b>(%) Deviation from Average</b>	<b>Projected Enrolment as at 31/03/2024</b>	<b>(%) Deviation from Projected Average Enrolment</b>
Division 1	28,854	-9.87	44,796	8.46
Division 2	33,189	3.68	43,297	4.83
Division 3	35,070	9.55	38,790	-6.08
Division 4	30,936	-3.36	38,330	-7.2

## RECOMMENDATION

Given the unique situation in Ipswich and the significance of the changes being recommended by this review, the Change Commission recommends the Minister consider directing the Ipswich City Council, in consultation with the Change Commission, to conduct a mid-term review and community consultation in 2022 to gauge residents' experiences and satisfaction with the multi-member arrangement and divisional boundaries.

Due to the high-level growth anticipated in the Ipswich region, the Change Commission notes it will likely be reviewing Ipswich's divisional boundaries in 2023 prior to the next quadrennial election. Therefore, it is of the view that it will assist the 2023 assessment process to have a better understanding of the community's experiences, and particularly whether the multi-member arrangements are meeting the community's representation requirements.

The Change Commission has provided its assessment to the Minister for Local Government and recommends the Governor in Council implement the following recommendations:

- the Ipswich City Council be divided into four (4) multi-member divisions with two (2) councillors representing each division, plus a mayor (nine (9) councillors in total); and
- for the purpose of the 2020 Local Government Quadrennial Election, the boundaries of the four (4) multi-member divisions are as shown in the maps in Appendix A.

In accordance with the Act, the Change Commission has published a notice of results in the Government Gazette, a newspaper circulating in the local government area and on the ECQ website.



**Pat Vidgen PSM**  
Electoral Commissioner




**Wade Lewis**  
Casual Commissioner

# **APPENDIX A**

**Maps of Council Divisions  
for 2020 Elections**


# IPSWICH CITY

## Existing Electoral Divisions



This product was created using datasets from various authoritative sources, and is intended as a guide only to display current divisional boundaries. Elector deviation is referenced as C (Current) and P (Projected). The digital GIS data is available FREE to download from Queensland Spatial Catalogue, or Qspatial, at <http://qldspatial.information.qld.gov.au> © The State of Queensland - 2019 (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy). © Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019. Creative Commons (CC BY)










# Final Electoral Divisions




This product was created using datasets from various authoritative sources, and is intended as a guide only to display final divisional boundaries. Elector deviation is referenced as C (Current) and P (Projected). The digital GIS data is available FREE to download from Queensland Spatial Catalogue, or Qspatial, at <http://qldspatial.information.qld.gov.au> © The State of Queensland - 2019 (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy). © Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019. Creative Commons (CC BY)

**FINAL DIVISIONAL BOUNDARIES**

**IPSWICH CITY**  
**Division 1**

- LEGEND**
-  Final Division Boundary
  -  Final Adjacent Division
  -  Locality Boundary
  -  Adjacent Council
  -  Reserve, Parkland
  -  Waterbody
  -  Railway
  -  Main Road
  -  Wetland


Location Map  
Division 1




This product was created using datasets from various authoritative sources, and is intended as a guide only to display final divisional boundaries.

The digital GIS data is available FREE to download from Queensland Spatial Catalogue, or QSpatial, at <http://qdsportal.information.qld.gov.au>

© The State of Queensland - 2019 (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)  
© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019  
Creative Commons (CC BY)






**2019**  
**Local Government Area**  
**Divisional Boundary Review**  
**FINAL DIVISIONAL BOUNDARIES**  
**IPSWICH CITY**  
**Division 2**



Location Map  
 Division 2



**LEGEND**

- Final Division Boundary
- Final Adjacent Division
- Locality Boundary
- Adjacent Council
- Reserve, Parkland
- Waterbody
- Railway
- Main Road
- Wetland










This product was created using datasets from various authoritative sources, and is intended as a guide only to display final divisional boundaries.  
 The digital GIS data is available FREE to download from Queensland Spatial Catalogue, or Qspatial, at <http://qldspatial.information.qld.gov.au>  
 © The State of Queensland - 2019 (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)  
 © Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019 Creative Commons (CC BY)



**FINAL DIVISIONAL BOUNDARIES**

**IPSWICH CITY**  
Division 3



**LEGEND**

-  Final Division Boundary
-  Final Adjacent Division
-  Locality Boundary
-  Adjacent Council
-  Reserve, Parkland
-  Waterbody
-  Railway
-  Main Road
-  Wetland



Location Map  
Division 3

This product was created using datasets from various authoritative sources, and is intended as a guide only to display final divisional boundaries. The digital GIS data is available FREE to download from Queensland Spatial Catalogue, or QSpatial, at <http://qdsportal.information.qld.gov.au>  
© The State of Queensland - 2019 (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)  
© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019  
Creative Commons (CC BY)



**FINAL DIVISIONAL BOUNDARIES**

**IPSWICH CITY**  
**Division 4**


- LEGEND**
- Final Division Boundary
  - Final Adjacent Division
  - Locality Boundary
  - Adjacent Council
  - Reserve, Parkland
  - Waterbody
  - Railway
  - Main Road
  - Wetland



Location Map  
Division 4



This product was created using datasets from various authoritative sources, and is intended as a guide only to display final divisional boundaries. The digital GIS data is available FREE to download from Queensland Spatial Catalogue, or QSpatial, at <http://qdsportal.information.qld.gov.au>  
© The State of Queensland - 2019 (Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy)  
© Electoral Commission of Queensland 2019  
Creative Commons (CC BY)



# **APPENDIX B**

## **Minister's Referral & Council Administration's Report**



Minister for Local Government,  
Minister for Racing and  
Minister for Multicultural Affairs

Our ref: MC19/1152

1 William Street  
Brisbane Queensland 4000  
PO Box 15009  
City East Queensland 4002  
**Telephone +61 7 3719 7560**  
**Email** lgrma@ministerial.qld.gov.au  
**Website** www.dlgrma.qld.gov.au

ABN 65 959 415 158

07 MAY 2019

Mr Pat Vidgen PSM  
Electoral Commissioner of Queensland  
Local Government Change Commission  
GPO Box 1393  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Pat

I am writing to you in relation to a Local Government electoral review that was undertaken by the Ipswich City Council in preparation for the 2020 Local Government quadrennial elections.

I received correspondence from Mr Greg Chemello, Interim Administrator of the Council dated 28 February 2019, advising of the results of the review, as required by the *Local Government Act 2009* (the Act). I note that you have also received a copy of Mr Chemello's letter.

The review revealed the proportion of electors in January 2019 was out of quota range in one of the Council's divisions, with Division 9 being significantly out of quota at 25.9 per cent.

Following on from this review, Mr Chemello took the opportunity to consult with Ipswich residents about the most appropriate divisional boundary model for the city via a survey. This consultation process was carried out during March 2019.

On 30 April 2019, Mr Chemello provided me with the City of Ipswich Divisional Boundary Review Report (the Report) which analyses the survey responses received and recommends Ipswich move to a multi-Councillor model with two to three Councillors per division with four to six divisions. I have enclosed a copy of the Report for your information.

As you are aware, section 18 of the Act provides that only I may apply to the Local Government Change Commission (Change Commission) for an assessment of a proposed Local Government change. Further, under section 19 of the Act, the Change Commission must consider whether the Local Government change is consistent with the Act and must consider my views on any proposed changes.

I consider it appropriate to propose a Local Government change to the Change Commission for independent assessment, with this change being the recommended option from the Report: a multi-Councillor model with two to three Councillors per division with four to six divisions.

In undertaking the assessment, I would ask the Change Commission to consider the following matters:

- Current and potential growth in the current and future residential developments. I am advised that ongoing housing estate subdivisions at Redbank Plains and substantial industrial area growth on the outskirts of the established urban areas at Swanbank is driving most of the population growth in Ipswich. In addition, priority new development areas at Springfield Lakes, Springfield Central and Ripley areas will further increase the population growth in these areas.
- The engagement undertaken by the Council with Ipswich residents regarding the three possible models for the city's divisional boundaries.
- The reasoning for recommending Option 3 (a multi-Councillor model with two to three Councillors per division) to be selected as set out in the Report.
- If Option 3 is assessed as being in the public interest, the option of two Councillors per division with four divisions be considered as the preferred model as it will allow for future population growth with an ability to increase Councillors as required while retaining the same divisional boundaries for multiple election cycles.

I have asked for Ms Rebecca McAnalen, Acting Principal Region Advisor (Southern), Local Government Division in the Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs to assist you with any further queries. You may wish to contact Ms McAnalen on [REDACTED] or by email at [REDACTED].

Yours sincerely



**STIRLING HINCHLIFFE MP**  
**Minister for Local Government,**  
**Minister for Racing and**  
**Minister for Multicultural Affairs**

Enc

# City of Ipswich Divisional Boundary Review Report

30 April 2019

Prepared by the Interim Administrator, Ipswich City Council  
For the Minister for Local Government



---

# CONTENTS

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2. DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW ENGAGEMENT</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>3. THE SURVEY</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>4. INTERPRETING THE SURVEY PREFERENCE RESULTS</b> .....	<b>7</b>
4.1 THE RAW DATA .....	7
4.2 APPLYING SCORES TO THE SURVEY RESULTS .....	8
4.3 INTERPRETING THE FLOW OF PREFERENCES.....	8
<b>5. INTERPRETING THE SURVEY COMMENTS</b> .....	<b>9</b>
5.1 'COUNCILLORS'.....	9
5.2 'DEMOCRATIC PROCESS' .....	9
5.3 'GEOGRAPHIC / SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIVERSITY' .....	9
5.4 'PARTY POLITICS'.....	9
<b>6. WHY 'MULTI-COUNCILLOR DIVISIONS' IS THE BEST WAY FORWARD</b> .....	<b>10</b>
6.1 A MAJOR FAILING.....	10
6.2 GEELONG CITY CASE STUDY .....	10
6.3 WHY NOT AN UNDIVIDED MODEL? .....	11
<b>7. CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: COMMUNITY DISCUSSION PAPER</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: SAMPLE NEWSPAPER ADS AND MEDIA COVERAGE</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: HARD COPY SURVEY</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: OVERVIEW OF SURVEY RESPONSE TRENDS</b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>APPENDIX F: QUALITATIVE RESEARCH REPORT</b> .....	<b>41</b>
<b>APPENDIX G: TABLE OF ALL QUALITATIVE COMMENTS</b> .....	<b>66</b>



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Throughout the month of March 2019, Ipswich City Council (ICC) encouraged residents to help shape their future council by sharing their views on the most appropriate divisional boundary model for the city via a survey, available both online and in hard copy.

This report was prepared by the Interim Administrator for the consideration of the state government to provide a summary of the city's collective preferences.

Three models were proposed for consideration through a month-long community consultation program, which was promoted by significant marketing and media activity, with each model resulting in between eight and 12 councillors being elected, as follows:

- OPTION 1: Undivided (8 to 12 Councillors)
- OPTION 2: Divided – 1 Councillor per Division (8 to 12 Divisions)
- OPTION 3: Divided – 2 to 3 Councillors per Division (4 to 6 Divisions)

This survey, which was supported by a community discussion paper, background document and comprehensive Q&A that highlighted potential advantages and disadvantages, asked respondents to rank these options from 1 to 3 (1 being most preferred, 3 being least preferred). Space was also allocated for additional feedback.

Following analysis of the survey data and preference results from 1,049 respondents as well as a review of 450 written comments provided during the

consultation process, the recommendation is for the state government to select 'Option 3: Divided – 2 to 3 Councillors Per Division (for 4 to 6 Divisions)' for the City of Ipswich, to be effective for the local government elections in March 2020 and beyond.

This is the most appropriate approach for the city for the following reasons:

- Almost 90 per cent of survey respondents ranked Option 3 as either their first or second preference.
- For those people whose first preference is 'Option 1: Undivided Council', 75 per cent of respondents cited Option 3 as their second preference.
- For those people whose first preference is 'Option 2: Divided – 1 Councillor Per Division (for 8 to 12 Divisions)', almost 90 per cent of respondents cited Option 3 as their second preference.
- Only 11 per cent of respondents ranked Option 3 last.
- While both single-councillor divided or undivided council models will please a significant proportion of residents, these models will also offend a significant proportion of residents, making Option 3 the least polarising option for the city.
- For the various communities of Ipswich, multi-councillor divisions will effectively deliver the local representation they are seeking at the same time as avoiding a return to the significant governance pitfalls experienced in the past.





---

# 1. INTRODUCTION

---

The City of Ipswich is one of the fastest growing in Australia. With population and jobs both growing at around 4 to 5 per cent each year, the city is seeing rapid changes in its people, where they live, where and how they work, and what they want in their communities.

As the various communities around Ipswich grow and change, it could be expected that they will also have differing views on what they want from their council compared to when the city was first established some 160 years ago.

Ipswich communities have also seen significant upheaval in their council in recent years. The community's confidence and trust in its council has been severely tested.

Last year, a Crime and Corruption Commission (CCC) investigation identified significant governance failures in Ipswich City Council as summarised in their report titled *'Culture and corruption risks in local government: Lessons learned from an investigation into Ipswich City Council (Operation Windage)'*.

As a result of these governance failures, the mayor and councillors were dismissed by a unanimous vote in the Queensland Parliament in August 2018, and an Interim Administrator put in place until the March 2020 local government elections.

The Interim Administrator is supported by an Interim Management Committee (IMC) made up of five expert consultants appointed by the state.

Since the last divisional boundary changes made prior to the 2016 elections, Ipswich has experienced growth of 9.3 per cent in voters.

Changes made to divisional boundaries in preparation for the 2016 elections were intended to spread the growth areas over multiple divisions.

While this approach yielded some success, the substantial growth in certain areas on the outskirts of the established urban areas has meant that the majority of growth was concentrated in a few divisions.

This is not ideal as it means that voter growth in only a couple of divisions is driving the need to regularly change the boundaries of many other (slower growth) divisions across the local government area.

The boundaries of the current 10 divisions have also evolved over time as the city's population grew, with little clear reference to the principle of 'communities of interest' outlined in the *Local Government Act*.

Two of these 10 divisions will be outside of the 10 per cent variation of the number of voters allowable under the *Local Government Act 2009* by March 2020.

For all of these reasons, a change of the divisional boundaries in the City of Ipswich is clearly required.

To ensure the best possible outcome for the city, the Interim Administrator committed to consulting the community on how they wanted to be represented by their future council in 2020 and beyond.

A survey, supported by a month-long period of community engagement, was released to gauge the city's collective preferences and views.

Following analysis of the survey data and preference results from the 1,049 respondents as well as a review of 450 written comments provided during the consultation process, this report was prepared by the Interim Administrator for the consideration of the state government to provide a summary of the city's collective views and preferences.

## 2. DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW ENGAGEMENT

With no councillors in place and no predetermined view by the current council administration, it was the perfect time for Ipswich residents to have a transparent discussion on what they believe is the best way forward, with three divisional models proposed for consideration.


Throughout the month of March 2019, Ipswich City Council (ICC) encouraged residents to help shape their future council by sharing their views and preferences on the most appropriate divisional boundary model for the city.

Three models were offered for consideration through council's month-long community consultation program, with each model resulting in between eight and 12 councillors being elected:


### OPTION 1: UNDIVIDED (8 to 12 Councillors)



### OPTION 2: DIVIDED – 1 Councillor per Division (8 to 12 Divisions)



### OPTION 3: DIVIDED – 2 to 3 Councillors per Division (4 to 6 Divisions)



To facilitate this engagement and ensure the collective views of the local Ipswich community could be communicated to the state government, a simple online survey was created that asked respondents to rank these options from 1 to 3 (1 being most preferred, 3 being least preferred). Space was also allocated for additional feedback.

Best efforts were made to ensure that online respondents could only respond to the survey once.

Hard copies of the survey were also available at all nine community offices, as well as at council's central administration building and all Ipswich libraries.

Alternatively, residents could call or email to request a hard copy of the survey and reply-paid envelope to be posted to them.

The community was also invited to share submissions via a special email address ([shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au)) for consideration by council and inclusion in this report.

A detailed background paper was produced, as was a more concise community discussion paper, with both available, along with the survey and a comprehensive Q&A, at [ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil).

These documents provided a list of possible advantages and disadvantages for each model, as well as other suggested considerations and background material, in order to inform and support residents in making a decision.

In addition to encouraging respondents to consider potential advantages and disadvantages, they were asked to keep the following considerations in mind:

1. How would each model assist or hinder a councillor's obligation to provide leadership and strategic delivery of services in the public interest of the whole of the city?
2. How would each model assist or hinder the responsibility of the councillors to focus on planning for the future and developing corporate plans and strategies, as opposed to a focus on day-to-day operational issues?
3. Which model would best allow for the diversity of the city's communities to have their interests represented on council?
4. Which model best promotes "good governance" (i.e. transparency, accountability, integrity, ethics and effectiveness)?

In order to reach as many local residents as possible with the invitation to share their views and preferences on the city's divisional model, council created a month-long comprehensive marketing and promotional program which included:

- Print advertising in all four local newspapers
- Radio advertising on River 94.9
- Paid social media advertising on Facebook
- Digital billboard promotion
- Organic social media promotion
- A strategic media relations campaign targeting South East Queensland media
- Regular updates on council's Ipswich First website
- Inclusion in the Interim Administrator's monthly column.

As an additional avenue for engagement, a community information night was organised to provide an opportunity for the community to hear from independent speakers (three mayors and an experienced CEO) who have worked in all three models, and to ask questions of this panel.

Queensland media personality Madonna King was engaged to facilitate the event to ensure impartiality. The evening was also streamed live on Facebook.

Approximately 170 engaged residents attended this information night to hear from Mayor Tanya Milligan from Lockyer Valley Regional Council, Mayor Paul Antonio from Toowoomba Regional Council, Mayor Amanda Findley from Shoalhaven City Council and CEO David Farmer from Ipswich City Council – an incredibly positive result.

See **Appendix A** for a copy of the Community Discussion Paper.

See **Appendix B** for sample newspaper ads and media coverage.

---

## 3. THE SURVEY

---

The survey consisted of three parts:

- **Demographic questions**
- **A statement of the person's preferences for the three optional models by ranking the three generic approaches from 1 (most preferred) to 3 (least preferred)**
- **The option to include comments for the state government's consideration.**

While 1,049 people completed the survey on the divisional boundary review, 450 of these respondents also provided written feedback. It should be noted that of these 1,049 respondents, 28 identified themselves as not residing in Ipswich. However, their data has been included in this report as many of them noted that they had a genuine interest in the future of the city (i.e. some worked in Ipswich, some owned property in Ipswich etc).

A further 24 residents provided written feedback by other means (see **Appendix G**).

For a population of 213,638, a minimum sample of 384 would provide a confidence level of 95 per cent, and a margin of error of 5 per cent. With 1,049 responses, this provides a confidence level of 99 per cent and a margin of error of around 4 per cent. In practical terms, this means any reported percentage response cited below should be treated as 'plus or minus 4 per cent'.

Key demographic information was collected in the front-end of the survey, with the following points of note:

- The most engaged respondents were between 30 and 49 – reflective of the city's median age of 32.
- There was almost an even split of male and female respondents.
- While Australian was noted as the cultural background in the majority of respondents, 11 other 'cultural backgrounds' were noted (in addition to 'other').
- Sixty-eight of the 82 suburbs across Ipswich were represented in the survey with strong representation amongst urban areas, rural areas and newer developments.

See **Appendix C** for a copy of the survey.

See **Appendix D** for a summary of the demographic information captured.

## 4. INTERPRETING THE SURVEY PREFERENCE RESULTS

In the survey, respondents were asked to rank the three models in preference, from 1 to 3. The table below summarises the results of the survey preferences:




	<b>OPTION 1</b> Undivided	<b>OPTION 2</b> Divided Single-Councillor	<b>OPTION 3</b> Divided Multiple-Councillor
1st preference	271	453	325
2nd preference	203	239	607
3rd preference	575	357	117

### 4.1 The Raw Data

The first approach to interpreting the survey results is a simple summary of the rankings, with some analysis included below.

- While a quarter of people (26 per cent) nominated 'Option 1: Undivided Council' as their first preference, more than half (55 per cent) nominated an Undivided Council as their least preferred model.
- While 43 per cent of people nominated 'Option 2: Divided - 1 Councillor Per Division' as their first choice, over a third of people (34 per cent) designated Option 2 as their least preferred model.
- This points to a polarisation of views across the Ipswich community, with people strongly preferring either an undivided model or single-councillor divisions, and strongly disliking the other.
- Put another way, the single-councillor divided model will please a significant proportion of residents but will also offend a significant proportion of residents.
- This polarisation is reflected in many of the comments and views expressed in the survey and is discussed further in 'Interpreting the Survey Comments' in Section 5.
- The same cannot be said for 'Option 3: Divided - 2 to 3 Councillors Per Division (for 4 to 6 Divisions)'.
  - Almost a third of respondents (31 per cent) cited this model as their first preference, and a significant 58 per cent cited it as second preference. Only 11 per cent of respondents ranked Option 3 last.
  - Almost 90 per cent of people ranked Option 3 as either their first or second preference. It is clearly the 'least disliked' option.

See **Appendix E** for an overview of survey response trends over the month of the survey. Note that Options 1 and 3 were close throughout most of the consultation period, around 33 per cent to 38 per cent, (ie within the survey margin of error) except during the last week when a number of surveys were received from a non-metropolitan area, the majority of which ranked option 2 first.




## 4.2 Applying Scores to the Survey Results

As noted, the purpose of the survey was to understand the community's order of preferences, not just to seek 'first past the post' feedback. Therefore, the second way of interpreting the survey results is to convert the rankings into scores. This type of analysis can be undertaken using two approaches.

Firstly, **we could take a positive perspective and assume that all options are acceptable**; that even the third ranked model is satisfactory to respondents. Using this approach, the rankings have been assigned scores of:

- First ranking scores: 3 points
- Second ranking scores: 2 points
- Third ranking scores: 1 point.

The resulting scores utilising this approach are as follows:




**Using this method of analysis, 'Option 3: Divided – 2 to 3 Councillors Per Division (for 4 to 6 Divisions)' scores the highest points.**

Alternatively, **we could take a more negative perspective and assume that the third ranked model is not acceptable** for most people who ranked it as such. When using this methodology, the rankings were assigned scores of:

- First ranking scores: 1 point
- Second ranking scores: 0 points
- Third ranking scores: minus 1 point (-1).

The resulting scores utilising this approach are as follows:



Again, Option 3 scores the highest number of points.

## 4.3 Interpreting the Flow of Preferences

A third way of interpreting the survey results is by studying the flow of preferences; i.e. by identifying the preferred model if their first preference was not successful. As follows is a summary of the flow of preferences:

- For those people whose first preference is 'Option 1: Undivided Council', 75 per cent of respondents cited Option 3 as their second preference.
- For those people whose first preference is 'Option 2: Divided – 1 Councillor Per Division (for 8 to 12 Divisions)', almost 90 per cent of respondents cited Option 3 as their second preference.
- For those whose first preference is 'Option 3: Divided – 2 to 3 Councillors Per Division (for 4 to 6 Divisions)', about 50 per cent of respondents equally cited Options 1 and 2 as their second preference.

This holistic interpretation of the survey preference results indicates that 'Option 3: Divided – 2 to 3 Councillors Per Division (for 4 to 6 Divisions)' is, on balance, the most preferred model for the City of Ipswich.

While it ranked behind Option 2 as a first preference (31 per cent compared to 43 per cent), it received general support across the community, with the following points of note:

- **Almost 90 per cent of people ranked Option 3 as either their first or second preference.**
- Almost 90 per cent of people who ranked Option 2 first considered Option 3 to be their next preference.
- About 75 per cent of people who ranked Option 1 first considered Option 3 to be their next closest preference.

There is a significant gap between the number of respondents who ranked Option 3 last and those who ranked Options 1 and 2 last.

Put another way, **Option 3 is the least polarising model across the community.**

## 5. INTERPRETING THE SURVEY COMMENTS

In addition to reviewing and interpreting the quantitative data, it's important to take into account the qualitative data collected via the survey and [shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au), with additional feedback noted by some 450 of the 1,049 respondents.

A review of the qualitative survey responses conducted by independent research firm IPSOS noted that the 450 respondents who commented did not vary significantly to the total sample and were highly engaged, making reasonable effort to articulate their responses.

Four themes emerged from the comments, with some respondents mentioning more than one response code or more than one theme in their survey. (Please note that 'n=' denotes the number of respondents who made similar comments, as per the themes.)

As follows is a summary of these responses, separated into the four core themes (councillors, democratic process, geographic/socio-economic diversity, party politics) as prepared by IPSOS:

### 5.1 'Councillors'

There was a very mixed discussion about both the quantity but also calibre of the candidates to stand for councillor. Respondents commented about a councillor's character, skills, quality of contribution and location as important aspects regardless of the model.

There was a mix of views about which model this group preferred. Their main points were around ensuring that councillors could do the job and represent their interests as a local member.

### 5.2 'Democratic Process'

A number of respondents raised concerns around the democratic process and the way in which any changes to the divisional boundaries should be made. Participants commented about the process of changing the divisions. There were some who felt that changing the current divisional structure should only be done by a vote, enabling a democratic process for change.

There was also negative sentiment towards the rationale for changing. They do not see the current model as the cause of issues but rather the councillors as individuals. This group was more aligned with divisional boundaries and one councillor.

### 5.3 'Geographic / Socio-Economic Diversity'

The changes posed initiated discussion around the need for local representation across the Ipswich region due to the geographic and socio-economic diversity that exists in the electorate.

Respondents felt that the geographic characteristics such as urban, rural and small town differences as well as large distances across the Ipswich City Council meant that there were many different needs of the constituents. This meant that if there were no divisions that some areas would not have their interests represented or be forgotten.

There was also a sense of the "grass is greener" with lots of comments about other areas getting more attention, resources or funding. There were comments around the more affluent or newer development areas like Springfield and Ripley having more of council's focus. There were also comments about different areas having different cultural backgrounds and needing their diversity represented.

### 5.4 'Party Politics'

A number raised concerns around the democratic process and the affiliation of councillors with political parties. Respondents also commented on the desire to have independent councillors and to keep party politics to state and federal governments. Councillors also should be transparent and declare their affiliations.

Note that there were also a number of random comments, statements that they preferred not to comment, or topics not of interest to this survey that were allocated to an 'Other' category.

See **Appendix F** to view the complete independent report prepared by IPSOS.

See **Appendix G** for a spreadsheet featuring all additional comments (with identifying information redacted for privacy purposes).

---

## 6. WHY 'MULTI-COUNCILLOR DIVISIONS' IS THE BEST WAY FORWARD

---

### 6.1 A Major Failing

Throughout this period of Interim Administration, a number of failings and flaws have been identified by the Interim Administrator. One governance concern is that there was far too much emphasis placed by councillors on a councillor's own division and on operational issues; and not enough attention given to city-wide priorities and strategic issues.

This approach, which is a contradiction to the required role of councillors as prescribed in the *Local Government Act*, fostered a 'tale of 10 small cities' approach to leadership, rather than a whole-of-city commitment.

A divisional focus was supported from a budgeting perspective. For example, in the 2018 budget, each divisional councillor was allocated approximately \$680,000 for capital projects. While many of these projects indeed provided benefit to the community, they were not prioritised across the entire city, only across a division.

There was no framework in place to review whether (say) a new park in one suburb was more or less important to a road upgrade in another suburb, from a city-wide, strategic perspective.

Allocating an aggregate total of some \$7 million of ratepayers' money each year to local divisional projects identified by individual councillors in this fashion is not good governance.

Community donations were handled in a similar manner, with each councillor allocated a local budget for donations in their division, without a robust framework to assess each grant application against the city's needs on the whole. In 2018, an aggregate total of almost \$1.4 million was made available to divisions by way of community donations.

A common criticism of divisional budgeting is that it encourages a 'pet and populist' approach to project and community support, with divisional needs, as perceived by the councillor, often prioritised over wider community needs.

Reporting of council expenditure was also on Divisional terms, reinforcing a competitive approach for ratepayer funds based on ensuring each councillor got their 'divisional shares' rather than overall city priorities.

The impact of this divisional-based approach can be seen across the city.

### 6.2 Geelong City Case Study

Ipswich isn't alone when it comes to these types of issues. The Commission of Inquiry into Greater Geelong City Council, which resulted in the dismissal of the mayor and all councillors in 2016, found the single-ward (or single-division) structure as it operated at Greater Geelong contributed to the governance failures it identified at the council. In its report, the commission said,

**"A significant number of councillors appear to be preoccupied with their individual ward interests rather than the city as a whole and have shown little capacity to work together."**

It added,

**"Replacement of single-councillor wards by multi-councillor wards supported by mechanisms to ensure strategic, whole-of-municipal planning and delivery would strengthen council leadership, corporate behaviour and decision-making."**

The commission formally recommended that the single-member ward structure be replaced with multi-member wards, which occurred in 2017. With the support of returning and new councillors, council officers, and the local community, Greater Geelong City Council transitioned from a single-councillor model into a multi-councillor model with relative ease.\*

(\**Democracy in Geelong Background Paper 2016*)

## 6.3 Why not an undivided model?

Some 55 percent of survey respondents ranked an undivided council as their last preference. Clearly this is “a bridge too far” for many in the community. The Interim Administrator believes that, while an undivided model may be better-placed to deliver a strategic outcome for a city on the whole, this isn’t necessarily the best option for Ipswich.

Option 3 combines the benefits of a single-councillor divisional model with an additional layer of good governance through the increased accountability that comes with a multi-councillor model.

Local representation is still provided so councillors are aware of divisional issues, but with fewer divisions and additional peers to share responsibilities, it’s easier to encourage a strategic, whole-of-city focus.

This model also allows for increased representation for residents. No longer will they have just one councillor to approach. Option 3 provides residents with three or four councillors to contact – their two or three local ‘divisional’ councillors plus the relevant committee chair (if committees are utilised).

While there are many potential advantages noted with Option 3 in the Community Discussion Paper in **Appendix A**, with some included above, there are also several potential disadvantages associated with the model.

The Interim Administrator has identified these potential issues. Council officers will create a framework that will mitigate the risks should Option 3 be the model selected by the state government.

Preparing council for its return to elected representation, including the creation of a strategic tool kit, increased support, and a comprehensive induction program, is a high priority for the organisation.

## 7. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, **the recommendation is for the state government to select ‘Option 3: Divided – 2 to 3 Councillors Per Division (for 4 to 6 Divisions)’ for the City of Ipswich, effective after the local government elections in March 2020 and beyond.**

This is the most appropriate and preferred option for the following reasons:

- **Almost 90 per cent of people ranked Option 3 as either their first or second preference.**
- **For those people whose first preference is ‘Option 1: Undivided Council’, 75 per cent of respondents cited Option 3 as their second preference.**
- **For those people whose first preference is ‘Option 2: Divided – 1 Councillor Per Division (for 8 to 12 Divisions)’, almost 90 per cent of respondents cited Option 3 as their second preference.**
- **Only 11 per cent of respondents ranked Option 3 last.**
- **While both single-councillor divided or undivided council models will please a significant proportion of residents, these models will also offend a significant proportion of residents, making Option 3 the least polarising option for the city.**
- **Option 3 most comprehensively and positively addresses the considerations listed in Section 2.**
- **For the various communities of Ipswich, multi-councillor divisions will effectively deliver the local representation they are seeking at the same time as avoiding a return to the significant governance pitfalls experienced in the past.**
- **Based on his experiences over the last eight months, the Interim Administrator concurs with the survey results for the reasons noted in Section 6.**

With the return to elected representation fast approaching, now is the perfect time to effect the change necessary to set the city on a new course towards the prosperous, proud future its people deserve.



City of Ipswich  
**Ipswich, Help Shape  
Your Future Council**

Divisional Boundary Review  
Community Discussion Paper  
March 2019



[ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil)



---

## HELP SHAPE YOUR FUTURE COUNCIL

---

### Ipswich is experiencing significant change.

There is no better time than this period of interim administration for you, a resident of Ipswich, to openly consider and debate how you would like to be represented by your future Ipswich council in 2020 and beyond.

The City of Ipswich local government area is one of the fastest growing regions in Australia, with population and economic growth at around 5 per cent each year.

As the various communities around Ipswich grow and change, it could be expected that they will also have differing views on what they want from their council compared to when the city was first established some 160 years ago.

Last year, a Crime and Corruption Commission (CCC) investigation identified significant governance failures in Ipswich City Council as summarised in their report titled "Culture and corruption risks in local government: Lessons learned from an investigation into Ipswich City Council (Operation Windage)". As a result of these governance failures, the mayor and councillors were dismissed by a unanimous vote in the Queensland Parliament in August 2018, and an Interim Administrator put in place until the March 2020 local government elections.

The community's confidence and trust in your council has been severely tested.

With no councillors in place and no predetermined view by the current council administration, the Ipswich community can have a transparent discussion on what you think is the best way forward.

### Would you prefer your councillors to be elected on a divisional basis or across the entirety of the local government area?

**Please read on to see how you can have your say.**

This community discussion paper is a summary of a range of issues. A more detailed report is also available at [ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](https://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil).

To have your say, just **answer a few simple questions**. Once you've read through this community discussion paper (and the longer background paper if you so desire), we are going to ask you to rank the three types of divisional models in your order of preference from most preferred (1) to least preferred (3). It's that easy! There'll also be space to share your additional thoughts.

Of course, if you want to also provide a written submission, we will be grateful to receive your views (email [shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au)).



## WHAT IS THE ROLE OF A COUNCILLOR AND HOW SHOULD THEY CONTRIBUTE TO GOOD GOVERNANCE?

In representative democracies like Australia, citizens entrust the decisions about how they are governed to elected representatives.

Governance is about the way that elected representatives make decisions and oversee the functions of councils.

The Good Governance Framework ([premiers.qld.gov.au](http://premiers.qld.gov.au)) says that government bodies should also observe the core governance principles of:

- transparency,
- accountability,
- integrity, including resolution of potential and actual conflicts of interest with selflessness and objectivity in the public interest,
- due diligence, and
- economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

”  
The primary accountability of a local government is to its community, and that the decisions of the local government must be made with regard to the benefit of the entire local government area.

The *Local Government Act* is very clear that this applies regardless of whether a council has electoral divisions (like Ipswich currently has) or is undivided (ie. has no councillor divisions). The core obligation of a councillor is to make decisions in the best interests of the entire council area.

In considering councillors' accountability to the community, the Operation Windage report highlights that it is also useful to draw comparisons with the duties placed on directors of companies by the *Corporations Act 2001*, including the duty to act with care and diligence, and to act in good faith in the best interests of the company (or the community, in the case of councillors).

Another issue that needs to be appreciated is that the law clearly distinguishes between the roles and responsibilities of the elected councillors and the administrative (council employees) arms of local government.

The primary role of councillors is to focus on policy development and ensure the strategic delivery of services in the public interest. Councillors are responsible for planning for the future and developing corporate plans and strategies to achieve their goals and deliver outcomes to the whole of the community, and monitoring the performance of the council against these.

Councillors are not responsible for overseeing the internal day-to-day work done by local government employees. This is managed by the chief executive officer and senior staff.



---

## WHAT ARE YOUR OPTIONS?

---


There is no single accepted view of which model is best-placed to contribute to good governance; that is the best way to ensure that councillors provide strategic guidance and leadership to their local government area as a whole.

**There are three broad models of electing councillors as community representatives (each model will result in a minimum of eight and maximum of 12 councillors being elected):**


### OPTION 1: UNDIVIDED (8 to 12 councillors)



### OPTION 2: DIVIDED - 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions)



### OPTION 3: DIVIDED - 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)



As you read through the overview of these three options on the pages to follow, we encourage you to keep these questions in mind:

1. How would each model assist or hinder a councillor's obligation to provide leadership and strategic delivery of services in the public interest of the whole of the city?
2. How would each model assist or hinder the responsibility of your councillors to focus on planning for the future and developing corporate plans and strategies, as opposed to a focus on day to day operational issues?
3. Which model would best allow for the diversity of Ipswich's communities to have their interests represented on council?
4. Which model best promotes "good governance" (ie transparency, accountability, integrity, ethics and effectiveness)?

# OPTION 1

## UNDIVIDED COUNCIL (8 TO 12 COUNCILLORS)



An undivided council has no divisions.

All candidates for council are listed on a single ballot paper for the entire local government area, and all voters nominate their preferences across all candidates. There will be a separate ballot paper for the position of the Mayor. The (typically) eight to 12 candidates who receive the most votes become the councillors. This is the most common approach in Queensland, New South Wales, South Australia and Western Australia, although it is far more common in rural councils than in urban councils.

The following Queensland councils have adopted this model:

- [Toowoomba Regional Council](#)
- [Noosa Council](#)
- [Mackay Regional Council](#)

### Possible **ADVANTAGES** include that it:

- Delivers a more unified, citywide, strategic focus to council governance.
- Gives voters a choice of councillors they can approach with their concerns.
- Promotes councillors, as per the Act, to address issues in the best interests of all residents in the local government area, as opposed to a 'my backyard' approach.
- Leads to more integrated policy making.
- Allows voters to express a preference for every candidate in the council election.
- Allows voters to select candidates based on their capabilities as community leaders and decision makers across the whole local government area rather than just on their geographic associations.
- Results in a simpler voters' roll for elections.
- Avoids the requirement for regular divisional reviews (reviews needed to ensure the proportion of councillors to voters does not vary by more than 10 per cent between any division in the local government area).

### Possible **DISADVANTAGES** include that:

- There are risks that most councillors will be elected from a single part of the local government area and that some 'communities of interest' could be unrepresented.
- A councillor's capacity for local engagement and representation may be diminished if they become inaccessible to residents in parts of the local government area.
- Councillors' responsibilities may become confused and their efforts duplicated if there is no clarity around roles and representation among the councillors.
- It is a far more costly exercise for candidates to campaign across an entire local government area, as opposed to a division, which may disadvantage independent candidates who do not have the financial backing to market themselves to the whole community.
- It may make it difficult for voters to assess the performances of individual councillors across the local government area.

# OPTION 2

## DIVIDED – 1 COUNCILLOR PER DIVISION (FOR 8 TO 12 DIVISIONS)



A divided council is where the local government area is split into (typically) eight to 12 divisions (currently in Ipswich we have 10 divisions). Each division has more or less the same number of voters.

The electoral ballot papers for each division only have those candidates who have decided to nominate for that particular division included, plus all candidates for mayor. The candidate with the most votes in each division becomes a councillor.

Single-councillor representation is the most common model used in urban councils across Queensland, and is the model most Ipswich voters are familiar with.

It is important to understand that the current 10 divisions across the city cannot continue to apply; two of the 10 divisions will be outside the 10 per cent variation of the number of voters allowable under the *Local Government Act* by March 2020.

### Possible **ADVANTAGES** include that it:

- Encourages a diverse range of candidates to run for council as they only have to incur electoral campaign costs for a division (and not across the entire council area).
- Allows for councillors to be truly local representatives (for their division), easily accessible to residents and more aware of local issues.
- Ensures that geographically-formed 'communities of interest' are likely to be represented at the council.
- May contribute to ensuring that sectional interests are less likely to dominate the council.

### Possible **DISADVANTAGES** include that:

- Councillors might be elected on local, minor, or parochial issues and lack perspective on or offer less support for policies that benefit the whole council (ie a 'my backyard' approach).
- Divisional boundaries might divide larger communities of interest and might be hard to define.
- When this model is accompanied by other practices, such as the portfolio system in which areas of responsibility are allocated to individual councillors, the culture of the 'lone councillor' looking after 'my patch' is reinforced.
- When combined with a divisional funding program (which was discontinued in Ipswich) that allocates funds to each councillor to dispense more or less unchallenged, a councillor can develop a preoccupation with funding for their own division rather than the priorities of the whole city.
- Voters might have fewer options to select from for their representative.
- If a division has a high growth rate, boundaries will be more susceptible to change (as population changes put numbers above or below the 10 per cent quota), which could mean more regular reviews.

# OPTION 3

## DIVIDED – 2 TO 3 COUNCILLORS PER DIVISION (FOR 4 TO 6 DIVISIONS)



In a divided council model – multi-councillor representation, the local government area would be divided into divisions (usually four to six), with each division having roughly the same number of voters with between eight and maximum 12 councillors elected. Residents are represented by more than one councillor, with two or three typically elected per division.

Between 30 and 40 per cent of councils in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia and the Northern Territory operate under this model. Obviously, the divisions tend to be larger than in a single-councillor model.

The ballot papers for each of these larger division have those candidates who have decided to nominate for that

particular division, plus all candidates for mayor. The top two or three candidates with the most votes for each division become councillors.

The following councils have adopted this model:

- [City of Greater Geelong](#)
- [Wollongong City Council](#)

### Possible **ADVANTAGES** include that it:

- Offers all of the advantages cited for the divided – single representative model.
- Supports representation of different interests in a division.
- Allows for greater consideration of multiple views on issues than the single representation model as each division would be represented by more than 1 councillor.
- Can make divisional boundaries easier to identify and less susceptible to change as a result of uneven growth population or decline than does the single representative model.
- Provides councillors in a division with increased opportunity for discussion and shared responsibility.
- Provides residents with 3 or 4 councillors to contact about issues – their 2 or 3 local ‘divisional’ councillors plus the relevant committee chair (if committees are utilised), therefore increasing the level of local representation.

### Possible **DISADVANTAGES** include that:

- All of the disadvantages cited for the divided – single representative model may also be relevant.
- Groups may come together along interest lines, leading to issues between divisional councillors.
- Councillors may duplicate their efforts if they do not communicate or share their workloads effectively.
- Different views on issues within a division may make these issues more difficult to resolve.

## HAVE YOUR SAY

To have your say, all you have to do is answer a few simple questions, starting with a request to rank the three divisional models you've just reviewed from most preferred (1) to least preferred (3).

Find the survey form by:

- Visiting council's **website** at [ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil).
- Visiting council's **central administration office** or any community office to collect a hard copy version of the survey or online access.

- Visiting any of council's **libraries** to collect a hard copy version.
- Telephoning council's **call centre** on **(07) 3810 6666** for a survey form to be mailed or emailed to you.

You are free to provide any submissions to council on your views and preferences for any matters or issues regarding how best to deliver good local governance for the City of Ipswich (email [shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au)), and the survey will also provide space for additional feedback.

## NEED MORE INFORMATION?

If you feel that you need more background information before you can make your decision visit [ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil) for the detailed report that informed this discussion paper.

A public information session will be held on **Monday 25 March 6.00 pm**  
**North Ipswich Reserve Corporate Centre**  
**2B Pine Street, North Ipswich, QLD.**

The session will feature three guest speakers from relevant local government areas who will be presenting on the three models and will be available to answer your questions. Additional information can be found at [ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil).

## KEY DATES

You have until **12.00 pm on Sunday 31 March** to share your views and opinions.

## WHERE TO FROM HERE?

While we are seeking your views and preferences and encourage all local residents to have their say, the community cannot directly determine the local government representative model. *The Local Government Act* is clear that is a matter for the state government to decide.

Your views will be included in a report to the Minister for Local Government who will be asked by council to consult the state government's Change Commission for their assessment. The Change Commission will share the results of its assessment with the Minister and the public.






---

## APPENDIX B: SAMPLE NEWSPAPER ADS AND MEDIA COVERAGE



---



**Ipswich, Help Shape Your Future Council**

How would you like to be represented by council in 2020 and beyond?

Read the Divisional Boundary Review discussion paper and complete the short, anonymous survey at [ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil)




**Ipswich, Help Shape Your Future Council**

How would you like to be represented by council in 2020 and beyond?

**Divisional Boundary Review Public Information Session**  
Monday 25 March 6.00 pm  
North Ipswich Reserve  
Corporate Centre  
2B Pine Street, North Ipswich

The session will feature three guest speakers from relevant local government areas who will discuss the three models and will be available to answer your questions.  
[ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil)



Press adverts in Moreton Border News and News Limited papers



**Ipswich, help shape your future Council**

Read the Divisional Boundary Review discussion paper and share your ideas in the short, anonymous survey



Social media posts in ICC Facebook and Twitter accounts as well as [ipswichFirst.com.au](http://ipswichFirst.com.au) EDM and blog post



02 Mar 2019

Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Author: Hayden Johnson • Section: General News • Article type : News Item  
Classification : Regional • Audience : 7,461 • Page: 1 • Printed Size: 819.00cm<sup>2</sup>  
Region: QLD • Market: Australia • ASR: AUD 861 • Words: 513 • Item ID: 1086458372

isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.



Page 1 of 3

[back](#)

# DISCUSSION PAPER OUTLINES OPTIONS AHEAD OF 2020 ELECTION

# PEOPLE DECIDE ON COUNCIL DIVIDE

**HAYDEN JOHNSON**

[hayden.johnson@qld.com.au](mailto:hayden.johnson@qld.com.au)

NOW is your chance to have a say on the most significant councillor shake-up in two decades, with Ipswich City Council releasing its long-awaited divisional boundary review.

The review discussion paper has been released to the community for public feedback.

The eight-page paper offers the most comprehensive change to council boundaries since amalgamation in 1995.

Residents are given three op-

tions and encouraged to have their say about how the council will be represented at the March 2020 elections and beyond.

Ipswich administrator Greg

Chemello said the discussion paper offered three options on divisional boundaries for consideration, with each model resulting in a minimum of eight councillors and maximum of 12 councillors be-

ing elected.

The community's views will be submitted to Local Government Minister Stirling Hinchliffe before a proposal is sent to the Local Government Change Commission.

Mr Chemello said now was a good time to reflect on the make-up of the community's desired representation.

**CONTINUED ON PAGE 4**



19 Mar 2019  
Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Section: General News • Article type : News Item • Classification : Regional  
Audience : 6,256 • Page: 4 • Printed Size: 163.00cm<sup>2</sup> • Region: QLD • Market: Australia  
ASR: AUD 149 • Words: 219 • Item ID: 1095025453



isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.

Page 1 of 1

[back](#)

# Speakers on boundary review revealed

FOUR speakers from two states will share their views on the choice available to Ipswich residents about their future council representation.

The speakers will appear at Ipswich City Council's public forum, held to provide information about its Divisional Boundary Review Community Discussion Paper.

Interim Administrator Greg Chemello said the speakers bring a wealth of experience through local government and working within the various models in their own councils.

The speakers are Toowoomba Regional Council Mayor Paul Antonio, Lockyer Valley Regional Council Mayor Tanya Milligan, New South



**WAY FORWARD:** Ipswich CEO David Farmer. Photo: Cordell Richardson

Wales Shoalhaven City Council Mayor Amanda Findley and new Ipswich City Council CEO David Farmer.

There are three models of

electing councillors for consideration including: Undivided, no divisions; divided, one councillor a division and divided, two or three councillors a

division.

Each model will result in a minimum of eight and maximum of 12 councillors being elected.

The public information session will be held on March 25 from 6pm-7.30pm at North Ipswich Reserve Corporate Centre.

"I am sure residents will appreciate hearing first-hand how the models work as they consider what might work best for Ipswich going forward," Mr Chemello said.

Toowoomba and Lockyer has the undivided model.

Shoalhaven is divided, with four councillors representing each of the three wards, and the mayor.



27 Mar 2019

Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Author: Hayden Johnson • Section: General News • Article type : News Item  
Classification : Regional • Audience : 6,256 • Page: 4 • Printed Size: 238.00cm<sup>2</sup>  
Region: QLD • Market: Australia • ASR: AUD 218 • Words: 364 • Item ID: 1099004919



isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.

Page 1 of 1

back

# 'Politics, gangs' in models

## Councillor representation the hot topic at session

HAYDEN JOHNSON

hayden.johnson@qjt.com.au

THE potential for team politics, gangs of councillors and better rural representation for far-flung communities have been detailed at Ipswich City Council's boundary review evening.

More than 150 residents, including dismissed councillors Kerry Silver, Kylie Stoneman, Sheila Ireland, David Pahlke and David Martin, attended Monday night's session.

Three mayors and a council CEO detailed the positive and negative aspects of each proposed representation model put forward to the Ipswich community.

In Toowoomba, residents elect 10 councillors and a mayor across the city.

That mayor, Paul Antonio, told the audience there were advantages and disadvantages to the model.

"It's a one vote, one value (model) and I think it's got great democratic principles," he said.

"In an undivided council... the community gets a say on everything."

He said Toowoomba operated like a board, with a whole-of-city interest at heart.

Cr Antonio acknowledged the cost of running a campaign was significant.

"Potential candidates can at times be discouraged by the size of the electorate and getting around to do an election campaign," he said.

At the last election, he re-

quired 300 volunteers to man 70 polling booths.

He said name recognition was "critical" to help incumbents, but also hinder them.

"If you've done something stupid, you're in trouble," he said.

He said the risk of an undivided council was a loss of "general representation from smaller parts" of the region.

Shoalhaven Mayor Amanda Findley travelled from New South Wales to reveal thoughts about her three-division, four councillor a division model.

Cr Findley said her council, which stretches 130km from north to south, had the best model to ensure smaller areas were represented.

She said a strong party team would likely be elected.

"Registered political parties with very strong campaigns who poll highly can get a majority on the council," she said.

"There's an expectation that I have the numbers to make the decisions, I don't.

"It requires really strong leadership when the council is in disarray."

Lockyer Valley Mayor Tanya Milligan said her undivided council provided financial benefit to forgotten areas.

"If you don't like a particular councillor, you have six other councillors to converse with," she said.



02 Mar 2019  
Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Author: Hayden Johnson • Section: General News • Article type : News Item  
Classification : Regional • Audience : 7,461 • Page: 1 • Printed Size: 819.00cm<sup>2</sup>  
Region: QLD • Market: Australia • ASR: AUD 861 • Words: 513 • Item ID: 1086458372

isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.



Page 2 of 3

 back




Photo: Rob Williams

Ipswich City Council interim administrator Greg Chemello with the Divisional Boundary Review Community Discussion Paper.

Photo: Rob Williams

# Division shift up to region

## FROM PAGE 1

He said the review came after some residents voiced strong thoughts to him.

The options for residents are: An undivided council (councillors elected to represent the whole city); Divided, one councillor per division (eight to 12 divisions) or; Divided, two or three councillors per division (four to six divisions).

The community will have until 12pm on March 31 to fill out the survey.

“Consider and debate how you would like to be represented by your future Ipswich council in 2020 and beyond,” Mr Chemello said.

“Would you prefer your councillors to be elected on a divisional basis or across the entirety of the local government area?”

Mr Chemello said he had no view on what would be best.

The discussion paper outlines the role of a councillor; which Mr Chemello said was not to take complaints about potholes or footpaths.

“The role of a councillor is strategic leadership of the

council, setting the policies of the council,” he said.

Mr Chemello said the review was not about making it difficult for previous councillors to be elected in their old areas.

“It’s not about individuals and it’s certainly not about past individuals,” he said.

“It’s about creating for the future group of councillors elected in 13 months time.”

Ipswich City Council CEO David Farmer has worked under all three models.

He said all had pros and cons and it would be up to the community to have its say.

The survey result will not be binding, with the state government given final say on the council’s boundaries.

“Our job is get to the state really clear articulated views about what the community wants,” Mr Chemello said.

“I didn’t seek the minister’s permission to do this and I’m not under any ministerial direction to do this.”

“We’ll be suggesting what the community says the state ought to listen very carefully to.”



02 Mar 2019  
Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Section: General News • Article type : News Item • Classification : Regional  
Audience : 7,461 • Page: 4 • Printed Size: 102.00cm<sup>2</sup> • Region: QLD • Market: Australia  
ASR: AUD 107 • Words: 167 • Item ID: 1086458504



isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.

Page 1 of 1

 back

## We're on the right road: McMahon

A FRESH breath of air is blowing across Ipswich's diverse landscape after 18 months of darkness, community champion Peter McMahon believes.

Mr McMahon joined Ipswich administrator Greg Chemello to launch the council's Boundary Review Discussion paper.

The businessman encouraged residents to have their say and revealed his own preference.

"We do need divisional representation," he said.

"We have a situation where people of Springfield



**Community champion and businessman Peter McMahon.**

wouldn't even know where Rosewood is.

"It's totally two different groups of people."

Mr McMahon said the city battled through difficult times in recent months.

"There's been a few councillors/council workers who have gone off the rail and there's been a lot of people hurt in that time," he said.

Mr McMahon said the region had turned a corner.

"I can talk about the wonderful growth taking place in this town and it's so exciting to be part of," he said.

"Let's get on the new road and get it working.

"I see fresh air coming."



05 Mar 2019  
Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Section: General News • Article type : News Item • Classification : Regional  
Audience : 6,256 • Page: 5 • Printed Size: 6.00cm<sup>2</sup> • Region: QLD • Market: Australia  
ASR: AUD 5 • Words: 52 • Item ID: 1087614302

 isentia mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.



Page 1 of 1

  
back

### **Your chance to shape the future**

HELP shape the future of the city by completing Ipswich City Council's Divisional Boundary Review. The council wants to know how you want to be represented by the council in 2020 and beyond. You have until noon on March 31 to share your views and opinions. Visit [/www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil) for more.



19 Mar 2019  
Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Section: General News • Article type : News Item • Classification : Regional  
Audience : 6,256 • Page: 4 • Printed Size: 163.00cm<sup>2</sup> • Region: QLD • Market: Australia  
ASR: AUD 149 • Words: 219 • Item ID: 1095025453

isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.



Page 1 of 1

 back

## Speakers on boundary review revealed

FOUR speakers from two states will share their views on the choice available to Ipswich residents about their future council representation.

The speakers will appear at Ipswich City Council's public forum, held to provide information about its Divisional Boundary Review Community Discussion Paper.

Interim Administrator Greg Chemello said the speakers bring a wealth of experience through local government and working within the various models in their own councils.

The speakers are Toowoomba Regional Council Mayor Paul Antonio, Lockyer Valley Regional Council Mayor Tanya Milligan, New South



**WAY FORWARD: Ipswich CEO David Farmer.** Photo: Cordell Richardson

Wales Shoalhaven City Council Mayor Amanda Findley and new Ipswich City Council CEO David Farmer.

There are three models of

electing councillors for consideration including: Undivided, no divisions; divided, one councillor a division and divided, two or three councillors a

division.

Each model will result in a minimum of eight and maximum of 12 councillors being elected.

The public information session will be held on March 25 from 6pm-7.30pm at North Ipswich Reserve Corporate Centre.

"I am sure residents will appreciate hearing first-hand how the models work as they consider what might work best for Ipswich going forward," Mr Chemello said.

Toowoomba and Lockyer has the undivided model.

Shoalhaven is divided, with four councillors representing each of the three wards, and the mayor.





25 Mar 2019  
Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Section: General News • Article type : News Item • Classification : Regional  
Audience : 6,256 • Page: 4 • Printed Size: 112.00cm<sup>2</sup> • Region: QLD • Market: Australia  
ASR: AUD 102 • Words: 227 • Item ID: 1098046515

isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.



Page 1 of 1

 back

## Public session tonight will shape future of council representation

RESIDENTS and prospective council candidates are expected to pack the North Ipswich Corporate Centre tonight to hear details about the region's proposed representation.

As the deadline looms on Ipswich City Council's Divisional Boundary Review, a public information session will be held from 6pm.

Administrator Greg Chemello will be joined by new Ipswich CEO David Farmer, Toowoomba mayor Paul Antonio, Lockyer Valley mayor Tanya Milligan and Shoalhaven (NSW) mayor Amanda Findley who will speak about their experiences with their model.

"The session will feature four guest speakers from rele-

vant local government areas who will discuss the three models and will be available to answer your questions," Mr Chemello said.

"They will talk openly about the advantages and disadvantages of each model.

"I am sure residents will appreciate hearing first-hand how the models work as they

consider what might work best for Ipswich going forward."

Residents have the rest of March to have their say: Do you want your councillors to be elected on a divisional basis or across the entirety of the Ipswich region?

More than 600 Ipswich residents have given feedback during the council's consultation.

Three options on divisional boundaries are up for consideration including: Undivided; divided, one councillor per division or; divided, two or three councillors across four to six divisions.

"All three models continue to receive strong support," Mr Chemello said.

**- Hayden Johnson**



27 Mar 2019  
Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Section: General News • Article type : News Item • Classification : Regional  
Audience : 6,256 • Page: 4 • Printed Size: 312.00cm<sup>2</sup> • Region: QLD • Market: Australia  
ASR: AUD 285 • Words: 209 • Item ID: 1099004937



isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.

Page 1 of 1

back

## Mayor 'wary' about state's plans to overhaul voting

HOW the State Government's proposed changes to local government voting will play into Ipswich's new representation models has created concern.

Toowoomba Mayor Paul Antonio told the council's boundary review information session he was "particularly wary" about some of the suggested new reforms "coming out of the State Government".

He said compulsory preferential voting for divided councils and proportional representation could see a rise in informal votes and other issues.

Under the changes, voting for councils would be similar to the Australian Senate.

"The changes may have unintended consequences, when you look at some of the outcomes in the senate of recent times," he said.

"You'll be voting one to 35 or whatever the number of candidates there are.

"If you don't do it properly your vote will be informal.

"If you miss out 29, your vote is informal."

Cr Antonio said the existing voting system had served Toowoomba well.

"I think we need to keep it simple," he said.

"The first past the post system for councillors has served my community particularly well for a long time."

The Local Government Association of Queensland has launched a campaign against the State Government's proposed voting changes.



DEBATE: Toowoomba mayor Paul Antonio at the Ipswich City Council Boundary Review information session.



27 Mar 2019  
Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Section: General News • Article type : News Item • Classification : Regional  
Audience : 6,256 • Page: 4 • Printed Size: 174.00cm<sup>2</sup> • Region: QLD • Market: Australia  
ASR: AUD 159 • Words: 297 • Item ID: 1099004986

isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.



Page 1 of 1

[back](#)

## Models aside, good candidates are needed

NO MATTER the system, the best way to ensure good representation is to elect capable councillors.

That was the underlying message from several speakers at Monday night's boundary review evening, hosted by Ipswich City Council.

Ipswich City Council chief executive David Farmer responded to an audience member's question about the lack of skills new councillors often possessed.

The questioner asked how inexperienced councillors would manage council financials.

"It's not just budgets – you've got to set environmental policies, deal with drainage, storm-water quality and animal control," Mr Farmer said.

He said Wollongong councillors were urged to undertake

training similar to board members.

"We encouraged all of our councillors to do the Australian Institute of Company Directors course," he said.

"It's expensive, it's hard work and you do an exam.

"That helps them fulfil their role as a member for the board.

"A number of those councillors had not done any formal education since they left school."

Mr Farmer said the council would work to ensure the next crop was a good one.

"We would be seeking to assist incoming councillors to skill themselves up as much as possible," he said.

"It's much, much more than budgets, a role of a councillor."

Toowoomba Mayor Paul Antonio said there was a "strict

line" between elected councillors and council operations.

"The reality is you need skills – skills to analyse what the operational arm are putting forward," he said.

Lockyer Valley Mayor Tanya Milligan said some qualities could not be learned on a course.

"I have known some exceptionally intelligent people that just lack common sense and being practical," she said.

"Do not ever underestimate life skills and being a reasonable person and having empathy. You can't train those qualities in a person."



**CAPABILITY:** Lockyer Valley Mayor Tanya Milligan.



06 Apr 2019  
Queensland Times, Ipswich QLD

Author: Hayden Johnson • Section: General News • Article type : News Item  
Classification : Regional • Audience : 7,461 • Page: 3 • Printed Size: 206.00cm<sup>2</sup>  
Region: QLD • Market: Australia • ASR: AUD 217 • Words: 269 • Item ID: 1104247378

isentia.mediaportal

Licensed by Copyright Agency. You may only copy or communicate this work with a licence.



Page 1 of 1

 back

# Boundary study hits high rate of reply

## Council collates survey feedback

HAYDEN JOHNSON

[hayden.johnson@qt.com.au](mailto:hayden.johnson@qt.com.au)

THE result from Ipswich City Council's divisional boundary survey is being finalised before a report about the community's sentiment is sent to the State Government.

The council received about 1000 opinions – the majority submitted online – relating to the future of the city's councillor representation.

Three models; undivided, divided with one councillor a division or divided with two or three councillors a division were put to the vote.

"The Divisional Boundary public consultation process has been extremely successful," interim administrator Greg Chemello said.

Residents were asked to number boxes one to three with their preference.

Of the responses, 19 handwritten surveys marked only one option.

"These are incomplete so can't be included in the data analysis," Mr Chemello said.

"Any comments made in

these surveys are being noted and considered.

"In the end, only four out of the almost 1000 surveys received have been both incomplete and without any additional comments for analysis by council. That's an exceptionally positive result."

Mr Chemello said the consultation period was "not about voting".

"It has been to determine trends, cognisant that different parts of the city might actually have differing views and preferences on this important issue," he said.

"The views and preferences of our community will be forwarded to the Minister for Local Government and again we have been clear that it is the State Government that will ultimately decide on the structure of Ipswich's councillor representation.

"I take this opportunity to thank all those people who have completed the survey and contributed to this process of restoring trust and confidence in Ipswich City Council."

# Divisional Boundary Review myths busted

More than 600 submissions made so far



More than 600 Ipswich residents have given feedback during Ipswich City Council's consultation period on divisional boundaries for the March 2020 local government elections.

Interim Administrator Greg Chemello, briefing council on Tuesday, said he was delighted with the number of respondents since launching the discussion paper on 1 March.

The paper offers three options on divisional boundaries for consideration. Each model presents a minimum of eight councillors and a maximum of 12 councillors being elected:

1. Undivided
2. Divided – 1 councillor per division (8-12 divisions)
3. Divided – 2 or 3 councillors per division (4-6 divisions)

"Almost three weeks into the consultant period, all three models continue to receive strong support," Mr Chemello said.

Residents have the rest of March to have their say: do you want your councillors to be elected on a divisional basis or across the entirety of the Ipswich region?

There is also a public information forum on Monday, 25 March, where Mr Chemello will be joined by new Ipswich CEO David Farmer, Toowoomba Mayor Paul Antonio, Lockyer Valley Mayor Tanya Milligan and Shoalhaven (NSW) Mayor Amanda Findley as they speak about their experiences with each of the models.

"The session will feature four guest speakers from relevant local government areas who will discuss the three models and will be available to answer your questions," he said.

"They will talk openly about the advantages and disadvantages of each model. I am sure residents will appreciate hearing firsthand how the models work as they consider what might work best for Ipswich going forward."

The feedback from residents had focussed on some key issues and frequently asked questions about the divisional boundaries debate, including:

- **Does Ipswich City Council make the final decision?** No, council does not make the final decision. Council will provide a summary of the community's feedback to the Change Commission, which will review the boundaries and advise the Local Government Minister. Ultimately, it is the State Government's decision.
- **Has the Local Government Minister made up his mind as to his preferred model?** No. Council understands that the State Government has not decided on a model – the results of the survey will guide the final submission from council to the state and the eventual outcome.

- **Does Ipswich have to have a mayor and councillors?** Yes. Ipswich will definitely go to an election in March 2020 for new councillors and a mayor – there is a legal requirement under the Local Government Act for elected representation.
- **Does this review consider external divisional boundaries?** No. This survey is about how you will be represented within the local government area of Ipswich – internal divisional boundaries, not external boundaries.
- **What is the role of a councillor?** As per page six of the Divisional Boundary Review Background Paper, "The primary role of councillors is to focus on policy development and ensure the strategic delivery of services in the public interest. Councillors are responsible for planning for the future and developing corporate plans and strategies to achieve their goals and deliver outcomes to the whole of the community, and monitoring the performance of the council against these. Councillors are not responsible for overseeing the internal day-to-day work done by local government employees. This is managed by the chief executive officer and senior staff."
- **Do councillors have to work full-time hours, and does council decide how much they are paid?** Councillors do not have set hours under the Act and need to work for the hours necessary to fulfil their role. The maximum pay rates are set by the Local Government Remuneration and Discipline Tribunal, not council.
- **Will there be increased governance for incoming councillors?** Yes. Mr Chemello, the Interim Management Committee and senior council staff are currently working on 18 business transformation projects which will set council up for the future, covering everything from risk management and procurement through to dealing with fraud and corruption and preparing council for the return of elected representatives.

Mr Chemello is pleased with the quality of the ongoing feedback.

"We are incredibly grateful to the community for their views and comments – so many residents have taken the time to share their thoughts, not just fill in the survey. We encourage all local residents to have a say before the end of March and help to shape your council," he said.

**Some of the most recent comments from the community noted in the anonymous survey included:**

*"Need a person to represent us or otherwise interests of only a few suburbs will be prioritised. Need a person to take responsibility for local suburb issues."*

*"An undivided model would make it near impossible for individuals to run. The sheer size of the council area and the number of booths would mean it is better and more efficient to run as teams. If you have one of the divided models then it is easier for independents. Having said that, I think the fewer divisions might mean the multiple councillors per division are keeping each other accountable and hopefully make it difficult for "fiefdoms", as happened previously."*

*"There should be fewer councillors, eight plus the mayor, but they should remain full-time. If there are to be multi-member divisions, proportional representation should be used as the system of voting."*

*"I would prefer the council of 2020 to consist of one mayor and 10 councillors as the 2016 was composed. In other words, council to continue as before. Thank you for allowing me to express my views."*

*"We need to make sure that our incoming councillors are held accountable for their actions, I really hope that by having shared responsibility areas that even if someone starts to stray other councillors will be able to remind them of their obligations and pull them back into line."*

# Divisional Boundary Review: Frequently asked questions



Ipswich City Council's decision to seek feedback from residents on the new divisional boundaries for the March 2020 local government elections and beyond has certainly piqued interest in the community.

There have been plenty of questions already since Interim Administrator Greg Chemello launched the discussion paper last Friday outlining the three options under consideration. They are:

1. Undivided
2. Divided – 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions)
3. Divided – 2 or 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)

"This is a time to openly consider and debate how you would like to be represented by your future Ipswich Council in 2020 and beyond," Mr Chemello said.

"Would you prefer your councillors to be elected on a divisional basis or across the entirety of the local government area?" the discussion paper asks.

Council has prepared a list of Frequently Asked Questions to hopefully make it simpler for residents over the month of March, when they are asked to share with us how they would like to "shape your council" going forward.

Some of the 40 FAQs include:

**Question:** How do I share my views with the Interim Administrator directly?

**Answer:** The best way to get in touch with the Administrator is via [shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au).

**Question:** Do these proposed models affect anything else i.e. school catchment zones or state/federal electorates?

**Answer:** No. These are state and federal issues and are not impacted by local government area divisional boundaries.

**Question:** Is the data in this report based on electoral data (voters) or population data?

**Answer:** Electoral data has been used as the basis of this report as the Act requires consideration around the number of enrolled voters in a local government area.

**Question:** What criteria is taken into consideration when reviewing divisional boundaries?

**Answer:** For an overview of the principles noted in the Act that guide divisional boundary restructure, as well as additional principles relevant to the City of Ipswich, please see Section 4 of the background document ([www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil)).

[shapeyourcouncil](http://www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil)).

**Question:** If divided is the chosen model, will they remain numerical (ie divisions one to 10) or will they be 'named'?

**Answer:** This has not been considered at this stage.

**Question:** Do we need to have councillors at all?

**Answer:** Yes. In representative democracies like Australia, citizens entrust the decisions about how they are governed to elected representatives. It is your democratic right to have elected representation. It is also the law. In March 2020, a new group of councillors (and a mayor) will be elected for the City of Ipswich.

**Question:** Can former councillors run again in March 2020 under all three models?

**Answer:** Yes, former councillors are eligible to run for council in March 2020, in accordance with the Dissolution of Ipswich City Council Bill 2018. Any person may nominate as a candidate to be councillor only if the person is qualified to be a councillor under the requirements as set out in Section 152 of the Local Government Act 2009.

**Question:** When do the new boundaries come into effect?

**Answer:** This depends on the state determining that new boundaries are needed. If a decision is made by the state government, it will come into effect from election day March 2020.

For the full list of Frequently Asked Questions on the Divisional Boundary Review click [here](#).

The full report can be found here:  
[www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil)

#### Public Information Session

A public information session will be held later this month. The session will feature three guest speakers from relevant local government areas who will be presenting on the three models and will be available to answer your questions.

**Date:** Monday, 25 March

**Time:** 6:00 pm

**Location:** [North Ipswich Reserve Corporate Centre](#)  
2B Pine Street, North Ipswich

For more information or to request a hard copy of the survey please email: [shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au) or call (07) 3810 6666.

# Community discusses divisional boundaries options



Divided or undivided? Single or multi councillor divisions?

The dilemma remains after a community consultation session hosted by Ipswich City Council last night to discuss three options relating to divisional boundaries ahead of the 2020 March local government elections.

About 160 people – including five of the 10 councillors sacked last year, two state MPs, former and future candidates, plus interested residents – packed the North Ipswich Reserve Corporate Centre for the near two-hour forum chaired by Interim Administrator Greg Chemello.

Four expert speakers brought a wealth of experience to the table, not only from local government, but from working within the various models across their own councils.

The speakers were Toowoomba Regional Council Mayor Paul Antonio, Lockyer Valley Regional Council Mayor Tanya Milligan, Shoalhaven City Council (NSW) Mayor Amanda Findley and new Ipswich City Council CEO David Farmer.

Ipswich residents will be able to vote for councillors again at elections in exactly one year. There are three broad models of electing councillors as community representatives up for consideration (each model will result in a minimum of eight and maximum of 12 councillors being elected):

1. Undivided – (no divisions)
2. Divided – 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions)
3. Divided – 2 or 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)

Mr Chemello started proceedings by reassuring the audience that he and council had not made up their mind over the preferred model to be recommended to the Local Government Minister after the consultation period ended this month and he was almost certain the State Government was still undecided.

He confirmed [more than 650 public submissions](#) had so far been received from Ipswich residents.

"There are three strong options that are getting some serious attention from the community ... the state ultimately will make the decision, however they will seek our advice," he said.

*The panel: Ipswich City Council CEO David Farmer, Shoalhaven Mayor Amanda Findley, Lockyer Valley Mayor Tanya Milligan and Toowoomba Mayor Paul Antonio.*

## Undivided model works 'well' for Toowoomba

Cr Antonio said the undivided model – with the first 10 candidates past the post elected – worked well for Toowoomba. Only 31 candidates stood for those spots at the last election.

"One vote, one value, with equal weighting. The 10 councillors are equally responsible to every ratepayer," he said.

Cr Antonio said the system was not perfect as some residents and smaller communities felt disenfranchised.

He said name recognition of candidates was very important with the undivided model and, answering a question from the event's MC, well known journalist Madonna King, he agreed it was possible 10 people from the same street in the same suburb could get elected.

Cr Milligan said she had experience with divided and undivided councils, with the latter working well for Lockyer, which had six councillors. She said in a divided council with single representation, councillors could lose sight of the "bigger picture" and get bogged down with local issues rather than working for the good of the entire region.

During the public Q&A, she recommended option 3 for Ipswich, a divided council with 2 or 3 councillors in each division. She also said she was against quotas (ensuring more female councillors) and thought it was best to "give the job to the right person".

[Have your say: Take the Divisional Boundary Review survey](#)

Cr Findley presented the unique-to-NSW/VIC model of multi-representative, with 12 councillors – four councillors representing each of the three wards – and her as an "unpopular" mayor, where they were all part-time. She received a stipend of \$45,000 a year as mayor, with the councillors getting a \$20,000 annual stipend.

She said it was the best system for a coastal city which stretched 130kms from north to south.

"I love our system because it gives the best value representation to those people who live in the far-flung corners of our electorate," she said.

# APPENDIX C: HARD COPY SURVEY

## Divisional Boundary Review Survey March 2019



### This is your opportunity to help shape your future council!

As the various communities around Ipswich grow and change, it could be expected that locals will also have differing views on what they want from their council compared to when the city was first established some 160 years ago.

There is no better time than this period of interim administration for you, a resident of Ipswich, to openly consider and debate how you would like to be represented by your future council in 2020 and beyond.

Would you prefer your councillors to be elected on a divisional basis or across the entirety of the local government area?

With no councillors in place and no predetermined view by the current council administration, the Ipswich community can have a transparent discussion on what you think is the best way to answer this question.

As part of a broader community consultation throughout the period of March, we are seeking your views and preferences via the following short survey. The results of this engagement will be summarised and presented in a report prepared by council, and delivered to the state government for consideration (who will make the final decision on the divisional model to be used).

The survey is anonymous, and you will not be personally identifiable in any reports that come out of this community consultation. If you have additional questions please contact [shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au) or read the discussion paper and background document to be found at [ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil)

<b>1. What suburb do you live in?</b> <i>(please complete)</i>		
<b>2. How old are you?</b> <i>(please select one of the below)</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> 18-19	<input type="checkbox"/> 30-49	<input type="checkbox"/> 65-74
<input type="checkbox"/> 20-29	<input type="checkbox"/> 50-64	<input type="checkbox"/> 75+
<b>3. What is your gender?</b> <i>(please select one of the below)</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Female	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender variant / non-conforming
<input type="checkbox"/> Male	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say	
<b>4. What is your cultural background?</b> <i>(please select one of the below that most applies to you)</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Australian	<input type="checkbox"/> English	<input type="checkbox"/> Samoan
<input type="checkbox"/> Aboriginal	<input type="checkbox"/> Fijian	<input type="checkbox"/> Scottish
<input type="checkbox"/> Torres Strait Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Filipino	<input type="checkbox"/> South African
<input type="checkbox"/> Both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> German	<input type="checkbox"/> Sudanese
<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/> Indian	<input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese
<input type="checkbox"/> Dutch	<input type="checkbox"/> New Zealander	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
		_____

Please turn over to complete the survey >



There are three broad models of electing councillors as community representatives (each model will result in a minimum of 8 and maximum of 12 councillors being elected). The possible advantages and disadvantages of each of these models are considered in a community discussion paper and a comprehensive background document – [ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil](http://ipswich.qld.gov.au/shapeyourcouncil). Please read the background and justification for each of these models to help you answer the following question.

**5. Of these three models, please indicate your preference**

(1 = Most preferred option, 3 = least preferred option).

<input type="checkbox"/>	Undivided
<input type="checkbox"/>	Divided – 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Divided – 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)

**6. Do you have other views that you feel the state government should consider when selecting a divisional model?**

*Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey.*

**Please return your completed survey:**

**In person**

Ipswich City Council  
Customer Service Centre  
143 Brisbane Street  
IPSWICH  
(top of the Ipswich City Mall)

**Post to**

Ipswich City Council  
PO Box 191  
IPSWICH QLD 4305

**Email**


[council@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:council@ipswich.qld.gov.au)

# APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SUMMARY


## Divisional Boundaries Survey Responses

### Profile of Respondents

#### Age of Respondents




#### Gender of Respondents<sup>1</sup>



<sup>1</sup> Note: ABS data does not include transgender or gender variant/non-conforming

## Cultural Background of Respondents<sup>2</sup>



<sup>2</sup> Note: For the purpose of analysis, survey responses for 'cultural background most identified with' have been compared here with two ABS Census data sets: 'country of birth' and 'Indigenous status'.


### Suburb of Respondents

Brassall	6.29%	66
Rosewood	4.77%	50
Raceview	4.48%	47
Redbank Plains	3.91%	41
Ipswich	3.62%	38
Karalee	3.43%	36
Eastern Heights	3.34%	35
Flinders View	3.34%	35
Yamanto	3.05%	32
Silkstone	2.76%	29
Collingwood Park	2.67%	28
North Ipswich	2.48%	26
Springfield	2.48%	26
Booval	2.38%	25
Bundamba	2.38%	25
Springfield Lakes	2.29%	24
East Ipswich	2.19%	23
Coalfalls	2.00%	21
Walloon	2.00%	21
Bellbird Park	1.81%	19
Camira	1.81%	19
Augustine Heights	1.72%	18
Ripley	1.72%	18
Sadliers Crossing	1.72%	18
Woodend	1.72%	18
Chuwar	1.53%	16
Goodna	1.53%	16
Pine Mountain	1.43%	15
Ebenezer	1.33%	14
Grandchester	1.33%	14
Willowbank	1.33%	14
Deebling Heights	1.24%	13
Leichhardt	1.14%	12
Thagoona	1.05%	11
Riverview	1.05%	11
Newtown	1.05%	11
Barellan Point	0.95%	10
Churchill	0.86%	9
South Ripley	0.86%	9
Tivoli	0.86%	9
Wulkuraka	0.76%	8
Redbank	0.76%	8

One Mile	0.76%	8
Marburg	0.76%	8
Brookwater	0.67%	7
Tallegalla	0.67%	7
Haigslea	0.57%	6
Mount Forbes	0.48%	5
Basin Pocket	0.38%	4
Muirlea	0.38%	4
West Ipswich	0.38%	4
Ironbark	0.29%	3
Mount Mort	0.29%	3
Purga	0.29%	3
Dinmore	0.19%	2
Karrabin	0.19%	2
Lanefield	0.19%	2
Moores Pocket	0.19%	2
Mount Marrow	0.19%	2
North Booval	0.19%	2
The Bluff	0.19%	2
Amberley	0.10%	1
Calvert	0.10%	1
Ebbw Vale	0.10%	1
Goolman	0.10%	1
Lower Mount Walker	0.10%	1
Mount Walker West	0.10%	1
Springfield Central	0.10%	1
Other	2.67%	28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,049</b>

68 of 82 suburbs across Ipswich (82.92%) are represented, with strong representation between urban areas, rural areas, and newer developments.

## APPENDIX E: OVERVIEW OF SURVEY RESPONSE TRENDS



# APPENDIX F: QUALITATIVE RESEARCH REPORT



## Ipswich City Council

2019 Divisional Boundary Review Survey  
Prepared by Ipsos  
Friday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2018

© 2018 Ipsos. All rights reserved. Contains Ipsos' Confidential and Proprietary information and may not be disclosed or reproduced without the prior written consent of Ipsos.



# Contents

Key Insights	i
Commenting survey sample	ii
Survey engagement	iii
Key survey take outs	iv
Introduction	1
Sample Structure	2
Councillors	4
Democratic processes	6
Geographic and Socio-economic diversity	8
Party politics	10
Other	12
Written submissions	14
Appendix - tables	16

## Key Insights

There were 1049 respondents who completed the survey (online and paper). While this is a large sample it may not be representative of Ipswich residents due to the self selecting sampling method. All 1049 provided their preference by ranking the three proposed models.

There were 450 (43%) people who provided their views on what government should consider when selecting a divisional model. Overall the total sample ranked the Divided – 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions) with one councillor as their first preference (43% total sample, 44% commented) and Divided – 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions) as their second preference (57% total sample, 60% commented) and ranked an undivided model as their third preference (54% total sample, 53% commented).

The 450 respondents who commented did not vary significantly to the total sample and were highly engaged making reasonable effort to articulate their responses. All comments were manually assigned to 748 response codes. Four themes emerged from the comments, and some respondents may have mentioned more than one response code or more than one theme in their survey.

Twenty-four written submissions were also accepted by Council via email and analysed separately to the survey.

### Councillors

There was a very mixed discussion of both the quantity but also calibre of the candidates to stand for Councillor (n=203). Respondents who commented about the councillors character, skills, quality of contribution and location as important aspects regardless of the model. There was a mix of views about which model this group preferred. Their main points were around ensuring that Councillors could do the job and represent their interests, as a local member.

### Democratic Process

A number of respondents raised concerns around the democratic process and the way in which any changes to the divisional boundaries should be made (n=140). Participants commented about the process of changing the divisions. There were some who felt that changing the current divisional structure should only be done by a vote, enabling a democratic process for change. There was also negative sentiment towards the rationale for changing. They don't see the current model as the cause of issues but rather the Councillors as individuals. This group were more in favour of one Councillor per division.

### Geographic / Socio-Economic Diversity

The changes proposed initiated discussion around the need for local representation across the Ipswich region due to the geographic and socio-economic diversity that exists in the electorate (n=74). Respondents felt that the geographic characteristics such as urban, rural and small town differences as well as large distances across the Ipswich City Council meant that there were many different needs of the constituents. This meant that if there were no divisions, some areas would not have their interests represented or be forgotten. There was also a sense of the "grass is greener" with lots of comments about other areas getting more attention, resources or funding. There were comments around the more affluent or newer development areas like Springfield and Ripley having more of Council's focus. There were also comments about different areas having different cultural backgrounds and needing their diversity represented.

### Party Politics

A small number raised concerns around the democratic process and the affiliation of Councillors with political parties (n=43). Respondents also commented on the desire to have independent Councillors and to keep party politics to state and federal government. Councillors also should be transparent and declare their affiliations.

### Other


There were also a number of random comments, statements that they preferred not to comment or topics not of interest to this survey (n=172).

Total sample 1049; base n = 450 who commented



# Commenting Survey Sample

Of 1049 survey respondents 450 made a comment



From **64** suburbs

From **8** cultural backgrounds


\* 'Gender other' includes: Transgender, Gender variant / non-conforming, non-disclosed.

## Three models were ranked by preference

**44%** ranked the Divided – 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions) with one councillor as their first preference

**60%** ranked the Divided – 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions) as their second preference

**53%** ranked an undivided model as their third preference




Total sample 1049; Unweighted; base n = 450 who commented



■ Divided 1  
■ Divided 2  
■ Undivided  
 Total sample 1049; Unweighted; base n = 150

# Key Survey Take Outs

## Councillors




### Mixed responses on 1<sup>st</sup> Preference

**91%** either 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> preference  
 For Divided – 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)

“Do not allow the previous Councillors to stand for re-election”  
 “Fewer Councillors and greater accountability, such as could be achieved by having fewer but larger divisions each with groups of Councillors providing checks and balances to the group.”

## Democratic Process




**62%** ranked a divided – 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions) model as 1<sup>st</sup> preference

**90%** either 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> preference  
 For Divided – 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)

“Leave it the way it was. Without the corruption.”  
 “This should be taken to a vote of all the people not some silly Online Survey.”  
 “They should never of removed my democratic right without consultation with the people.”

## Geographic / Socio-Economic Diversity




**61%** ranked a divided – 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions) model as 1<sup>st</sup> preference

**92%** either 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> preference  
 For Divided – 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)

“...representation of specific communities is not lost given the diversity of Ipswich.”  
 “The previous model ...enabled a LOCAL and knowledgeable Councillor to not only represent us, but be readily accessible in person and also be involved in the community areas.”

## Party Politics




**65%** ranked a divided – 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions) model as 1<sup>st</sup> preference

**98%** either 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> preference  
 For Divided – 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)

“Local Government should be free of party politics.”  
 “Keep State Politics out of Local Government.”  
 “Local councils will suffer if party politics is allowed to enter into the equation.”

## Other responses



### Mixed responses on 1<sup>st</sup> Preference

**88%** either 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> preference  
 For Divided – 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)

“What feedback from other Councils e.g. Noosa has been gathered to demonstrate local satisfaction of the model adopted there?”

# INTRODUCTION



# Introduction

## Research Background

Ipswich City Council is currently undertaking community consultation regarding the review of divisional boundaries in the Ipswich LGA. An online survey was distributed as a part of this consultation, closing on Sunday 31 March. Ipsos has been engaged to analyse the results and provide insights to meet the research objectives.

## Research Objectives

The research objectives were to:

- Discern what divisional model is preferred by the community with the additional understanding of second and third preferences.
- Identify community sentiment on the issue.
- Understand why residents selected their preferred model through their commentary on what government should consider when selecting a divisional model.

## Survey Methodology

The following three models were proposed for consideration through council's month-long community consultation program, with each model resulting in between eight and 12 councillors being elected:

- Option 1: Undivided (8 to 12 councillors)
- Option 2: Divided – 1 councillor per division (8 to 12 divisions)
- Option 3: Divided – 2 to 3 councillors per division (4 to 6 divisions)

To facilitate this engagement and ensure the collective views of the local Ipswich community could be communicated to the state government, a simple online survey was created that asked respondents to rank these options from 1 to 3 (1 being most preferred, 3 being least preferred). Space was also allocated for additional feedback.

Hard copies of the survey were also available at all nine community offices, as well as at council's central administration building and all Ipswich libraries. Residents could also call or email council to ask for a hard copy (with a replied paid envelope) to be posted to their home.

The local community was also invited to share submissions via a special email address ([shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au)) for inclusion in this final report.

# Sample Structure

Survey sample by gender, age, cultural background and suburb can be seen below.

Age	%	n
18 or 19	0%	5
20 to 29	8%	88
30 to 49	35%	372
65 to 74	18%	194
50 to 64	30%	316
75+	7%	74
Total sample; Unweighted; base n = 1049		

	%	n
Male	46%	486
Female	51%	535
Gender Variant / non-conforming	0%	2
Transgender	0%	1
Prefer not to say	2%	25
Total sample; Unweighted; base n = 1049		

	%	n
Aboriginal	1%	11
Australian	87%	908
Both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander	0%	4
Dutch	1%	7
English	6%	58
Filipino	0%	1
German	0%	2
Indian	0%	2
New Zealander	2%	19
Scottish	1%	8
South African	1%	6
Vietnamese	0%	1
Other (please specify)	2%	22
Total sample; Unweighted; base n = 1049		

Amberley	1
Augustine Heights	18
Barellan Point	10
Basin Pocket	4
Bellbird Park	19
Booval	25
Brassall	66
Brookwater	7
Bundamba	25
Calvert	1
Camira	19
Churchill	9
Chuwar	16
Coalfalls	21
Collingwood Park	28
Deebing Heights	13
Dinmore	2
East Ipswich	23
Eastern Heights	35
Ebbw Vale	1
Ebenezer	14
Flinders View	35
Goodna	16
Goolman	1
Grandchester	14
Haigslea	6
Ipswich	38
Ironbark	3
Karalee	36
Karrabin	2
Lanefield	2
Leichhardt	12
Lower Mount Walker	1
Marburg	8
Moore's Pocket	2
Mount Forbes	5
Mount Marrow	2
Mount Mort	3
Mount Walker West	1
Muirlea	4
Newtown	11
North Booval	2
North Ipswich	26
One Mile	8
Other	28
Pine Mountain	15
Purga	3
Raceview	47
Redbank	8
Redbank Plains	41
Ripley	18
Riverview	11
Rosewood	50
Sadliers Crossing	18
Silkstone	29
South Ripley	9
Springfield	26
Springfield Central	1
Springfield Lakes	24
Tallegalla	7
Thagoona	11
The Bluff	2
Tivoli	9
Walloon	21
West Ipswich	4
Willowbank	14
Woodend	18
Wulkuraka	8
Yamanto	32
Grand Total	1049

# COUNCILLORS



## Survey sample

# Councillors represent us

Respondents who commented about the Councillors character, skills, quality of contribution and location as important aspects regardless of the model. There was a mix of views about which model this group preferred. Their main points were around ensuring that Councillors could do the job and represent their interests, as a local member.

RESPONSE CODES	%
Every division should have a councillor / be represented	31%
Local issues need a councillor to turn to who lives there / need a direct contact with who represents you	17%
Multiple councillors per division	15%
Have too many / need less councillors	13%
Part time might get better calibre capability / people who have other interests but care about the city	11%
Need proportional representation in an undivided council / prefer undivided / Administrator	10%
Former councillors should be barred from running again	9%
Limited terms	9%
Undivided city could result in all the councillors living in just one suburb/ not living in suburb representing	4%
Councillors should be full-time	1%
Total sample; Unweighted; base n = from 450 to 1049; total n = 203	

“Irrespective of model selected processes to ensure transparency and governance need to be implemented so that the changes recently effected have a chance to become embedded and the culture improved.”

“Councillors need to be community based and accountable, not some elite board member type just overiewing non elected staff decisions.”

“Fixed terms, part-time, people with a strategic background who aren’t obsessed with getting votes over the good of the city!”

“I genuinely believe that the person who represents us should reside within the area they represent. It's very important to understand the issues unique to each division.”

“It is important that future Councillors have the background, intellect and capacity to immerse themselves in strategic decision making of a high order. It is a waste to have elected representatives obsessing about shopping trolleys, local parking issues and local issues....The problems at Ipswich can partly be held at the foot of Councillors who were unable to properly consider strategic issues and did not fully understand the role of local government.”

“Make it mandatory that anyone running and elected to Council holds an area of expertise related to government AND a professional or cultural discipline experience.”

“Councillors are public servants and they should be fully accountable in all affairs relating to the Council. They should declare truthfully their assets and their potential conflicts of interest. As public servants a code of conduct should be adhered to.”





# DEMOCRATIC PROCESS



## Survey sample

# Democratic process for change

Respondents who commented about the process of changing the divisions. There were some who felt that changing the current divisional structure should only be done by a vote enabling a democratic process for change. There was also negative sentiment towards the rationale for changing, in that they don't see the current model as the cause of issues but rather the Councillors as individuals. This group were more in favour of one Councillor per division.

RESPONSE CODES	%
Should be handled in democratic manner / put to vote by residents	26%
Don't like undivided / mistake	25%
Need strong checks and balances / detect corruption	22%
Build a strong governance and integrity culture	21%
Happy with the old system / don't want to change	20%
Don't like being told / decisions by an administrator	11%
Problem was with the corrupt Councillors not the model / fix the Councillors not change the model	8%
Decisions should not be made by change commission	2%
Total sample; Unweighted; base n = from 450 to 1049; total n = 140	

“I do not feel this survey/decisions has been handled in a democratic manner, e.g. Change Commission rather than a vote by residents.”

“Need to communicate better with community. Was not aware of this survey till today.”

“A decision by the change commission doesn't appear to be very democratic. This decisions needs to be put to the rate-payers.”

“Leave it the way it was. Without the corruption”

“Give us the old council back again and stop being a dictator. We elected the old council. There were problems but mostly caused by outside political influences.”

“Keep it the way it was before - it worked well. A few bad eggs didn't make the whole basket rotten.”



# GEOGRAPHIC AND SOCIO- ECONOMIC DIVERSITY



## Survey sample

# Diversity needs to be represented

Respondents felt that the geographic characteristics such as urban, rural and small town differences as well as large distances across the Ipswich City Council meant that there were many different needs of the constituents. This meant that if there were no divisions some areas would not have their interests represented or be forgotten. There was also a sense of the “grass is greener” with lots of comments about other areas getting more attention, resources or funding. There were comments around the more affluent or newer development areas like Springfield and Ripley having more of Council’s focus. There was also comments about different areas having different cultural backgrounds and needing their diversity represented.

RESPONSE CODES	%
Rural areas have different needs and should be represented (country areas are forgotten)	35%
Change boundaries (Division 10 out / Springfield should be Brisbane etc)	31%
Perception that rate payer money disproportionately spent on newer development areas (Springfield, Ripley) or Division 10 bigger than 2 ect	28%
Too culturally diverse for undivided	16%
Too bid an area for undivided	14%
Differences in newer development areas (Springfield, Ripley) needs of other areas overlooked if Councillors not living in that area	1%
Total sample; Unweighted; base n = from 450 to 1049; total n = 74	

“An undivided council without divisions can easily turn into a situation whereby entire suburbs are without representation which is an appalling”

“Ipswich is too geographically and culturally diverse to be effectively governed by any other model than one Councillor per division.”

“I feel the country regions of Ipswich City Council are the forgotten. We lack the road maintenance and barley use the parkland facilities due to the drive. Either more focus and money should be spent on our area or cut our rates. Sick of footing Springfield and the greater city areas. Start looking out for your country regions.”

“An undivided city could result in all the Councillors living in just one suburb.”

“An undivided council won’t build true representation of a diverse community.”

“Everyone in Ipswich knows where Springfield is because that's where the bulk of our rates are spent. Two thirds of Ipswich people wouldn't know where Haigslea is.”

“I prefer a Councillor that knows my division. I don't believe that a Councillor will have an intimate knowledge of the whole city area. People in Booval aren't that interested in what is happening in Springfield.”

“Rural and urban issues require different local knowledge and awareness.”

“I want someone I can ring and knows the area I live and one who will take responsibility for that area this was working well until being changed by the government.”

“At the heart of local government should be local representation. The 1 Councillor per division allows for this best.”

“Living in a rural community requires the personal representation of one of our local residents to participate in local issues and then represent our views, interests and needs to the broader council.”



# PARTY POLITICS



## Survey sample

# Keep party politics out of Council

Respondents also commented on the desire to have independent Councillors and to keep party politics to state and federal government. Councillors also should be transparent and declare their affiliations.

RESPONSE CODES	%
Keep party politics out of local council	91%
Restore independent council	9%
Corporate property owners should also have some mechanism to vote (as large taxpayers and owners don't live in Ipswich)	2%
More transparency needed for independent candidates who support political parties (name affiliations etc)	5%
Total sample; Unweighted; base n = from 450 to 1049; total n = 74	



“Keep party politics out of local council/government.”

“Party politics has no place in local government.”

“I feel representation at a council level should be free from politics i.e. no Labour or Liberal councils. Some good people put their hands up to make the community better and they should be unhindered by politics.”

“Completely not aligned with any political party.”

“Councillors should be independent and non party aligned.”

“Need Councillors whom you can talk to as a neighbour. No party politics for local govt.”



“KEEP PARTY POLITICS OUT OF IPSWICH AND RESTORE OUR INDEPENDENT COUNCIL.”



# OTHER



## Survey sample

### Other comments

"I am grateful that each citizen has the opportunity to have their opinion heard and I trust that the state government will respect the views of the majority of citizens in our community on this issue, whether or not that majority view aligns with my personal preference. Thank you for finally hearing our voices! Please make the results of this survey public once it closes. We have a right to know how our community responded."

"Results of this survey should be published (including comments) with time allowed for consideration by the public."

"In my opinion, the CEO of Local Government should be reporting to a Permanent Secretary of the Local Government Ministry/Department who then reports to the Minister of Local Government."

"This will only work if Councillors have less power on over through decisions made by experienced officers of Council and are more accountable for their actions. Fewer Councillors would be better."

"Think about the people of Ipswich."

"That they can't approve development, without fixing up the roads."

"The council (as an organisation) is dysfunctional. The election should be delayed for four years."

"Transparency with the results of this survey. After the decision is made, public information sessions to explain how the model will work and the voting process. Maximise community knowledge and understanding of the electoral process."

"Complete overhaul of the Environmental Protection Act and the Planning Act so as to allow adequate environmental assessment, authorisation/permitting and enforcement e.g. complete failure of the "task force" re odour from Swanbank to achieve any improvement."



# Written Submissions



## Email Written Submissions

The local community was invited to share submissions via a special email address ([shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au](mailto:shapeyourcouncil@ipswich.qld.gov.au)) for inclusion in this final report.

These submissions (n=24) focussed on the role of the councillors with a strong emphasis on local issues needing a local councillor who lives in the area and is accessible to the residents. Most of those who did comment on process were happy with the old system and did not want it to change. There was also a proportionally large amount of what has been categorised as “other” comments which are topics not of interest to this survey (n=10).

RESPONSE THEMES	%
Councillors	88%
Democratic Process	42%
Other	42%
Geographic & Socio-Economic Divides	29%
Party Politics	13%
Total sample; Unweighted; total n = 24	

“It is better to have separate Divisions because the members know that those that are elected KNOW the Division and what is happening in that area.”

“I believe that we should have divisions with a Councillor for each division. With a divisional Councillor all parts of Ipswich City Council area would equally represented. A Councillor would ensure that his or her division would receive adequate funding from Council’s budget.”

“Whatever you decide to do please fix the walk connecting from mall to Riverlink. The state of the transition area is a disgrace and you should all be ashamed.”

“Keep party politics out of local council/government.”

“To ensure the best planning for the entire council area, and proper scrutiny of decisions, we need proportional representation in an undivided Council elected by the quota preferential system.”

“HANDS OFF!!!”

“This system [undivided] over time would lead to party policy in local council which is not in the best interests of councils and a concept I disagree with.”



# APPENDIX - TABLES



## Survey response codes by 1<sup>st</sup> preference

Response codes Column %	Divided 1	Divided 2	Undivided
	1st preference	1st preference	1st preference
Every division should have a Councillor / be represented	23%	9%	4%
Should be handled in democratic manner / put to vote by residents	14%	3%	4%
Happy with the old system / don't want to change	14%	0%	1%
Don't like undivided / mistake	14%	6%	0%
Keep party politics out of local council	13%	7%	3%
Local issues need a Councillor to turn to who lives there / need a direct contact with who represents you	13%	6%	2%
Rural areas have different needs and should be represented (country areas are forgotten)	9%	3%	3%
Don't like being told / decisions by an administrator	8%	0%	1%
Perception that rate payer money disproportionately spent on newer development areas (Springfield, Ripley) or Div 10 bigger than 2 ect	6%	5%	2%
Problem was with the corrupt Councillors not the model / fix the Councillors not change the model	5%	1%	0%
Need strong checks and balances / detect corruption	5%	5%	12%
Too culturally diverse for undivided	5%	2%	0%
Too bid an area for undivided	4%	2%	0%
Change boundaries (Div 10 out / Springfield should be Brisbane etc)	4%	8%	4%
Undivided city could result in all the Councillors living in just one suburb/ not living in suburb representing	4%	0%	2%
Former Councillors should be barred from running again	3%	6%	5%
Part time might get better calibre capability / people who have other interests but care about the city	3%	5%	8%
Build a strong governance and integrity culture	2%	10%	10%
Have too many / need less Councillors	2%	8%	11%
Decisions should not be made by change commission	1%	0%	1%
Councillors should be full-time	1%	1%	0%
Multiple Councillors per division	1%	19%	2%
Limited terms	1%	6%	7%
Restore independent council	1%	2%	0%
Corporate property owners should also have some mechanism to vote (as large taxpayers and owners don't live in Ipswich)	1%	0%	0%
Differences in newer development areas (Springfield, Ripley) needs of other areas overlooked if Councillors not living in that area	1%	0%	0%
Need proportional representation in an undivided council / prefer undivided / Administrator	0%	2%	16%
More transparency needed for independent candidates who support political parties (name affiliations etc)	0%	2%	0%
Other	23%	39%	44%
Don't know	0%	0%	0%
Refused	7%	5%	2%
NETT POLITICS	14%	8%	3%
NETT GEOGRAPHIC / SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIVERSITY	23%	15%	7%
NETT OTHER	29%	44%	46%
NETT COUNCILLORS	38%	52%	50%
NETT PROCESS	44%	21%	21%
Column n	197	131	122
Total sample; Unweighted; base n = from 450 to 1049; total n = 1049; 599 missing			

# Survey response codes by demographic

Responses Column %	Male						Female					Other / prefer not to say						
	Age						Age					Age						
	18 or 19	20 to 29	30 to 49	50 to 64	65 to 74	75+	18 or 19	20 to 29	30 to 49	50 to 64	65 to 74	75+	18 or 19	20 to 29	30 to 49	50 to 64	65 to 74	75+
Every division should have a Councillor / be represented	0%	8%	6%	10%	6%	10%	0%	6%	1%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	33%	0%
Should be handled in democratic manner / put to vote by residents	0%	0%	10%	6%	15%	5%	17%	6%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	33%	0%
Happy with the old system / don't want to change	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Don't like undivided / mistake	0%	8%	7%	12%	8%	5%	0%	6%	7%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Keep party politics out of local council	0%	0%	0%	3%	6%	5%	17%	5%	1%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%
Local issues need a Councillor to turn to who lives there / need a direct contact with who represents you	0%	15%	3%	4%	8%	0%	0%	9%	10%	8%	8%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%
Rural areas have different needs and should be represented (country areas are forgotten)	0%	8%	3%	7%	6%	0%	33%	6%	10%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Don't like being told / decisions by an administrator	0%	0%	4%	3%	3%	0%	0%	4%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Perception that rate payer money disproportionately spent on newer development areas (Springfield, Ripley) or Div 10 bigger than 2 ect	0%	8%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Problem was with the corrupt Councillors not the model / fix the Councillors not change the model	0%	23%	13%	15%	16%	10%	0%	11%	19%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%
Need strong checks and balances / detect corruption	0%	0%	0%	3%	3%	5%	0%	3%	0%	3%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Too culturally diverse for undivided	0%	8%	6%	1%	2%	20%	0%	6%	4%	3%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Too bid an area for undivided	0%	0%	6%	3%	3%	0%	17%	5%	6%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%
Change boundaries (Div 10 out / Springfield should be Brisbane etc)	0%	8%	3%	6%	13%	5%	0%	11%	7%	8%	8%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%
Undivided city could result in all the Councillors living in just one suburb/ not living in suburb representing	0%	0%	7%	4%	8%	0%	0%	5%	6%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Former Councillors should be barred from running again	0%	8%	7%	9%	3%	5%	33%	9%	1%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%
Part time might get better calibre capability / people who have other interests but care about the city	0%	0%	9%	4%	8%	5%	0%	9%	4%	11%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Build a strong governance and integrity culture	0%	0%	3%	4%	5%	0%	0%	6%	4%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	25%	0%	0%
Have too many / need less Councillors	0%	0%	1%	9%	19%	20%	0%	4%	7%	5%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Decisions should not be made by change commission	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Councillors should be full-time	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Multiple Councillors per division	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Limited terms	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Restore independent council	0%	0%	1%	1%	3%	0%	0%	0%	3%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Corporate property owners should also have some mechanism to vote (as large taxpayers and owners don't live in Ipswich)	0%	8%	9%	3%	2%	10%	0%	4%	1%	5%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Differences in newer development areas (Springfield, Ripley) needs of other areas overlooked if Councillors not living in that area	0%	8%	7%	3%	8%	5%	0%	3%	4%	5%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Need proportional representation in an undivided council / prefer undivided / Administrator	0%	8%	3%	9%	6%	5%	0%	10%	4%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
More transparency needed for independent candidates who support political parties (name affiliations etc)	0%	0%	4%	0%	2%	0%	0%	4%	4%	3%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other	33%	11%	21%	17%	23%	18%	0%	10%	14%	17%	12%	9%	0%	0%	0%	22%	67%	100%
Don't know	100%	31%	41%	36%	29%	20%	67%	35%	36%	21%	25%	0%	0%	0%	25%	33%	100%	100%
Refused	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NETT OTHER	100%	38%	46%	39%	34%	35%	67%	36%	40%	32%	25%	0%	0%	0%	50%	67%	100%	100%
NETT PROCESS	0%	23%	26%	37%	37%	20%	50%	28%	34%	37%	8%	0%	0%	40%	0%	67%	0%	0%
NETT COUNCILLORS	0%	54%	46%	43%	48%	45%	50%	51%	46%	34%	25%	0%	0%	60%	50%	0%	0%	0%
NETT POLITICS	0%	0%	1%	9%	23%	20%	0%	5%	7%	5%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
NETT GEOGRAPHIC / SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIVIDES	0%	15%	17%	13%	16%	20%	0%	15%	18%	24%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Column n	1	13	70	67	62	20	0	6	80	67	38	12	0	0	5	4	4	1

Total sample; Unweighted; base n = from 450 to 1049; total n = 1049; 599 missing

## Your Contacts at Ipsos

**Kylie Brosnan**  
Director, Public Affairs

0488 455 505  
Kylie.brosnan@Ipsos.com

**Andrew Ross**  
Director, Brisbane

0402 098 718  
andrew.ross@Ipsos.com



## APPENDIX G: TABLE OF ALL QUALITATIVE COMMENTS

Written submissions to the Ipswich City Council regarding divisional boundaries

Details that identify specific individuals (names, roles, geographic areas) have been removed and replaced with [Removed].

474 Responses

1.	I was very happy with the "old" system. [Removed] did an excellent job.
2.	How Springfield is considered in the same divisional council as Ipswich - I feel it belongs more to Brisbane. I think Springfield and surrounds gets the lions share of money and council works when surroundings receive very little in terms of capital growth and general infrastructure projects. The Rosewood Library for one thing. Also rainfall, I think the Gold and Sunshine Coast and the Boonah region get far more rainfall than our immediate area.
3.	1 - All councillors need to be full-time 2 - A decision by the change commission doesn't appear to be very democratic. This decisions needs to be put to the rate-payers. I will remember that Labor instigated this change, when at Ballot Box.... 3 - Local councils will suffer if party politics is allowed to enter into the equation.
4.	* Keep party politics out of local council/government. * I do not feel this survey/decisions has been handled in a democratic manner, eg Change Commission rather than a vote by residents. * Councillors need to be full-time.
5.	There is a need for Councillors to represent us because an administrator cannot do a proper job.
6.	That [Removed] & [Removed] have nothing to do with it.
7.	Party politics to be kept out of local government.
8.	Ownest vote would be great!
9.	Yes, listen to the people what they want.
10.	Please restore our independent council.
11.	KEEP PARTY POLITICS OUT OF IPSWICH AND RESTORE OUR INDEPENDENT COUNCIL.
12.	Leave the divisions as they are 1-10 Why change something that works. Every division should have their own (REP) Councillor.
13.	At all levels of government, federal, state and local the elected member has a dual role of representing those who selected him in his electorate, and being part of the government. An undivided city could result in all the councillors living in just one suburb. Representation of country towns and landowners would be swamped by the city-centrics. Landowners living in the outer fringes of "Ipswich city" have a whole different set of needs than do residents of Ripley, Springfield or Old Ipswich. What do city folk know or care about invasive weeds, wild dog attacks or post-mining land-use problems. Also keep party politics out of local government.
14.	Need individual divisions.
15.	Undivided - Biggest mistake - *by your Administrator*
16.	The previous model of 10 divisions enabled a LOCAL and knowledgeable Councillor to not only represent us, but be readily accessible in person and also be involved in the community areas he represented. This is a very mixed division which has very different challenges to a suburb based division with much less money having to be utilised across a very broad area with main council not truly understanding the need. I have lived and owned property in other council areas and non-local representation is a disaster.
17.	It is ridiculous to think of having our division which is division 10 undivided. The area it covers is huge. Shouldn't even think of having an undivided model.
18.	Everyone in Ipswich knows where Springfield is because that's where the bulk of our rates are spent. Two thirds of Ipswich people wouldn't know where Hagslea is.
19.	Scrap Div 10 from Ipswich c/c. Ammalumate with Scenic Rim-Somerset & Lokyer Valley councils, give Div 10 councillor back his job, too be payed for by the people who sacked him (state gove qld) for as long as his term was pending for, so other councils can transition into div 10 with him overseeing the transition. Only businesses and ratepayers in council elections with 3x4 year terms maximen.
20.	When dividing divisions make them more evenly if dividing in area size. If by voters then the bigger divisions like the current Divisions 10 should receive at least three times what division 2 receives. Furthermore since the previous Councillors admitted knowing what was going on, I believe not one of them should be allowed to stand again or any of their family members. This will stop any further fraud. Thank you.

- 
21. In order to avoid the problems of the previous council we need proportional representation in an undivided council. The Discussion paper says "Councillors are responsible for planning for the future and developing corporate plans and strategies to achieve their goals and deliver outcomes to the whole community, and monitoring the performance of the council against these". "Deliver outcomes for the whole community". This implies that it would be best to do away with divisions. With divisions, the Councillor is likely to see their role as representing the people in their area, with little attention to integrated planning for the whole council area. "Monitoring the performance of the council against these". This has been the problem with our last council. There was little oversight and all Councillors appeared to be a comfortable group who agreed with each other and with little controversy. This is the result of the divisional system where Councillors basically simply represented the majority of the voters in each division with no input from minority options. Basically, a first past the post system. The Toowoomba situation was no better because it was also a first past the post system without preferential voting. Voters were simply required to mark just 10 Councillors are no more. This means that if voters selected minority candidates, they had no say as to which of the more popular candidates were selected. Both models result in only majority viewpoints, with no input from alternative ideas. The results in a council with little or no oversight and this was what led to the problems with our outgoing council. Unless this is corrected, we will eventually end up with the same problems with our new council. The only way this can be corrected is to have a proportional representation system. In this way, minority viewpoints can be put forward and should result in better informed and considered decisions as well as better oversight. To achieve this, voting should be by the preferential system and voters should be required to number all boxes so that their preferences and desires are fully expressed. Ideally, votes should be counted by the quota preferential system. This gives greater power to second preferences of people giving first preferences to less popular candidates than occurs in the usual bottom up counting system. The result is closer to true proportional representation. Alternatively, the Shoalhaven system, as outlined by their mayor at the meeting, resulted in a diverse council. They had a few large divisions with several Councillors in each. We should ideally have four Councillors in each divisions to ensure proportional representation. Counting in their case was by the quota preference system. Conclusion - To ensure the best planning for the entire council area, and proper scrutiny of decisions, we need proportional representation in an undivided council elected by the quota preferential system.
- 
22. accountability - how will councillors follow up on queries - how is this recorded and how are outcomes measured? what happens if things do not get followed up on? need a feedback loop
- 
23. Councils could be part time.
- 
24. rural areas should not be governed by people from residential ,city areas as outlines from A class does not hold any relevance to requirements to rural needs. also let all residents know by post [you send info out all time in post] not every one has a computer or access to computer, i only found out about this on march 31, doing this the way you have chosen to do is in my opinion this council appears to be more corrupt than ever , having just seen a report of the apparently advertised talk ,your option one was the item pushed by all speakers, which makes it highly biased, also state gov rules state anything that impacts residents directly by council changes etc all residents affected are to be directly notified by post so we the residents can have our say, doing this by internet only is so underhanded i would prepose acking of all council and government staff involved in this fiasco
- 
25. A large proportion of Ipswich council area properties are owned by corporations in the case of commercial properties and by individuals who do not live in Ipswich CC boundaries with housing. These people supply a huge percentage of the council rates, yet have no say whatsoever in how these rates are spent or how their properties are handled by the council. There should be some mechanism in place for property owners who are not residents to have a say. Perhaps say, 5 divisions (half of current) and 2 councillors per division. One of these councillors elected as per present system, and the other by all property owners who actually pay the rates. Corporate property owners should also have some mechanism to vote for the second councillor.
- 
26. Part time councillors may be an option as the priority is the machinery of council not individuals
- 
27. That having had to dissolve the previous council for misconduct and condoning misconduct by inaction : that former councillors should be forever barred from becoming part of a new council.
- 
28. Rural areas need their own representation
- 
29. All candidates should not be able to run for Mayor. It should be a separate vote of individuals not running for a council position. Previous councillors should not be able to run. Maximum 2 terms for any councillors elected.
- 
30. No, but someone may want to inform the survey author that "transgender" is not a gender.
- 
31. Country areas have very different needs from city areas and this needs to be considered
- 
32. Yes we better not have the same incompetence that we had last time. Also, there needs to be some way of monitoring things for the election. For example last time there was a candidate who won who said they were independent yet were supported at the polls by [Removed] Labour members. It was a farce but no-one does anything to stop this.
- 
33. Not related to divisional models but all candidates should be required to name any political affiliation or membership.
- 
34. surely it is preferable to have a representative that lives in his division and therefore is better able to know the issues that need addressing in the interests of his constituents
- 
35. I feel the country regions of Ipswich city council are the forgotten. We lack the road maintenance and barley use the parkland facilities due to the drive. Either more focus and money should be spent on our area or cut our rates. Sick of footing Springfield and the greater city areas. Start looking out for your country regions.
-



- 
36. Physical area should be a greater consideration. Example it is ridiculous that the current division 10 has a greater area than the other nine divisions put together.
- 
37. No
- 
38. Of paramount importance is to have a model where there are strong checks and balances over the election of an open and cooperative group of councillors. Good governance with the absence of corruption would be the ultimatum to assemble a great council.
- 
39. Make another council area e.g. Moreton shire council. I think Ipswich city council area is to big.
- 
40. Ipswich has had a hard time over many years. The council is suffering an inter generational shock that will only be aided by specified contest of capability. A multi member ward model forces all candidates to face off against similar interest and prove to voters they have the capacity to deliver a triple bottom line to the community. With out this in mind the contest will devolve back to self interested and popular contest at the expense of common interest. This model will train candidates and community at once to continue to deliver stronger community engagement and professionalism across many generations of council. Today's decisions should seek to avoid systemic failures that occurred in the past and deliver a self renewing, self sustaining model into the future. we need Ipswich to build a strong governance and integrity culture. Which ever model is adopted please consider this as a primary concern.
- 
41. Making sure areas arent disadvantaged because of post code eg 4306 post code is unfairly disadvantaged because some suburbs in this post code are regional which means those in the post code right next to Ipswich city pay higher cost for delivery etc.
- 
42. If Corruption and/or incompetence is to be avoided then it is necessary for the whole council to make each decision, not sub-committees of like minded people. This may be a longer decision-making process but it is transparent, thus avoiding complicity.
- 
43. We need a divisional Councillor available, when a concern arises, who can deal with local matters. Having two or three in a wider division should allow at least one to be available at any given time.
- 
44. Need councillors whom you can talk to as a neighbour. No party politics for local govt.
- 
45. Results of this survey should be published (including comments) with time allowed for consideration by the public.
- 
46. I believe it is important for constituents to have direct contact with an individual or individuals who will represent them and their own divisional issues while taking a global overview of how those interests align with the overall interests of the city they represent.
- 
47. Party politics should be kept out of local government elections.
- 
48. To stop grandstanding
- 
49. Make Councillors more accountable
- 
50. Teamwork working together by having 2 to 3 councillors per division
- 
51. It is very difficult for a mayor to get elected without the profile and experience from already being in council. But in the current system any councillor who runs for mayor must give up their council seat. This is a huge risk and hasn't been tried in Ipswich for some years and this is one of the reasons some of the problems have occurred. An incumbent mayor is very difficult to defeat, their power and belief in their infallibility grows and corruption results. A system that allows a current councillor to challenge but ALSO to be able to retain their council seat if unsuccessful would be a way to provide more credible challenges against incumbent mayors.
- 
52. I suggest we need to attract a more qualified Councillor. In my opinion Councillors should be like Board members. Their role is to set culture and vision for the city region. They set a vision and plan for the city, what it looks like, how it should operate. Not involved in barking dog complaints etc. They should be part time rather than full time. Council also needs to return to the old model in staff roles. No CEO but a Town Clerk. Also a Town Engineer, Town Health Inspector, Town Surveyor, They all operate as an executive below the Councillors.
- 
53. With one Councillor per division, they become like little kids, nothing gets done unless they have a vested interest in it. That's why we have to get away from one councillor per division. With 12 Councillors it leaves less chance of the Councillors being brought off by developments and corruption. They should not have any affiliation to any parties and we should bring back the old system.
- 
54. We need fresh faces. Keep [Removed] especially out of Ipswich council !!
- 
55. Fixed terms, part-time, people with a strategic background who aren't obsessed with getting votes over the good of the city!
-

- 
56. Yes! I do have strong views regarding this issue. I do not believe that any politician or political party has the right to affect the operation of Ipswich City Council., especially when any predetermined changes will not make any difference whatsoever, as councillors and the number of divisions are NOT part of the current issues. The problem lies with dishonest, [Removed], [Removed] and [Removed] - fix that if you can but leave the councillors and divisions alone. Stay with 10 divisions with one councillor per divisions. I believe that the 'Divided' with one Councillor per divisions 'Option 2', as was previously the case, is by far the best options and there should be a minimum of 10 divisions. After all, the current issues with corruption have NOT stemmed from any elected divisional Councillor, it has all come from upper management, including the [Removed], [Removed] and [Removed] who should have known better. No Councillor was ever charged with any corruption. So if that part of it ain't broke - don't try to fix it. I have read that any reasons for by choice of either option 1, 2 or 3 will not necessarily be considered anyway as it is deemed that the current State Government is pushing this issue to bring Ipswich City Council into line, ie, 'Undivided', with a few Local Government areas in some other states, and one would suspect that party politics ARE involved. Let the ratepayers decide their own fate - not some politician trying to make a name for himself like the last idiot who sacked all of our dedicated Councillors who have never been charged with any corruption or wrongdoing whatsoever. If the outcome of this survey has indeed been predetermined by the State Government, then one would suspect that the vast majority of ratepayers will be grossly offended if this does turn out to be the case. I know it has altered my thinking about who to vote for next time. My reasons to promote Option 2 (minimum of 10 Divisions with 1 cCouncillor per divisions) are as follows: - Each councillor should be responsible for the progression of their particular division and to be able to feel proud of their individual achievements within that divisions - Two or more Councillors per division may find themselves pulling in different directions with rate payer issues, should they have opposing views on any matter, whether it be that one Councillor doesn't get on with a particular resident or the other Councillor or their views - All Councillors should remain free of party politics as it may also cause disruptions if there are two of more looking after the same area, (or even different divisions). Let the rate payers have truly independent Councillors responsible for their wellbeing and, all issues within their community. - Fairer independent Councillors to fund their own election costs within their division of choice, as opposed to providing advertising for the whole Ipswich area. Costs need to be limited in each division otherwise one would find that some Councillors may be disadvantaged by unlimited funds of some political party. - Local independent Councillors are more likely to have a better understanding of their community's needs that another who resides out of the area and may not necessarily be too worried what happens out in rural sections of Ipswich. - A local independent Councillor would more likely give their division greater representation at joint Council meetings than another whose interests may lie in an area closer to home for them - Independent Councillors of their own division would be more accountable to their constituents. Council divisions must also be determined with regard to the number of rate payers residing within them as well as the land mass of that division, otherwise, as is the case of present division 10, any remote rural areas have a lot more infrastructure to look after and greater distances to travel, compared to a division with a denser residential area. Councillors working hours are greater due to the extra travel within the rural area of Division 10. I do not believe that the Option 1 for 'Undivided Council' or the Option 3 ' Divided with 4 to 6 Councillors will be of any benefit to the majority of ratepayers in the long run, for the following reasons; - If Councillors are not bound to be responsible for any particular area, then I can see that 'party politics' will eventually come to play with some residents being discriminated against for not holding the same political views as those who represent them. - All Councillors must remain truly independent so that rate payers have confidence that any decisions represent their views, and not those of any political party - I believe that some Councillors will be attracted to built-up areas where it is easier to look good and with little travel time, thus leaving the rural sector with little or no representation - The costs associated with Electoral voting advertising literature etc for the whole of Ipswich City would be unsustainable for most nominees, except those with political backing, compared to the costs for a single division - Rate payers will find that some Councillors may be working on the same particular issues without the others knowledge and wasting Council resources unnecessarily - It could also occur that some Councillors may choose to sit back and let the others do all the hard work until some resolution has been determined and then making comment suggesting the they had somehow been involved, making it difficult for the average rate payer to know just who was responsible for a given outcome One cannot see how a voter's roll would be any simpler with the Option 1, as all rate payers names and addresses are recorded anyway, so it would make no difference at all. - Option 3 will not support the interests of individual groups any better than what an individual independent Councillor will and to suggest otherwise shows a lack of confidence in the duly elected single representative.
- 
57. Not to forget the Ipswich CBD in providing for the newer satellite suburbs.
- 
58. To me local government means interaction of councillors with the community - hence model 1 approximates my views more effectively. The needs of smaller communities such as Rosewood has to have representation as well as [unclear] Springfield. At the moment the latter seems favoured. Prospective councillors should provide a CV to the community and be prepared to gain skills in budgeting if they don't already have them. Managing finances of our community is of prime importance to many. As Ipswich is an important cultural hub I think council should give monetary support to groups who have developed our musical and theatrical culture over many years.
- 
59. I thought the time to reconsider change now appropriate.
- 
60. I think that Springfield should be separated from Ipswich. Most of ratepayers money is going that way. We need better roads and new bridges before sporting stadiums and parks.
- 
61. More respect for the people in the Ipswich area.
- 
62. Need to communicate better with community. Was not aware of this survey til today.
- 
63. Think about the people of Ipswich.
-

- 
64. Each division needs to be represented either by one councillor per division or 2 to 3 councillors per division but certainly not "first past the post" voting where all councillors could be from the one area - eg Springfield who would have no knowledge of needs and concerns of other divisions.
- 
65. The undivided model would be disastrous, in a local government area such as the current Ipswich City Council. Ipswich has a densely populated urban area, and a huge rural and semi rural area. 95% of people, who live in urban areas, have not idea of the reality of life in rural or semi rural areas. In the undivided model, all the councillors will be elected from the heavily populated areas. Their concerns and efforts will be concentrated on the areas which elected them. A huge section of Ipswich would struggle to be heard. Single member division is the only fair way.
- 
66. No
- 
67. Local Government is a very important level of government and is probably the level at which most Australians would feel most able and most effective in exercising their democratic rights. It is essential that there is a close link and understanding between the councillors and their constituents, as well as a clear and easily accessible avenue of communication between residents and their Council. This is something that we in Ipswich have been very proud of and this needs to continue. Having one councillor per division living and working in their division allows this to happen.
- 
68. Why wasn't the option to have Councilors only employed part time flagged?
- 
69. Ipswich is too geographically and culturally diverse to be effectively governed by any other model than one councillor per division. Ultimately the state government should focus on their areas and allow the councils to focus on theirs.
- 
70. Leave as it is.
- 
71. The chosen model needs to be the one with the greatest level of accountability.
- 
72. Keep it the way it was before - it worked well. A few bad eggs didn't make the whole basket rotten.
- 
73. Bring back the honest cr's who have proven themselves so we have experienced, proven honesty to begin with. People like [Removed] to just name one! That's a good foundation to build on!
- 
74. This will only work if Councillors have less power on overthrowing decisions made by experienced officers of Council and are more accountable for their actions. Fewer Councillors would be better.
- 
75. No
- 
76. small towns need a voice, if they do not have someone allocated to them that lives in the area, they will be forgotten.
- 
77. We need councillors that are for 1 division, that live in and understand what the division requirements are. No divisions, who would fight for the small towns.
- 
78. Yes, local representation for divisional areas is imperative.
- 
79. Multi-member wards ensure everyone is represented. The notion that there will be 'blame shifting' is myopic. If there are councillors who engaged in this they can be removed at the ballot box and in the mean time there are other councillors to address the concern.
- 
80. I would strongly encourage the state government to consider how smaller and poorer regions can be better represented by the council (eg Rosewood or One Mile), as many citizens of Ipswich are becoming apathetic towards the governance of their council. This has been a long-term issue caused by elected members only showing interest in high-growth areas, and neglecting the communities with long-established histories. If this continues, then the low-growth regions of Ipswich will decline economically and become modern slums, where the only employment opportunities for young people are in crime and drugs. The issue lies not within the way the council is divided, but in both the nature of future councillors and the incentive to develop pre-existing suburbs to provide opportunities for residents and reduce the risk of poverty. One needs look no further than the economic state of Ipswich CBD to see the damage of a negligent council whom abandoned their CBD as Brisbane developed. Future councils must confront the reality that bad things do happen and should be fixed, rather than ignored until someone else comes along. Last council was too busy celebrating the growth of Ripley and Springfield to address the economic stagnation of the Greater Ipswich and Goodna areas. Making the council undivided will only exacerbate these issues, but creating divisions based on the hub that serves the particular area (Goodna, Springfield, Greater Ipswich, Redbank, Grandchester/Regional) allows councillors to best create opportunities that benefit the hub division and therefore whomever falls within the catchment. This would also make the divisions more sensible, as they currently divide communities, creating situations where an issue in another division can heavily impact a neighbouring division, where the councillor impacted may not have authority to fix the issue. In future, when deciding how our representatives are elected, they should be held to a greater standard and with greater accountability to avoid widespread apathy from the voters, and to create better opportunities for both workers and employers.
- 
81. Councillors should be part-time, workload not sufficient for full-time. Last lot got up to too much mischief with spare time as full-time employees of Council. This might emphasise the fact that role should have a community focus. Having divisional offices in Ipswich, East Ipswich, Brassall etc was a waste of money - residents could phone or visit Council offices just as easily.
- 
82. Don't have councillor allocation as it was used for self promotion
-

- 
83. need a diverse group of Councillors that are not all business men or woman with large financial backing to get them into office. Equality is a must. I am concerned that smaller less populated areas of Ipswich may be under valued and lack financial assistance due to being more rural thus a "slum area" nametag will be attached making those areas less desirable to live. I like the current divided option as the Councillor is from your area although I am open to having more than one councillor representation in highly populated areas of Ipswich
- 
84. In the event of council sacking (becoming more common) representatives should be appointed per division. One Administrator Model does not work as the appointed person just ignores the rate payers and their issues. Lets call it the 'Killing Democracy Model'
- 
85. Please include community consultation as part of deciding the divisional boundaries.
- 
86. Possibly establishing a community leadership/advisory group within the separate divisions to assist with decisions.(similar to what is now the Ipswich community advisory
- 
87. No :)
- 
88. Councillors should be limited to 2 terms
- 
89. Set terms - maximum 2 terms
- 
90. Transparency with the results of this survey. After the decision is made, public information sessions to explain how the model will work and the voting process. Maximise community knowledge and understanding of the electoral process.
- 
91. No political party involvement of councillors.
- 
92. We need fewer councillors and greater accountability, such as could be achieved by having fewer but larger divisions each with groups of councillors providing checks and balances to the group.
- 
93. No
- 
94. I'd be keen to see the number of terms a councillor can serve limited to two or three terms to allow new people with fresh ideas a chance to serve as a councillor, given that name recognition ensures that incumbent councillors are nearly always returned at elections.
- 
95. Full investigation into last 5 yrs tax / business dealings. Undergo public administration type course.
- 
96. It needs to be a vote unlike unseating the councillors that we voted in. Our say was removed . The current rate payers association did not and do not speak for all ratepayers.
- 
97. Closely monitor spending and councillors should not be allowed to sit on boards for companies that are owned or regulated within the council.
- 
98. Do not allow the previous councillors to stand for reelection as they have been spending their time since their sacking badmouthing the interim administrator and the state government. If you don't agree with their views you are blocked from providing your views at all. This needs to stop
- 
99. The divided model works very well. Residents prefer to identify with their Councillor, probably the only politician they see.
- 
100. Why do we need so many Councillors? We have been nearly 12 months without any Councillors in this time we have not encountered times when they have been needed.
- 
101. Ipswich has become a divided city and the divisions of Council with individual Councillor working for their divisions and its priorities has only made that more entrenched. Ipswich has three Chambers of Commerce identifying 3 business centres. Keeping the council divisions will only strengthen that divide. It is time to bring out city together.
- 
102. No corrupt politicians for Ipswich please.
- 
103. Fair voting system. Optional preferential is the fairest and most democratic system. No groupings avoids party blocs. Ipswich needs a system that guarantees freedom from corruption and manipulation
- 
104. All councillors should be qualified or take the course of Public Directors. I would prefer no preference voting. One vote for the person no preferences.
- 
105. Personal representation in each division. Undivided creates inefficiencies at many levels. In undivided, Ratepayers will play one Councillor against another thus wasting time. In undivided Councillors will be falling over each other to grab headlines when there's a headline to be sort. If there is one division with 3 Councillors they'll end up dividing up the division any between themselves. Undivided there is the potential for the Councillors to hide. Abolish the Divisional Offices and centralize all Councillors to the Admin Building.
- 
106. I feel as if the way the division were previously allocated was honestly hard to understand. Explain why there is divisions to community members would be great
- 
107. By chosing option 2 or 3 you are making it much more difficult for the little independent to win and easier for teams and parties
-

- 
108. No person who has previously on ICC should be allowed to run at this election. If they did not know about the corruption then they were asleep at the wheel & should not have been there; if they knew but did not want to speak up then they were allowing the corruption to continue hence condoning it; if they did know then they were colluding and should never be allowed to hold office again. I have no confidence in any of the previous councillors & feel there are many lies & sins that have brushed aside for far too long & allowed to fester. We have an opportunity to have a fresh start let us make it a great one.
- 
109. Selecting the 4 to 6 Divisions the Government should consider ensuring those residents in non-populous areas are considered as part of the Council area. Too often with the previous Council those in highly populous or sparse areas received greater focus than those with small populations. Also any previous Councillor should be barred from contesting the next election
- 
110. No party politics in local Government
- 
111. No party politics in local government
- 
112. In the undivided model, councillors can designate a special aspect of interest across the city; newer councillors can have mentors more easily; fiefdom syndrome can be minimised.
- 
113. Councillors should be employed part-time.
- 
114. I feel Australia is over-governed with tax payers funding an ever increasing financial burden to support the current three levels. We should start to simplify this and a good first step is to minimise the number of Councillors and for them to take on a true Governance and oversight role of the paid Council employees on behalf of their employers (the rate payers).
- 
115. I don't believe that an undivided council would provide adequate representation for the broad Ipswich area and has the potential for growing areas like Springfield and Ripley Valley to dominate council resources.
- 
116. Some minimum educational standards for candidates at registration.
- 
117. There can be a great disparity between divisions, some infrastructures being much older, and I think that the divided model would ensure and equal voice for all divisions.
- 
118. At the forum last night I believe it was demonstrated that the community is more than capable of shaping its council no matter what form it takes, and if there is no clear desire to change then why change. After all the stress the councillors, staff, and community have gone through recently there is no need to go down a path of radical change when the existing model has served us well and just needs to be more firmly structured. There is nothing to say that the alternate models would work any better.
- 
119. Yes to keep in consideration the vast extremes in our social structures eg the Riverview catchment division and the greater Springfield area / the ever evolving new suburbia Ripley etc once completed would need lesser funding to maintain infrastructure than say the older divisions that may need higher level of upgrade.
- 
120. I feel representation at a council level should be free from politics ie no Labour or Liberal councils. Some good people put their hands up to make the community better and they should be unhindered by politics.
- 
121. Don't let current council's run for a seat
- 
122. Local Government should be free of party politics.
- 
123. State governments should have a say, should be up to the rate payers
- 
124. I don't think we need so many councillors for the size of Ipswich.
- 
125. Registered party members should not be allowed to run.
- 
126. Each councillors should be assigned an administrative role in department/s eg.. roads, health etc.. Together they should vote for any major decision that would affect the city. Councillors should not have a private office, cars or secretary but should work within the current council facilities. The current administration is proven to be efficient their non political mode operands should be the template for any future council administration.
- 
127. Don't have a hybrid model that will result in a dominant member per division and will result in unfair representation.
- 
128. Historically divisions were "ruled" by the councillor and his cronies. Non cronies did not stand a chance.
- 
129. The window is closing to stop catastrophic climate change
- 
130. The undivided model limits the people who can run for council in a city of this size as it is impossible to cover the whole area without backing from some industry organisation wishing to push their own business interest or an union with their own agenda. By limiting the amount an individual can spend on their campaign you are impeding the democratic process unless there is also controls around interest groups promoting individuals.
- 
131. We absolutely want to keep the current model or similar - 8-12 divisions with their own councillor. The administration should not be trying to make a change while we do not have community representation. It's wrong on so many levels. The majority of my community did not want to lose our councillor, it was our decision to vote him in, it was not our decision to lose him. Please don't take away our divisional boundaries.
-

- 
132. Part-time should not be an option for councillors. If you pay peanuts you will get monkeys. Make this an attractive job for the intelligent people who already have jobs and know how to operate ethically to aspire to. Perhaps a fourth option should be to operate as a government department without any councillors? We are sick of politicians and do not want a labour run council which is what it will be in an undivided option. That would suit the current state government perfectly to stitch this up while they are in power as their nursery for developing their future state and federal candidates. That is why there is a huge conflict of interest at play by the state government that has not been declared.
- 
133. It's incredibly important for the area I live in to have divisional representation. It hasn't been the decision of the community to not have a current community representative and I strongly feel it is wrong that this decision is being made while there are no community representatives in place. This should not be considered under appointment of administrators. If we don't have divisional councillors it will be less likely that a councillor will be elected from the smaller communities and the urban councillors will not understand the needs of the rural sector.
- 
134. There should be no change until there is a legal council voted in by the people of Ipswich and not an appointed sheriff by a state government who want to get rid of all councils to have a dictated governing body running the city
- 
135. Strongly recommend against the "undivided" model as this could very easily and most probably lead to outlying suburbs/ area having no elected representative from their area. I personally saw this happen following the "Council Amalgamation" process several years ago, in a large geographic area of city and country.
- 
136. Part time councillors paid on a per meeting basis
- 
137. I would like to see 5 divisions each with 2 councillors one being a male and the other being a female
- 
138. 2-3 councillors per division 8 division
- 
139. Decision is obviously made. I thought councillors were to represent the community in which they live Not to be high flying board directors.
- 
140. Yes I disagree with the Administrator, councillors are politicians not directors.
- 
141. The model adopted must be that which best protects against the situation of a dominant Mayor controlling compliant councillors as was the case with the previous ICC.
- 
142. Rural areas don't get a fair say with divisions.
- 
143. Any model should be predicated on clear training for the incoming Councillors to ensure they understand the full range of their responsibilities and limits of their powers and influence.
- 
144. It is essential that in local government we have LOCAL representatives.
- 
145. the region is so diverse with its small country towns and bigger suburbs. If we go undivided the smaller country areas will be neglected.
- 
146. One Councillor per Division provides: 1. True accountability. 2. Very clear identification of the Councillor and their constituents.
- 
147. My preference is to have 5 Divisions each with one female and one male councillor
- 
148. We should 5 divisions each with 2 councillors - one male and the other female so that Ipswich has a fair distribution of male and female representatives
- 
149. The people of Ipswich are the most important ones here. The councillors work for us. I am adamant that the previous councillors should not be able to run again in future elections or we will be back to where we started from.
- 
150. Leave it as it is. If it goes undivided, the majority of the population is down the Springfield end of the city and all of the Councillor could be from that end of town. By having 1 member per division, we know who to call and who is responsible for the area and it ensures that every corner of the city is covered. With multiple members per divisions, one can do nothing while the other works, allows for political parties to form teams and if there 2 people have opposite views it would be a toxic outcome for the community. If you change IPSWICH you need to do it to the same councils in the same banding that has been set by the tribunal. Why do they allow a [Removed] from [Removed] to speak at the forum when he has been found guilty of misconduct in office? A [Removed] who works under a complete different act and a [Removed] from a council who's population is the same as 1 of the current divisions. They are all for undivided councils, how ironic and not a balanced representation of local government. Leave our council alone.
- 
151. There should be 5 divisions each with 2 councillors we vote for one male and one female in each division so that there will be an equal number of females and males in the council
- 
152. No
- 
153. we need an approach to governing our city with GOOD BUDGET PRACTICE to minimise our exorbitant rates and we need a more sensible approach to our recycling. Greed by all governments has gone too far - putting up prices of containers and then belittling the people by making them scrounge for 0.10cents. This is embarrassing in the extreme, govt WORK FOR US THE PEOPLE!!!!
- 
154. Make it the same number of Councillor's as before, before all the trouble started, I didn't have a problem with that at least they had the time to get back in touch with you personally with my issues.
-

155.	local knowledge is vital in these divisions. one division is plenty of work for each councillor
156.	having only one councillor in a division is preferable because the community can relate to one person their concerns and questions on council business and get back to them if there are any problems whereas having more than one means there may be confusion, also having just one division may result in local issues not being understood or acted upon.
157.	I do not believe an undivided council in this city, one of the fastest growing areas in the country, can best serve our needs due to the planned further rapid growth in both development of residential areas and (hopefully) appropriate infrastructure. On the other hand, a divided structure with 2-3 councillors per division could lend itself to conflicts of interest within that division and hence to delay and/or inactivity. A divided council with 1 councillor per division is my preferred option because in theory, it would mean that the representative is committed to providing his or her best effort for the division but, if the councillor does not perform to a standard the community expects, that person can be democratically removed at the following council election.
158.	WARNING.. This survey is open to multiple votes. I have voted previously and did this one to prove it can be manipulated..
159.	Limit the number of times a person can be re elected, mandate for community discussions with the counsellors on a regular basis.
160.	At the heart of local government should be local representation. The 1 Councillor per division allows for this best. The "my-backyard" vs "whole of city" concerns are a question of leadership from councillors and the mayor which should be judged on election day.
161.	Ipswich has become far too big. Isn't it time Springfield/Greater Springfield broke away and had its own council. Also someone should look at the boundaries of Bellbird Park. The area opposite Redbank Plains High from Keidges Rd back should now be Augustine Heights. Make the traffic lights at Keidges/Augusta Parkway the boundary.
162.	We have family living in a council area almost as large as Ipswich, they have undivided Councillors and they say they wish they had divisions. I believe Ipswich Council is too wide spread and has a mix of country and city therefore divisions are necessary to meet everyone's needs
163.	Please ensure we have accountability and strict governance.
164.	Yes. Make it a requirement for the counsellor to live in their division.
165.	Undivided electoral structures have the potential to elevate the voting power of high-population centers in the electorate at the expense of low-population areas that are still needing or deserving of representation. Ipswich is a rapidly growing and diverse community, not only in the conventional sense but with many different economic and cultural centers developing across its geographic area. The council structure should reflect the best attempt possible to see the interests of all these various communities represented in their shared local government area.
166.	Large growing councils need to remain divided with one elected councillor per division to ensure maximum efficiency
167.	To me this is the only model that will help provide extra accountability. I very strongly support only 2 councillors per division. with an odd number two can gang up on the third making the third irrelevant. The city is too geographically and socio-economically diverse to even consider an undivided councillor. What chance for funds etc would the older areas have against the 'Springfields' and "Ripleys"?
168.	whichever model is chosen - the model must have a commitment to complete transparency on all matters relevant to the operations of Council - this does not seem to be the case at this time and reflects poorly on past and potential Councils
169.	The boundaries do need changing due to population growth.
170.	A dictatorship with just a mayor
171.	Already had too much to say in destroying a system that was working.
172.	None of this matters if those elected do not have integrity.
173.	Community panels of randomly selected ratepayers (ie: like a jury) to make decisions on community issues after hearing from a panel of invested parties. This would cover topics like development applications which affect large percentages of residents in their division.
174.	Postal voting should also be considered. Each candidate could have included with the ballot paper a short resume' on why they wish to be elected to Council. The posting of a short resume' to voters could also be adopted even for a normal election at a stand up polling booth. If all other forms of election advertising and how to vote cards were eliminated this would ensure a fair election for all candidates.
175.	Redbank Plains is the largest suburb in the Ipswich Council region. It houses more than 10% of Ipswich's population. However, unlike Springfield, Redbank Plains has lacked a mouthpiece and has missed out on 'goodies' and necessary infrastructure.
176.	Non-political
177.	Non-political

- 
178. I was an alderman on Ipswich City Council from 1988 to 1991. Of that council, 7 were Labor, 3 Liberal and 1 independent. About 1989 a major storm washed out Whitehall Road which was part of my colleague Barry Thorn's division. We, along with Peter White, the third Liberal Alderman, were advised by the senior engineer that if Whitehall Road was to be reconstructed, it would have to come from our 3 works budgets. Labor aldermen would not be providing any funds from their allocations. As a consequence there was only one year during my term that I was able to undertake capital works. An undivided council should therefore ensure that all areas of the city are treated equally.
- 
179. To keep party politics out of local government
- 
180. For the past 6 months we have had no local Councillor. Whether the State Government made the correct decision in sacking all the Councillors is not the issue of this comment. But the issue is that it has given us an insight into what a Council is like with no local representation. Living in a rural community requires the personal representation of one of our local residents to participate in local issues and then represent our views, interests and needs to the broader council. Local government is the people's government, comprising well known, independent minded and respected people elected by their peers. This is best achieved by the Divided model having one Councillor per division. As already recognised in the pros and cons, local Councillors may not be well known across the entire city community, and without massive funding or major political party campaigning, their chances of election by the entire voter-base would be severely diminished. Party politics has no place in local government. We have yet another 12 months to go without personal, local representation. Surely the evidence already demonstrates the strength and significance of the Divided - 1 Councillor per division as the preferred model.
- 
181. To increase representation across the divisions while still maintaining the representation of the communities mentioned in the discussion papers... I feel a division of four areas should occur based on the town centres given in the Review Background Document- p7- ie "These centres include Ipswich Central, Springfield Town Centre, Goodna Town Centre and, in time, Ripley Town Centre". For each of these communities there should be three councillor representatives- to maximise the representation in each area and allow councillors who have a large area to cover to work together effectively. And given that I have heard rumours that the councillors position is suggested as a part-time position- I feel this would not be a good idea, as it would limit the quality of candidates who might otherwise apply.. I think very few people who are currently in a full time working position would give this up to work across such a large council as Ipswich with the work load of committees and other work required.
- 
182. Why three choices, so government can skew the results?
- 
183. Govt should not shift responsibilities away from elected councillors to non-elected officials. Retain democracy.
- 
184. An undivided model would make it near impossible for individuals to run. The sheer size of the Council area and the number of booths would mean it is better and more efficient to run as teams. If you have one of the divided models then it is easier for independents. Having said that, I think the fewer divisions might means the multiple Councillors per division are keeping each other accountable and hopefully make it difficult for "fiefdoms", as happened previously in Div 10 and Div 2
- 
185. I think that being a councillor is not a full time career but rather a part time position with limited tenure -say three teams
- 
186. Give us the old council back again and stop being a dictator. We elected the old council. There were problems but mostly caused by outside political influences.
- 
187. I don't think party politics have a place in local councils.
- 
188. Keep up good auditing practises for next 5 to 8 yrs, to ensure situation does not happen again.
- 
189. Not allowing any of the previous council members to run in the future election.
- 
190. Need a person to represent us or otherwise interests of only a few suburbs will be prioritised. Need a person to take responsibility for local suburb issues.
- 
191. Put this to a referendum or attach to rates notice...so it is fair to all Ipswich residents.
- 
192. Prospective candidates who want to run for council have to go through an EOI process to assess suitability for the role before being allowed to run as a candidate. As a baseline criteria 1 must be demonstrated strong governance skills and experience on boards of large organisations not just the local soccer club. They need to understand that good governance requires delegation of operational matters to council staff who are accountable in their roles. Preferably they should understand the concepts of triple bottom line, be known for their integrity, ethics, and commitment to acting in the public interest in the community of Ipswich.
- 
193. We need to ensure a balance between getting the work of council done effectively and efficiently, serving our community and at the same time, not wasting ratepayers money with "big council". Getting the number of councillors' right is important.
- 
194. Our Council provides services tailored for local communities. We need local representation that reflects the particularities of divisions. Example: the rapid expansion of Springfield does not have the same needs as more established areas as Ipswich central.
- 
195. Councillors should be part time, and the state government need to restrict the directive powers of the mayor in respect to the CEO and senior staff.
-



196.	The city of Ipswich is a very large area and I feel unless we have divisions we will not be represented equally across all areas of our city.
197.	There should be fewer councillors i.e. 8 + Mayor but they should remain full-time. If there are to be multi-member divisions, proportional representation should be used as the system of voting.
198.	I am concerned about recent historical issues when using this model - councillors working in silos, some areas of Ipswich represented well/not so well. A new fresh approach would be welcomed.
199.	Remember what the people of this city want not what political gains they think they can get if they think no division would work then they should try it at a state level first
200.	Why is Willowbank zoned with Beaudesert. We should be in Ipswich area the same as Amberly Airbase. We live 2 klm away. Why are we pushed aside and forgotten. We pay our Rates to the Ipswich Council. Why is my phone number listed in the Beaudesert phone book. Look after us please
201.	The "local" aspect of local government is diluted when a councillor's electorate is a very large area. If the undivided option were adopted the councillors' electorates would be larger in area than our local federal members' electorates. The option I have chosen gives a prospective councillor a chance of having a reasonable and possibly intimate understanding of the needs of their constituents.
202.	2 councillors per division. 3 may get a bit cumbersome
203.	Finance and the issuing of vehicles, and other logistics I cling their office, for the elected councillors. Will the councillors in an undivided council have their offices within the council chambers making a unified location and save the cost of councillors having their own offices in their divisions. A fleet of vehicles instead of an allowance for travel expenses, especially for the travelling to country areas. Travelling expenses be more scrutinised.
204.	We need to make sure that our incoming Councillors are held accountable for their actions, I really hope that by having shared responsibility areas that even if someone starts to stray other Councillors will be able to remind them of their obligations and pull them back into line.
205.	No
206.	I prefer to have a Councillor from my own Division. It has worked extremely well in the past. The Divisional councillor is more in tune with the needs of his or her community.
207.	I would prefer the council of 2020 to consist of 1 mayor & 10 Councillors as the 2016 was composed. In other words Council to continue as before. Thank you for allowing me to express my views.
208.	We need representation for being in a Rural area.
209.	We would like our own Councillor to represent us as we are rural.
210.	I think it would be great to have FIVE divisions each with TWO Councillors represented by one male and one female.
211.	Yes, to ensure a male and female Councillor is to be elected for each Division.
212.	councillors need to be community based and accountable, not some elite board member type just overiewing non elected staff decisions.
213.	Councillor will do that's for the divisions.
214.	nil
215.	Councillors now head various boards that work right across the whole council so why should they be elected by only a small section of Ipswich residents.
216.	To make sure we don't slip back to an uncontrollable council maybe instead of a mayor we may be better having a administrator appointed by the state government as we have now.
217.	Make all the councillors make the decisions together instead of some saying we didnt know what was going on in the rest of the community not in our district.
218.	No
219.	they should establish better guidelines and transparency for use of discretionary funds given to community groups.
220.	I want someone I can ring and knows the area I live and one who will take responsibility for that area this was working well until being changed by the government.
221.	I want to be able to speak to a councillor who knows where I reside and who will take ownership for their division. I don't want a councillor who resides in say Springfield and doesn't have a clue where the suburb I reside in actually is. Working this way now so don't change it.
222.	One councillor power to have unfettered power to allocate ratepayer funds leads to a situation where Community organisations have to or encouraged to support the councillor at the polls or face the fact that support could have funds renegotiated. Culture change at the grass roots is critical to change at the top table.

223.	I don't like the undivided model - I think we'd lose our local "say". I don't like the 2 to 3 councillors per division model - what if they can't agree?
224.	The old suburbs should stay in the Ipswich division
225.	Leave elected councillors in place until such time as they retire or are beaten in a subsequent election.
226.	Don't want what we've had!
227.	Poor results and representation under the present model. Let's try something different.
228.	Re-drawing the division boundaries to take into consideration the influx in growth in certain areas of the Ipswich City Council area.
229.	Aldermen should go back to being part time. We would probably get better quality candidates.
230.	Dont change something thats not broke
231.	Merge the entire Ipswich Council area in to Brisbane City Council adding two new divisional electorates. One East and one west. Forget about Ipswich, too much damage has been done. This would decrease the amount of administration staff required and reduce rates as many other services are already run in partnership such as Queensland Urban Utilities and electricity.
232.	[Removed] is evil
233.	Consider the "tale of 2 cities" we have at the moment. Historic Ipswich vs Springfield. Springfield is a very powerful and essentially privately run / controlled. Need to have some mechanism that in the "undivided scenario that Historical Ipswich does not wither and die. It is a lot cheaper to develop in empty paddocks in Springfield than it is to "redevelop" the old city.
234.	Aircon for all school classrooms.
235.	Maximise your resources.
236.	Personal contact with someone who knows the area I live in and someone who frequents it regularly has a much better understanding of problems encountered than someone who only has heard of the area. Knowing and living and experiencing things in the area at all times of the day and night gives a much better understanding of the situation rather than just a one of visit. My council needs to represent my concerns and my local neighbourhood as well as the general region. Centralisation is not the way to go as it quickly becomes impersonal and uncaring. All ratepayers need equal representation. Please preserve my local neighbourhood representation.
237.	Whilst it may be done with the best of intentions I feel concerned about this document. I believe it still shows a bias for option 3 which is not the right option for Goodna. If this model is selected I would be greatly concerned that it would be overrun by the interests of Springfield which would not be in the best interests of Goodna. It would also mean a loss of a local councillor and a trio of three would mean less focused representation and a loss of who to go to when things need to be fixed in the local area. I can see in the time that an administrator has been appointed that there has unfortunately been some negative impact on the area with this loss of representation. Also Ipswich City Council is not a rural community. I did not choose to live in Goodna because it was in Ipswich, I choose to live here as it was a part of Brisbane and the second closest suburb to the Brisbane CBD and undervalued. I see that in putting in the models no mention was made of the Brisbane City Council model that was used, only the other SEQ LGA's which I feel showed some bias. Whilst again done with good intentions I feel that an undivided representation would be a disaster and treat Ipswich as a country town which it is not. Accordingly I feel that this has been a somewhat waste of money in the process. Areas will continue to grow which is natural and higher density living should be encouraged especially near the train line. Accordingly the existing Divided 1 Councillor per division option should be retained by adjusted on a regular basis at the edges as is necessary. Without doing this I feel is treating Ipswich like a second class area.
238.	Please ensure that elected reps live within the division that they are seeking to represent.
239.	Councillors should be independent and non party aligned.
240.	Must live in that division so they are familiar with needs of that division. Maximum 2 terms as councilor
241.	A local with close ties to community and strong morals
242.	Would prefer to go back to what we had years ago. Part timers

- 
243. How can an undivided Council for 130,000 voters be aware of what is really happening on a day to day basis in other areas of Council? Rural and urban issues require different local knowledge and awareness. Undivided Councils become remote and distanced from the very people they committed to SERVE. Federal and State have electoral boundaries since federation with an elected representative in each area. Why should we be different? Talking about the role of the CEO is problematical given the last two CEOs failure and mismanagement. Giving the CEO and senior management more power in their roles and isolating the elected councillors to a review and visualising the future role is a recipe for loss of control of the WISHES OF THE PEOPLE. Developers should be banned from political donations. It is a form of legalised bribery. The current housing boom will not last forever and already the downside to postage stamp cheap housing in outlying areas is becoming evident in increased crime rates and drug issues that will only become worse. Some of the 'Living in the best city' bragging will in the future be recognised for the disaster it really is. City business CENTRE dead for around 20 years. Springfield and surrounds set to be a city in its own rights (no connections to Ipswich). Ipswich's reputation trashed for the next generation.
- 
244. Ensuring that gaps in representation of specific communities is not lost given the diversity of Ipswich.
- 
245. Do not allow councillors to have an operational say in what should happen. This leads to corruption. They should take advice from the council employees and only have direct input on strategy. The city is better with an administrator. We don't need amateurs ruining the city any more.
- 
246. We are a diverse community ... with history and innovation that needs to embrace all areas!! Not continue to great a "divide" between seemingly rich and seemingly poor!!
- 
247. we do not need 12 councillors. when i guy with 5 helpers did the job and are doing it better.
- 
248. Not only look at number of voters, but also look at ares of each WARD. Something has to be done about non growing wards to those of enormous area growing massively.
- 
249. What we had worked well before you dismissed our Council without publicly released proof, so there is no need to change from that structure.
- 
250. The divisions are too large. You should remain with 10 divisions and 3 councillors in each or increase the number of councillors in each of six divisions.
- 
251. One council, no divisions! Fair, even and democratic!
- 
252. Divided by equal population and industries
- 
253. I believe that councillors should be made up of independents as party politics has no real impact on council issues / policies. Undivided will result in political parties controlling council as they will be the only ones with the resources to get known by everyone - and in Ipswich this will almost certainly be all Labor. Also, the voting system is just as important. If having multiple people elected from the one electorate (Undivided and Divided multi-member), the system needs to be Single Transferable Vote, otherwise people voting for popular candidates will be disenfranchised. All votes above the quota to get the candidate elected would be wasted. It could be that 90% of the people put a "1" next to one particular candidate, leaving the other 9-11 councillors to be filled by votes cast by the remaining 10% of voters - a perversion of democracy. The candidates ranked "2" - "8" by the 90% of voters would not get a look in even though they are much more popular and probably much more suitable.
- 
254. Get it right try to.very difficult.
- 
255. Typical of the State Government to fix there lack of Oversight of a local authority and dislike of particular past Councillor's by suggesting some small group of appointed State Government employees to decide the electoral process of our Local Authority. This should be taken to a vote of all the people not some silly Online Survey. Would the people of Brisbane or any other more powerful local authorities put up with such a suggestion. I would imagine we would here the screams of dismay form here.
- 
256. The suburb I live in constitutes more than 10% of Ipswich's population so merits its own councillor. Please do not draw a divisional boundary through the middle of the suburb. The previous divisional boundaries tended slice the council area into north south slices. This too tended to divide communities of interest and dilute the councillors focus.
- 
257. Going back to the old model is the last thing I want. Some of the previous Councillors were in seat for too long and bullied Council staff. They cared more about their own power then the actual division they represented. They also lost sight of the bigger picture of Ipswich as a whole. They should not have that direct contact with staff, only senior management. I believe having divided regions with 2 - 3 Councillors per division will help with Councillors working together for the entire Ipswich region and not against each other fighting for their individual division.
- 
258. A model that cant be party political, although that miht be difficult with a Labour state government
- 
259. That they can't approve development, without fixing up the roads.
- 
260. Ipswich has one of the largest Indigenous populations in Australia, and a young population. Efforts should be made to ensure Indigenous voice, in line with the principles of the Uluru Statement, and to ensure young people have a voice, not just older people.
- 
261. That council have a comprehensive development plan for the next 50 years in regards to development applications
-

262.	If you do a first eight past the post you will only get very rich or political party supported people being able to afford to run an election campaign over an entire city. If you want Good equitable representation take political parties out not able to pay for political campaign material. A divisional approach will get a variety of people all gender background etc to run. You need to have local people who know their community and are passionate about community services to nominate Otherwise you have a council run by a labour or a liberal Party it becomes a puppet of the government.
263.	NO
264.	The needs of the ratepayers must be at the forefront of model and the ability to directly discuss issues with a councillor is paramount to this requirement. The "Undivided" model and the "2 or 3 councillors" model will rely on an ability for cohesive and unified approaches to solving issues. There is little to no confidence of this and it would further facilitate an approach of blaming someone else. Councillors need to be held personally accountable for their civic responsibilities and any model which has a collective or multiple level of responsibility will not achieve this
265.	Ipswich is somewhat unique in that there is significant diversity in the types of communities and settings within its boundary. The concentration of a large proportion of residents in a small part of Ipswich means that any model other than a divisional model will result in gross inequity of service provision and representation in the more rural areas. This will lead to disenchantment in the rural areas and will result in poorer outcomes for Ipswich council and its communities overall. The divisional system itself did not create the problems, the people within the system did.
266.	Undivided is undemocratic and unrepresentative.
267.	Diversity of candidates.
268.	There should be no Party Politics in Local Government.
269.	Councillors are public servants and they should be fully accountable in all affairs relating to the Council. They should declare truthfully their assets and their potential conflicts of interest. As public servants a code of conduct should be adhered to.
270.	I believe that since the previous model didn't work with single representation per divided division that another model is inevitable to resist the 'god' like bully attitudes and potential/actual corruption that has surfaced. Any model with multiple representation will allow some level of self regulation - and that has been missing.
271.	Anything but the current boundaries.
272.	DO NOT CHANGE THE DIVISIONAL MODEL!
273.	Less councillors please. Make them earn their money for a change.
274.	I believe the current model of paying Councillors for full time work attracts the Wong type of candidate. A Board of Directors approach should be taken with Councillors remunerated at a similar rate to those serving on a board. 20-25k Further, the number of councils should be reduced to a maximum of 8 regardless of the model chosen.
275.	Part time councillors
276.	Because the state government was derelict in putting governance over councils and policing them. Should not mean we change the way in which we elect our local council. If they want to change our divisional model then the entire State should go to that model.
277.	Leave it the way it was. Without the corruption
278.	Completely not aligned with any political party.
279.	The councillors should be part time board members not full time
280.	smaller amount divisions(5 to 6) with 1 councillor in each
281.	Consider a vote on not having an elected council and have the responsibility taken on by the elected State Members for the areas. Many people complain about the 3 levels of government, this is an opportunity to ask the people of Ipswich to consider doing away with one. A referendum at the same time as the next federal election would be a perfect time for the people of Ipswich to consider the matter. Many people I talk to comment on the fact that the council is operating well without the elected Councillors.
282.	I believe running candidates should reside in the electorate they are competing for or have a proven knowledge of the electorate.
283.	We need individual representatives for a fair go.
284.	It is important that future Councillors have the background, intellect and capacity to immerse themselves in strategic decision making of a high order. It is a waste to have elected representatives obsessing about shopping trolleys, local parking issues and local issues. Council should have a community engagement framework that can accommodate these issues using staff and not Councillors. The problems at Ipswich can partly be held at the foot of Councillors who were unable to properly consider strategic issues and did not fully understand the role of local government. Councillors need to be able to work within a shared vision for the City of Ipswich and not devote their attentions to, in the scheme of things, petty local issues that can be better managed by staff.

285.	We live in a democratic society which gives us the right to select who will represent our views and needs in Ipswich City Council. The undivided model does not lend itself to true democratic representation.
286.	No
287.	would prefer candidates that are not aligned to a political party
288.	With out individual councillors for each division matters with in the division or smaller suburbs get forgotten about or put on the back burner unless there is a advocate for the people in that area.
289.	My major concern with 1 councilor per division is that there may be more than 1 qualified candidate in a division whereas in another division there may be no candidate qualified to take on the role and one of these would be elected to council over a more qualified candidate in another division
290.	State should consider a non Councillor model. - Mayoral and deputy Mayor only. Wherein - senior executives manage public requests and a committee of execs with Mayoral as Chair for appeal processes or escalation for review of decisions is appropriate.
291.	Portfolio based Councillors
292.	We are a small rural area whose needs are so different from more densely populated urban areas. We need a divided model so that council is constantly reminded of these differences and acts accordingly.
293.	It's most important to not fall into the same pattern as previously. Having multiple councillors for each division should alleviate poor choices in regards to expenditure ensuring some level of oversight. Perhaps an added measure of candidate morale would be to have all candidates complete a Justices of the Peace course or similar prior to acceptance on the ballot.
294.	Mandatory Preferential Voting.
295.	not paying councillors, volunteers only with employees no CEO etc
296.	We should only have two levels of government Federal and Local Council the state level should be abolished as it is a complete waste of money
297.	State Government should look to their own ranks before meddling in our town
298.	A Divided divisional council with one councillor per division id far more representative than any other option. Residents have one person whom they can contact to discuss issues as opposed to having to contact many. It also allows far more persons to stand for election as it is not as costly as it would be if the option of undivided council was taken this would lead to only those with high disposable money a to stand. The one question not asked is should the councillors be part-time or full time. Both have their own pros and cons attached and I am unsure which I would prefer although I am leaning to part-time. I also believe that any previous long standing councillor of Ipswich should be ineligible to stand again for a councillor position as they have demonstrated their total incompetence to manage the cities well being. They have acted with something bordering on 'Criminal Neglect' of the city.
299.	Councillors should be held accountable for their actions. Councillors should not be allowed to 'reign' in a division as this allows less integrity and transparency. Councillors need to learn to work with the Council, within its policies and with other Council staff rather than doing what will get them the best publicity.
300.	No Thanks
301.	New Councillors !!!!!!!
302.	i note that the proposal is for 8 -12 councilors, we pay the highest rates of any council partly because we are over governed and surely a person can represent more that the 10,600 you are saying with 12 councilors
303.	no
304.	Ensure that there are a suite of strategies and plans to inform decision making and that staff make decisions based on the strategies. There needs to be extensive community consultation informing strategies and master plans so that upgrades/developments/ replacements are done with community input at the right time and in the right place.
305.	They should need to live within the division they are representing.
306.	Use the same one being used across most of the Council areas. There should be no difference between council areas.....
307.	I genuinely believe that the person who represents us should reside within the area they represent. It's very important to understand the issues unique to each division.
308.	If a divided model is preferred, a maximum term should be considered for the elected Councillor in that respective division.
309.	no
310.	Scrap all divisional seats and only have a mayor run the city

311. Having resided in other communities under other models, my preference is based on the experience that accountability disappears like the morning mist whenever responsibilities become shaded areas. Also, as evidenced in State and Federal politics, the broader the voting pool, the more it just becomes a popularity contest based on who can afford the most advertising. We do not need any more of that.
312. Maybe it is time to look at whether elected representatives are actually needed at a local level.
313. In my opinion, the CEO of Local Government should be reporting to a Permanent Secretary of the Local Government Ministry/Department who then reports to the Minister of Local Government. The locally elected State members representing the locality (e.g. Ipswich, Bundamba etc) within which the local governing authority oversees should be efficient and adequate enough in their capacity to represent their local electorate for any issues concerning their constituents. No need for a Divisional elected Local Government at all. This way the Public Service can be more professional in its delivery of services and also be efficient in the way in manages its day to day activities and operations.
314. Actually listening to the people. Probably the educated ones at that. Also not assuming you know what is best and making laws to back yourself. Its offensive. Stop playing God.
315. Would it be possible to limit the number of consecutive terms a lord mayor can sit?
316. It needs to change or we will end up with Councillors in charge of their own empire eg. [Removed] Div [Removed], [Removed] Div [Removed]
317. Can we please have an option 4? Maintain the status quo and not have Councillors at all? It seems that Ipswich is moving and progressing much better without them
318. Complete overhaul of the Environmental Protection Act and the Planning Act so as to allow adequate environmental assessment, authorisation/permitting and enforcement e.g. complete failure of the "task force" re odour from Swanbank to achieve any improvement.
319. No.
320. Respect my choice as you disrespected my vote
321. It would be nice to have a requirement for candidates to complete a JP course successfully prior to nominations. This would ensure a basic level of honesty and understanding of the justice system.
322. Keep same suburbs within divisions instead of splitting suburbs between divisions.
323. 2 councillor per area to ensure transparency
324. Significant cultural and governance problems stemmed from councillors having 'fiefdoms', which was caused by each councillor responsible for one division. Representing and setting strategic direction for the entire city should be the focus for all. The concern for Divided - 2 to 3 councillors per division is that councillors will either work against each other to compete for votes... or form a 'bloc' where their divisional interests and personal agenda overwhelm others.
325. I believe the role of a Councillor should be part time and not full time position. I also believe a Councillor should only serve two consecutive terms. This would allow for greater community participation and would not require Councillors to forego their occupation or profession.
326. There should be a limit on the number of times a councillor can be reelected. Also, the possibility of reelection should be performance or community satisfaction based via divisional boundary poll (non-compulsory)
327. no
328. That councillors,the mayor,CEO and COO can only serve a limited number of terms.
329. Area's like Rosewood ,Walloon,Marburg,be served by 1Councillor. The same with Springfield,Ripley ,Augustine Heights,Brookwater.I also think they should be Local people who live in the area,not someone who lives say North Ipswich,running for Springfield area.None of the sacked councillors should be allowed to run in the next council election. Some have been in council too long and old habits die hard.
330. Ipswich has a diverse range of properties now, I don't want to see people impacted because they aren't represented fairly ie I live on acreage and my concerns/issues are different to those that live in townhouses/units.
331. The fewer councillors the better, but enough for transparency.
332. I think we've seen enough of party politics, we've been bullied and let down by the Labour Party and we now want to have councillors represent the people again. No party should be involved with endorsing any candidate, there should be no party politics involved in local council. Everyone should run as independents, I don't want to see Labour Party members handing out on Election Day for candidates because the candidate is part of that party. Shame on the state government for their bulky tactics. Isn't that why they sacked our council?
333. Greater Springfield is a community within itself. Please don't split it into 2 divisions.
334. Each division need there own councilor, other wise they will be spread to thin and not be able to give 100%
335. Yes. A model requiring transparency

- 
336. I am a great believer in not changing from our current system. The old saying one bad apple doesn't spoil the whole bunch applied here.
- 
337. I haven't noticed not having a councillor in my division. The removal of the councillors has lessened the perceived level of bias that was involved. I would hope that removing councillors would reduce the every increasing rates in ICC
- 
338. Small towns are forgotten already when it comes to the dissemination of funding compared to the designer suburbs. We need someone to be our voice, someone to be your conscience.
- 
339. I believe one elected member per division is the best model for a large a growing city like Ipswich for the following reasons  
 1. It would be possible to have all Councillors elected from a certain section of the city if there were no divisions .  
 2. A local person elected within the division would normally know their division very well .  
 3. I believe it would create a "pecking order amongst elected members" if there were no divisions ie: an elected member could be elected with 70% of the vote down to 5% and everything in between .  
 4. I believe most Council's in SEQ have divisions with 1 Cr and it seems to be work well .
- 
340. There should 4 or 5 divisions each with two councillors made up of one male and one female so that there will always be an even number of men and women councillors
- 
341. One Councillor per division will give responsibility and accountability to that Councillor.
- 
342. A major disadvantage of the undivided model is not considered in the "Cons" listed. On past practices in Ipswich, each division averages 3 candidates leading to about 30 candidates across the region. Given the recent upheaval in council, this number may be significantly exceeded. There is no way an elector can make informed judgements about such a large number of candidates (similar to the senate ballot paper in many ways). This results in uninformed or poorly informed choices and councillors elected on insignificant % of votes. It virtually guarantees a council with little real popular support. It can and does work in less populated rural areas where the opportunity to know individual candidates is much greater. It would be a disaster in a diverse region such as Ipswich ranging from the heavily populated areas of Springfield and eventually Ripley to mall communities such as Rosewood. A maximum of 2 councillors per division and smaller more representative divisions is my real preference but the survey does not allow for that level of finer recommendation significantly diminishing the value of the survey.
- 
343. I recommend mandatory preferential voting be employed to ensure that every voter fully expresses their preferences for both council members and mayor.
- 
344. We need divisional representatives to ensure our local areas are properly serviced. In my experience, it has been beneficial to have a councillor in my area to raise important issues directly with and seek solutions; rather than having that become part of a wider group that will undoubtedly place less emphasis on my local needs. Local representatives covering my area have always been helpful in my 30 plus years as an Ipswich resident.
- 
345. Set amount of years they can be a Councillor eg 2 periods then not eligible for the next election but can run again the election after.
- 
346. An undivided model would go some way to stopping elected councillors from creating their own little enclaves which were one of the factors in the disgrace that was council previously.
- 
347. The existing divisional councillor option works well - it enables residents with local concerns to speak to a local representative who generally lives in and understands the area; it also is a much smaller electorate thus less expensive for independent local citizens to offer themselves for office - the cost of creating a citywide personal profile (from Springfield to Rosewood or Ripley to Karalee) would restrict elections to just wealthy individuals, people who have achieved citywide profiles through business or sports endeavours, or major political parties. Democracy should be of the people, by the people, for the people.
- 
348. an undivided council without divisions can easily turn into a situation whereby entire suburbs are without representation which is an appalling prospect and one which would just create further distrust in a city council that is already thought of exceptionally poorly.
- 
349. Review the basis of determining divisional boundaries with equal number of residents, or residents over voting age, or number of separate rateable lots (some lots being vacant), or total value of rateable land per division? Location of Divisions and position of boundaries. Do the new divisions have to replicate in any way the existing? Only use in the first instance readily identifiable physical boundaries such as major rivers and roads (rather than property boundaries.)
- 
350. The boundaries are not picked by on political party. Joh Belkepetersen is gone
- 
351. You need decisions so you have some to talk to directly which would save work the Ipswich city council. At least a council in a division can be their to talk too and try and defuse a problem or give time and one on one with the public
- 
352. The council (as an organisation) is dysfunctional. The election should be delayed for four years.
- 
353. From the accompanying papers, no divisional model is ideal.
-

- 
354. I want the model that is most likely to provide cohesion and representation of the city as a whole - ie. where all councillors are obliged to be across the issues for the whole city not just those in a particular division, which has been the case in the past, even despite the fact that they were meant to be across all issues. I would like to see proper education of new councillors on their responsibilities. I see the fact that candidates would have to campaign across the whole city as a small price to pay for more cohesion and it would require that they prove they understand the needs of the whole city and not just those of their divisions. Having a single councillor per division did not deliver good results, good governance or even proper representation for the electors of Ipswich. More councillors does not necessarily translate to better representation and costs ratepayers more money including for the running of divisional offices. Having councillor offices in the community, away from their main workplace made it possible for past councillors to hide, pursue their own interests and entrench themselves in their divisions as opposed to working for the whole City. I don't even see the need for Councillors to be necessarily full-time. If history is any guide, past councillors had too much time on their hands. I would also like to see more effective ECQ rules and penalties regarding the behaviour of councillors and their campaign workers and supporters during elections and monitoring of booths to capture inappropriate or undemocratic behaviour.
- 
355. Divisions. Keep council and councillors accountable.
- 
356. It should be made clear to all residents and councillors that there is significant governance responsibilities when elected and what those responsibilities are and why.
- 
357. If it was divisions again councillors should not have a combination of rural and city in their division. Country needs differ significantly to city. With the old model in our division the population is usually more in the city (Ipswich) then in the country. Allocation of funding tended to go more towards that area then the country towns and division outskirts. We were forgotten about time and time again. Councillors need to listen to the community more. Not just to those it seems will benefit the councillors own needs. I felt our old councillor had lost his way 15 yrs ago. He tended to be out of touch with reality in our division. Everything was being done backwards and not benefit us. The old councillor wanted us in the rural outskirts of the towns to stay in the 1800s but have estates built within town area. We were written off and forgotten even though our rates were willingly taken. So I would hope that a new council will stop building new areas and forgetting about older areas in need of infrastructure repair and needs. Such as roads. 1/2 - 1hr out of Ipswich is not out west. Give us some decent roads to drive on. We pay rates and deserve a bitumen road. The old excuse of too expensive and has always been like that just doesn't cut it anymore. Our ancestors and now us have lived here our whole lives, but we still get 2nd class infrastructure. Finally, a council and councillor works for the community. The old ones forgot they were not above the law. They just didn't care as they were to comfy in their jobs. I on many occasions felt bullied to the point of suicidal thoughts. I actually like not having a councillor. I like the idea of someone running the council that has no affiliation with the area and no biases. However, be it a divisional system or just mayor/administrator only 2 terms for everyone. Too much complacency and back door deals with councillors who continually know they will stay in the roll. Makes it refreshing and transparent to have a new person in the roll. Plus just like all other professionals there needs to be continual professional development. I'm not sure if many other councillors had a degree but they need to be more accountable to some other professional board. Not just a political party, state government. They are dealing with people's lives just like a doctor or solicitor.
- 
358. I think the government should appoint 8 councilors from nominees .making sure that no one so appointed has any conflict of interest with council management.
- 
359. A comprehensive check should be done on each candidate and the results made public to give the voters a greater knowledge of who they are voting for. You shouldn't depend on what the candidate says about him/her self. We should have the facts.
- 
360. Not specifically about the divisional model, but the influence of LGAQ needs to be heavily regulated/reviewed in order to remove the corruption that is impacting on ratepayers
- 
361. Model 2, Divided, led to such a power trip by the elected councillors. Many were unapproachable as the power seemed to go to their heads. And with power comes the behaviours we witnessed before the old council was fired (kudos to state government for that). At least with options 1 and 3 there's less chance of that happening.
- 
362. Maybe the government could look at the Ipswich City Boundaries as it must be a bit discerning for people living in the same suburb but some live in Ipswich and others in Brisbane.
- 
363. This is what is wrong with politics, you work for us not tge other way round, but you seem to have forgotten that. If the comunity need things done, do it. Stop the talking and the childist behaviour and get on with it.
- 
364. No
- 
365. You did the right thing overthrowing the incompetent and corrupt council.
- 
366. Keep State Politics out of Local Government
- 
367. What feedback from other Councils eg Noosa has been gathered to demonstrate local satisfaction of the model adopted there?
- 
368. The main point should be that of independent councillors not controlled by political factions that would have control over how various suburbs would receive favourable outcomes.
- 
369. I think the people's opinion should matter. The state government making the last decision was appalling. Give us the choice!
-



370.	Yes. Call the options by their correct names Undivided - FULL COLLUSION meaning No local representation. Divided - one councillor for each division - NO COLLUSION Individual local representation. Less chance of collusion. Divided - multiple councillors per division. LUKE WARM REPRESENTATION. Greater chance of fobbing off issues and greater chance of collusion.
371.	Not re elect former councillors
372.	The actual legal duties of Councillors
373.	I think we need to have specific councillors to go to with local issues & ideally they would have better knowledge of the issues/concerns that their own individual electorate have. Greater Springfield is growing, but the individual suburbs within it are closely linked for amenities etc so we should have 2/3 councillors representing us as a whole.
374.	Previous history of divided council in Ipswich. The relatively small area of Ipswich City. The availability of Community Offices covering all parts of the city. The need for a unified approach to planning in the city.
375.	Reduce the number of Councillors & Division to 7
376.	none
377.	yes they should never of removed my democratic right without consultation with the people
378.	Irrespective of model selected processes to ensure transparency and governance need to be implemented so that the changes recently effected have a chance to become embedded and the culture improved. Perhaps an annual external audit needs to be undertaken for the next 5 years with frequency reduced based on audit outcomes and a risk assessment.
379.	Divisions are important. Local councillors should be responsible and accountable to specific areas of the city. We do not need to turn into a mini state government, I want my local councillor to understand my area and be accessible.
380.	Ensure all councillors work together for the benefit of not only their division but the whole of the city
381.	Clearly the current model has not worked with parts of Ipswich CBD sadly neglected while the growth areas in Springfield and Ripley have the greatest focus. Hopefully a divided council with 2-3 councillors per ward would encourage cooperation and ensure that they work together for the who of the city.
382.	Yes each division should be represented by one man and one woman
383.	Allow past effective councillors to apply for re election.
384.	Yes like any job these days has performance reviews. If the electee doesn't do what they state they want to do in their pre election campaign there out not wait till next election on empty promises
385.	We don't want party politics in local council.
386.	Divided council but held accountable to each other and the area.
387.	Stay with an administrator. Everything is working well as it is. Too many Councillors have vested interests.
388.	I do Not believe the community will be represented adequately unless there is 1 councillor each division. Each councillor is then totally responsible for their community.
389.	Care about the people of Ipswich not be so greedy. Clean up Bell street & get rid of the scum
390.	Less Councillors rather than more. 4 divisions with 2 Councillors per division = 8 plus Mayor to give odd number and casting vote if required.

- 
391. Here are my opinions why I believe abolishing divisions will be a step backward for Ipswich. 1. The 2017 Ipswich City Mayoral By-Election proved that without boundaries, the ex councillors still had the same opportunities to win. The two candidates with the highest vote count in this election were, at the time, councillors. They had the popularity, funds via large donations and supporter base to gather all of those votes. This is no different to previous elections where both ran for council in their respective divisions. This proves that the removal of the council divisions does not lower the ex councillors ability to win future council elections should they decide to run. 2. Removing the division boundaries actually makes it harder for the average citizen to run for council. Running for council should be something that as many people as possible should have the opportunity to partake in. Factors like the cost to run an effective campaign should be as minimal as possible. Running a campaign for council in a division of approximately 12,000 voters costs much less than having to campaign all over Ipswich should the divisions be abolished. This will exclude a number of potentially great candidates due to the cost factor alone. Running for council should be open to as many people as possible and the current division structure accomplishes this nicely. 3. There will be lack of direct representation should the division boundaries be abolished in Ipswich. The candidates and those elected to council will focus their energies on the most densely populated areas of Ipswich to hopefully get the most votes and support. This will potentially leave certain parts of Ipswich without strong representation by the councillors. For example, Division 10 in Ipswich is mostly rural with a few sparse towns scattered within. Without a councillor directly focused to work hard for that part of Ipswich due to the divisions being potentially abolished, their needs could be potentially forgotten in favour of the needs of the more densely populated areas like the CBD and Springfield. 4. When a resident of Ipswich has a council issue it is obvious to whom they can seek support from to help get their issue sorted out. One of these people is their local councillor. Without clear divisions in Ipswich, it will not be clear to which councillor the resident should approach. The resident should not be forced to shop around and cherry pick the councillor each time they feel will help them with their issue. Every councillor should treat every issue with equal importance and thus having your local division councillor there makes it easier for the residents to start the process to having their issues sorted out. In conclusion I believe abolishing the council divisions for the Ipswich City Council does nothing to improve or hinder the ex councillors chances of re-election in 2020 should they decide to run. What abolishing the divisions does do, is make it harder for the average resident to make the commitment to stand up for their community and run for council as a candidate in the election. Also this removes the direct councillor representation that is an essential part of the more populated council areas like the Ipswich City Council. The push should be towards giving everyone more opportunities to run and hopefully the pool of candidates is of an overall higher quality because of it. That will ensure that the elected councillors are of a higher standard and there will be a higher chance they will follow the rules and not have a repeat of the issues that led to the sacking of the Ipswich City Council. Finally, the issues with the previous Ipswich City Council, as discussed in the WIndage report had nothing to do with the divisions. It was all caused by the councillors themselves. The 10 divisions with one councillor per division as an election model worked very well. A competent council can really run with the existing 10 divisional model and make a great council from it. I honestly believe the current system is what Ipswich needs. Better candidates will make for better councillors. Changing the divisions will not make better councillors. Thank you for your time.
- 
392. Do like BCC and give the councillors wards and not divisions
- 
393. The divisions need to change from current boundaries as they currently may reflect population changes but make little sense otherwise, crossing rivers, highways and other natural boundaries dividing communities with similar needs and issues that should be grouped together.
- 
394. Term limits for Mayors, 2 terms maximum. Term limits for Councillors 3 terms.
- 
395. Nil
- 
396. Previously sitting Councillors should not be allowed to nominate for the first election after the period of Administration. Regardless of wrongdoing (or not), all previously sitting Councillors dismissed in favour of the current administration process should have to wait until at least the 2nd election cycle (i.e. 2024 elections) to be eligible for election.
- 
397. Leave things alone, I can't believe what a waste of rate payers money this is.
- 
398. Moving to an undivided council requires the elected members to represent the whole of Ipswich not only their division. This enables scarce resources to be invested in priority areas rather than the divisions where the councillor has the louder voice.
- 
399. So many residents are happy with the current arrangement in place. We have the concern that certain past councillors are going to run again and whilst they won't get in they will be painful to listen to while campaigning. Current arrangement is keeping certain staff that are still employed on a leash open it back up like it was and your gonna have problems again.. But overall 1 division instead of having too many monkeys in the zoo would work.
- 
400. Redbank plains is ridiculously large both in size and population. Services need to be allocated to this suburb properly, connect it to the centenary highway, provide two train stations and divide it into smaller areas. Limited funds go into this suburb except the token community centre which was a waste when they could have injected life into the library if done properly. Redbank plains always gets a bad rap for issues but on a population ratio to issues it's not bad at all. Change the boundaries to reflect how the state of each area actually is.
- 
401. If divisional boundaries are in place, I would like to see rural communities represented separately from urban communities. Councillors should have a use by date, maybe 2 or 3 terms, with 1 extra as Mayor elect.
- 
402. Do we need Councillors?
-

- 
403. I prefer a councillor that knows my division. I don't believe that a councillor will have an intimate knowledge of the whole city area. People in Booval aren't that interested in what is happening in Springfield. Also I think it will result in a few councillors being snowed under by requests because they want to help people.
- 
404. no
- 
405. Part time Councillors - ensuring they have the city's best interests at heart and not just in it as a job or gravy train.
- 
406. Think of all the rate payers, homeowners and renters. Even though Ipswich had division areas previously not all towns/ suburbs were treated the same in that division and this mainly happened in rural areas.
- 
407. Make the amount of councillors elected no more than 8
- 
408. Ipswich is only getting bigger therefore infrastructure needs to be increased to cater for this, residents need to be listened to as they are the ones who reside in this region.
- 
409. No long term incumbent Councillors. This role should have a maximum 2-3 terms.
- 
410. Being a councillor shouldn't be a full-time form of employment.
- 
411. The current councillors division allocation works fine. Its the past corruption of certain individual councillors and administration staff that needed to be stamped out and addressed. Hopefully those types of practices can be monitored for in the future with whatever of the 3 models council chooses to adopt.
- 
412. My decision is based on what would be best for the greater good of Ipswich. The 1 councillor per division model, continues the parochial mindset that has obviously dogged ICC for so many years, this is definitely my least preferred option. Thank you for the opportunity to be involved in the consultation process.
- 
413. Make it mandatory that anyone running and elected to Council holds an area of expertise related to government AND a professional or cultural discipline experience. ALL MUST HAVE A HIGHER EDUCATION! You wouldn't want a doctor operating on you that has never done surgery before, so why have councillors run a council that don't have government experience (where you learn the basics about law and ethics) and basic business qualifications. It speaks volumes having unqualified people in positions of power, the [Removed] is a prime example. ALSO, ensure their is gender and age parity - 50/50 council officers which includes people of all generations - no more just baby boomers! Its time to say goodbye to the 'privileged baby-boomer white boys club' crap that destroyed Ipswich Council in the first place.
- 
414. Get on with it.
- 
415. There needs to be much better integration between the 'old' established Ipswich (Booval to Rosewood) and the newer suburban areas (eastern areas). The division (and animosity) between these areas is damaging to the city's overall growth and potential.
- 
416. How can a councillor work for an area they don't live in. Councillor should be a resident of the zone they are representing.
- 
417. No Councillors at all!
- 
418. No
- 
419. The previously removed counsellors must be excluded from standing at the next election
- 
420. Undivided to stop the Councillors having singular interests for their own division rather than the interests of the whole of Council.
- 
421. Undivided would widen the field to get us smarter councillors. The risk with undivided is that councillors would 'pass the buck'. Better for them to have some accountability back to a geographic boundary. A few in each division might lend some different perspectives.
- 
422. Better representation of the people instead of councillors trying on the look at me look at me, I did this so elect me. Less wasting ratepayer money
- 
423. Ensure that the division boundaries follow a clear, non changing boundary such as a road
- 
424. An undivided council won't build true representation of a diverse community as it will be only open for the rich and famous due to campaign costs.
- 
425. 2 councillors for 5 Divisions and 1st and 2nd Past the post declared elected. - no preferential voting to prevent teams forming as candidates in divisions.
- 
426. I am grateful that each citizen has the opportunity to have their opinion heard and I trust that the state government will respect the views of the majority of citizens in our community on this issue, whether or not that majority view aligns with my personal preference. Thank you for finally hearing our voices! Please make the results of this survey public once it closes. We have a right to know how our community responded.
- 
427. If an 'Undivided' or 'Divided - 2 to 3 Councillors per division' is chosed, the location where the Councillor is to be based should be included on the ballot paper. This will ensure the community has the opporunity to nominate candidates from a broad geographical area, rather than just on name recognition only.
-

428.	We need less Councillors, stop the backyard mentality. They should be part time and focus on greater good and public policy not the small things.
429.	No need for divisions. Can still have a good and fair representation of the community across all of Ipswich without dividing Ipswich up into sections. Councillors cannot lobby to get more for there divisions if there are no borders.
430.	The former councillors SHOULD NOT be able to run again.
431.	No point changing what worked because of the minority were bad eggs
432.	Maximum Time they can serve before becoming In eligible to run again stopping culture of the same people controlling the city
433.	An undivided council would be terrible for transparent politics in Ipswich and council in general. It would lead to those with the greatest amount of money (or party money) winning as they will have the greatest ability to spend on advertising. Over time it will effectively rule out candidates with smaller budgets. Ultimately if the mayor has a fair and balanced view, and has the city's best interest at heart than no division should be worse off than another.
434.	We should not have state governments, it just be local and federal
435.	Yes. [Removed] should not be re-elected under any circumstances.
436.	Yes leave the current model alone.
437.	Previous elected members should be not be allowed to nominate.
438.	The size of the areas being serviced & having ALL councillors available for every corner of their area. Don't ignore some just because they're on a dirt road or only a few live there, while other parts get all the attention.
439.	My only concern is that Party politics may impact on the election results given that a candidate with a party affiliation will have access to more resources with their campaigns than a truly independant candidate.
440.	That councillors can only in their position for 2 election cycles. We need more diversity and less complacency. We need councillors who truly work for the community and not themselves.
441.	Toowoomba Council's model - remove the boundaries and give the opportunity of committee portfolios (i.e. Growth and Infrastructure, Economic Development, Communities, Environment, Governance) with a few Councillors (2-3) in each portfolio.
442.	The allocation and use of discretionary funds is inappropriate, all council funding should be expensed with the same level of governance and transparency.
443.	While my personal preference is one coucillor per division I don't feel that model is appropriate for Ipswich at present.
444.	None of previous councillors should be allowed to run in the 2020 election. They either knew about the corruption, were part of it, did not report any suspect behaviour or turned their backs on what was happening.
445.	Councillors have portfolio's they work on eg- Homelessness, Domestic Violence etc. This still allows them to work across the city but on specific portfolios.
446.	Former councillors should be barred from running.
447.	Get rid of Electorate Offices.
448.	Undivided please and reduce numbers of Councillors
449.	Part time Councillors meaning that have to have made it in some part of society and to prevent them from dominating day to day activities. Act as a board of directors and not running the day to day activities.
450.	Organisationly, The current model works, why change it
451.	Whatever you decide to do please fix the walk connecting from mall to Riverlink. The state of the transition area is a disgrace and you should all be ashamed.

- 
452. DIVIDE THE DIVISIONS INTO 4: NORTH, SOUTH, EAST, WEST with each division having 2 office staff and all said Councillors to work part time and paid accordingly then see if they are capable of doing what they are elected for.
- No previous Councillors should be eligible to stand again. They knew what was going on, and if they didn't they should have, no excuses.
- The Councillor that was in Division 10, if you sucked up to him he fell all over you, if you didn't you got no help whatsoever.
- We don't need a Mayor, we want to move forward from the past and progress which will not happen if we have the same Councillors, Mayor and Deputy Mayor as in the past. We can appoint the CEO of Ipswich to do the job of Mayor.
- Where did the 50 Million they wasted on that Mall and the 20 Million for the footpaths go, where did it go?
- These past Councillors ruined our once beautiful city, it will never be the same again, no matter how much ratepayers money is spent. The past Councillors should have been made to pay for the work in the Mall and never be allowed to sit in Council again. The people have had a gut full of them all. Let's get some honest people to do the job.
- 
453. I believe that we should have divisions with a Councillor for each division. With a divisional Councillor all parts of Ipswich City Council area would equally represented. A Councillor would ensure that his or her division would receive adequate funding from Council's budget.
- If there is a single ballot paper covering the whole council area voters in heavily populated areas could return a higher ratio of Councillors especially candidates who reside in their areas. Lower populated suburbs especially areas like Woodend, Rosewood, Tivoli and Pine Mountain will lose out and some Councillors would disregard voter representations from their areas and suffer no backlash. This situation will lead to the setting up of more suburban action groups who perceived bias to certain areas to their detriment.
- A divisional Councillor would be more in tune with his or her constituents and would be quick to respond to their complaints.
- 
454. Total area of ICC (Ipswich City Council) is 1204 km<sup>2</sup>. I have lived in the ICC Division 10 (old) for 20+ years and I know that a Councillor from a high residential division will have limited appreciation for my concerns or ideas. We all pay for the right to representation and I believe Councillors should be accessible to the residents and have an understanding of what is happening within their boundary.
- 
455. Ipswich is growing, one person per division as it was before. Do not want to be made to vote preferential if I choose not to.
- \$10,000 sufficient to run, campaign but those running for first time should be allowed at least \$3000 more to cover, signs, apparel and other booth needs.
- Listen to the people and what we want!! We had good people in council who did not deserve the treatment received, due to one or two other actions.
- My fear is now we will get crazy people elected and create a bigger problem.
- Keep all divisions, as those who run know what their area needs.
- 
456. Strong council do their best for their division.
- 
457. Take down the name Pisasale Drive out at Yamanto. Absolute disgrace never want to hear about any Councillors – all a disgrace
- 
458. When we have upheaval like we have seen in this council and others we look to the system and think it is broke. It's not. The humans are broke each section of our city has different needs so therefore we 10-12 different divisions a strong councillor should be able to stand up for his/her division. Although not simple as it would require law change, limit councillors to 2-3 terms only, new ideas, new faces, less self interest.
- 
460. Divided – after winning the vote the elected councillor should have some support in the division from the locals. It would be expected that the councillor would be aware of the local problems and areas of concern. For a problem in a division there would be less chance of buck passing or lack of knowledge for a problem in this arrangement. People would have a better idea in the division as to the performance of each councillor for the next election vote.
- Undivided – The candidates would need to be aware that running for council would be a more costly exercise than the divided concept. The result could be a number of candidates elected from a more affluent area "say Springfield". These people may not have the local knowledge with regards to decisions in the country area "say Rosewood". With this system at the next election time how do the people know who has performed and who has sat on their hands. This system over time would lead to party policy in local council which is not in the best interests of councils and a concept I disagree with.
- 
461. One councillor per division. But have fewer divisions than last time.
- 
462. The waste of money spent on a mall who needs one now. We need a good bus service. Its good idea library going near station and we need a community hall with low rental office space for our older community to gather to play bowls indoors, table tennis, card games, gentle exercise, boccia. The old transport building could be turned into such a place. With the bus dropping people off at the door. Thank you.
-

- 
463. I would prefer the organisation of all Councils to stay the way they are organised. The 3 councils the other night were different but they seemed to be working very successfully. Thank you.
- 
464. In this context, I believe that preferential voting is not appropriate and should not be introduced.
- 
465. 1 – Less councillors, office staff handle most day to day issues.  
 2 – Define the roll and responsibilities of councillors.  
 3 – Review garbage charges.  
 4 – Incentive for residents who mow and maintain nature strip.  
 5 – Parking availability Ipswich city.  
 6 – Traffic flow and traffic light sinkrization.
- 
466. HANDS OFF!!!
- 
467. Greetings and thank you for the opportunity to make input into the design of our future council.
- I have a strong background in election matters having supervised and consulted on both Australian and international elections at all levels of government. My Dad worked for local government for 27 years giving me additional insight into the operations and problems of this level of government. I have also read the CCC Windage report
- Culture and corruption risks in local government: Lessons learned from an investigation into Ipswich City Council (Operation Windage) - PDF (13MB)
- and all discussion material provided by the current administrator. I have a statistics major in my degree and a long history of applying statistical analyses in a range of areas. I believe this gives me the background to make the following comments.
- Unlisted major disadvantage of the undecided model
- A major disadvantage of the undivided model is not considered in the "Disadvantages" listed. On past practices in Ipswich, each division averages 3 candidates leading to about 30 candidates across the region. Given the recent upheaval in council, this number may be significantly exceeded. There is no way an elector can make informed judgements about such a large number of candidates (similar to the senate ballot paper in many ways).
- This results in uninformed or poorly informed choices and councillors elected on insignificant % of votes. It virtually guarantees a council with little real popular support. It can and does work in less populated rural areas where the opportunity to know individual candidates is much greater. It would be a disaster in a diverse region such as Ipswich ranging from the heavily populated urban areas of Springfield and eventually Ripley to small rural communities such as Rosewood.
- Survey inadequacy
- A maximum of 2 councillors per division and smaller more representative divisions is my real preference but the survey does not allow for that level of finer recommendation significantly diminishing the value of the survey. This option is probably the best option for the diversity of the Ipswich area to ensure a diversity of representation within and across divisions. councillors elected under this model would generally enjoy substantial community support within their division providing an overall greater sense of ownership of and loyalty to the elected council.
- I welcome further discussion on this issue should you wish to contact me.
- 
468. Please leave boundary/ divisional/ councillor allocations as they were in 2016/17/18. It worked a treat and would continue to do so.
-

---

469. I note your announcement seeking input from Ipswich residents on the shape of the elected council from 2020. I wish to make the following observations. The record has shown that the current system gave us:

- Many millions of dollars “disappeared” and only a “dead heart” (Ipswich City Mall) to show for it
- The progressive demise of CBD businesses including since the beginning of 2019 - Event Cinemas, Gemutlich kitchenware and Cactus Espresso - with others merely hanging on.
- The moniker “Dump capital” due to numerous waste operations degrading our lifestyle and reputation, with no end in sight
- Soul-less, “sardine city”, heat-sink housing developments where the proximity of houses is a fire hazard, attended by devastation of natural habitat, lifestyle degradation and social dysfunction in the making
- Secretive council companies whose activities and expenditure were opaque to public scrutiny
- Council meeting minutes, informative only for their catalogue of real or perceived conflicts of interest
- Dysfunctional governance, ill-informed and poor decision-making
- Questionable development decisions
- A lack of community consultation in deliberations where the only “stakeholders” consulted were developers, waste operators and mining companies
- Self-interested and entitled councillors, secure in personal fiefdoms and unaccountable for expenditure of public money
- A terrible toll on Council public servants
- A former [Removed] and associates jailed for official corruption, with alleged corruption by others including 2 [Removed] yet to be tested in the courts

A shameful litany for which several terms of Ipswich City Council are responsible. I do not want a return to the status quo.

I have long considered that divisional boundaries do not reflect the interests of the communities within those divisions and I note that the Divisional Boundary Model Review Background Discussion Paper contains several examples. I believe an undivided Council is the best way forward, with a reduced number of Councillors (maximum 8, plus the Mayor). Successful candidates in an undivided Council would need to be the choice of the whole City, not just the first or second choice of a few thousand electors in divisions. The elected Council should be a smaller, more cohesive, open and accountable unit, working within more strictly defined parameters.

In an undivided council, councillors would have to work for the good of the whole city, not just their own divisions. They should never again be able to say, as [Removed] did on radio 612ABC on 20 March 2018 in reference to dumps, that the problem was not in his division therefore he was not aware of it. Furthermore, no Councillor should be able to say, as has also happened - is that a problem in my division? I was not aware of it! And despite being a volunteer community organisation working for justice for Ipswich residents living with the waste industry, Ipswich Residents Against Toxic Environments (IRATE) never enjoyed the support of Councillors. It is worth noting that since the dismissal of councillors last August, there appears to be more rigour exercised by Council's Planning and Development Department in the assessment of waste and other industry development applications. It would seem reasonable to conclude then, that the existence of 10 divisions and divisional councillors did not translate to better community outcomes.

---

I also believe that we should return to the model of part-time councillors, people who represent the interests of the community but do not get involved in the minutiae of daily Council administration which is the role of the CEO and their staff. This model would likely attract more community-minded and less self-interested candidates. Many years ago, councillors were paid an honorarium and had day jobs. “Councillor” was not a “job for life”. It is notable that the majority of councillors dismissed in August 2018 or who earlier resigned, had been in the job for between 14 and 39 years. Most of those had been councillors for at least 18 years, while those more recently elected were advantaged in the race by being friends, anointed successors and/or former staffers of politicians and retiring councillors. We now see the results of that kind of tenure. I also believe that political parties have no relevance to the community in local level governance.

Finally, while recognising that some form of elected representation is necessary at local level in a democratic society, I have found that during the period of Administration, if something needed to be done or communicated, I simply contacted the Council. Administration has demonstrated that over the short term at least and as long as the culture is sound, Council functions perfectly well without councillors.

Thank you for the opportunity of submitting an opinion on this very important topic.

---

470. I am writing in response to articles written in the Queensland Times recently. It has been my opinion for a number of years, that to have a successful local council, looking after the local community issues, politics has to be removed. No Councillor should belong to any political party, to allow an independent view for the good of the city. A clean slate of new representatives will assist to rid the administration of past culture of corruption. Ipswich needs people of integrity, and not jobs for the girls and boys who belong to political parties.

---

- 
471. Hi. The survey finished very suddenly and there no chance to go back and add explanatory comments. I opted for the 2 (-3) Councillor per division model. Or 2nd whole council model. Worst is current system. My overriding reason is that I consider this 'shared' model will reduce the opportunity for corruption. Getting 2 or more divisional Councillors to agree to do something dodgy is not eliminated but reduced. Other background reasons are:
- The current 1 Councillor per division resulted in some councillors being very hard on Council staff to push their pet project. At times, this really caused problems for staff. Effectively bullying by some councillors. In fact, Councillors should not have access to staff except through the departmental manager. That is how the elected members and staff should function.
- A very senior Councillor told me that if the divisional councillor did not object, applications would likely go through. Very dangerous. Spread the responsibility around a bit, and make the committee system truly, not just in theory, a Council wide committee, not a defacto divisional thing.
- The current 'slush fund' is also fraught with danger. Surely all decisions re expenditure should be approved by full council, not a by a single councillor with little practical oversight. Maybe in theory there was oversight but in practice it was very poor governance and open to abuse.
- And all donations to organizations, all signage around the streets should be on behalf of Council, not given by the individual councillor.
- It is not their money; it is the Council/ratepayers money and the current system is wrong.
- The shared Division system worked very well in the previously surrounding Moreton Shire Council : 2-3 councillors per Ward. and that was a very open Council.
- 
472. It is better to have separate Divisions because the members know that those that are elected KNOW the Division and what is happening in that area. In my Family there are 3 eligible voters and we are all in different Divisions. We knew who to contact when there was a problem and it was looked into and the members gave us their feedback so we were well informed. IF it goes any other way there will be confusion because we will not be privy to this and we also could have problems not knowing who will be getting back to us (IF ANYONE EVER DOES) and what progress has been made. I have lived in various places with various Councils and have come to the conclusion that IF IPSWICH goes any other way NOTHING will get done and there will be no feedback given to our enquiries. Let IPSWICH stay this way and have a CITY that cares about it's PEOPLE and NOT CARE ABOUT THEMSELVES ALL THE TIME because that is what happens in some places around AUSTRALIA. Let's be UNIQUE and others MIGHT think about why IPSWICH is such a nicer place to LIVE, VISIT etc.
- 
473. Ipswich, Help Shape Your Future Council
- The Discussion paper says: "Councillors are responsible for planning for the future and developing corporate plans and strategies to achieve their goals and deliver outcomes to the whole community, and monitoring the performance of the council against these." "Deliver outcomes for the whole community." This implies that it would be best to do away with divisions. With divisions, the Councillor is likely to see their role as representing the people in their area, with little attention to integrated planning for the whole council area. "Monitoring the performance of the council against these." This has been the problem with our last council. There was little oversight and all Councillors appeared to be a comfortable group who agreed with each other and with little controversy. This is the result of the divisional system where Councillors basically simply represented the majority of voters in each division with no input from minority opinions. Basically, a first past the post system. The Toowoomba situation was no better because it was also a first past the post system without preferential voting. Voters were simply required to mark just 10 candidates and no more. This means that if voters selected minority candidates, they had no say as to which of the more popular candidates were selected. Both models result in only majority viewpoints, with no input from alternative ideas. This results in a council with little or no oversight and this was what led to the problems with our outgoing council. Unless this is corrected, we will eventually end up with the same problems with our new council. The only way this can be corrected is to have a proportional representational system. In this way, minority viewpoints can be put forward and should result in better informed and considered decisions as well as better oversight. To achieve this, voting should be by the preferential system and voters should be required to number all boxes so that their opinions and desires are fully expressed. Ideally, votes should be counted by the quota preferential system. This gives greater power to second preferences of people giving first preferences to a less popular candidate than occurs in the usual bottom up counting system. The result is closer to true proportional representation.
- Alternatively, the Shoalhaven system, as outlined by their mayor at the meeting, resulted in a diverse council. They had a few large divisions with several Councillors in each. We should ideally have four Councillors in each division to ensure proportional representation. Counting in their case was by the quota preferential system.
- Conclusion
- To ensure the best planning for the entire council area, and proper scrutiny of decisions, we need proportional representation in an undivided Council elected by the quota preferential system.
- 
474. If you want a more comprehensive survey of public opinion regarding composition of divisions or no divisions, We suggest you arrange a ballot paper to be sent out to everyone with their rate notices because that way every household could have an input which would be much more representative than the 150 plus people who attended the recent forum.
- Many people from Rosewood and other outer suburbs may not have been able to attend.
- Also because it was at night-time many oldies like us did not attend.
- We know you have a difficult job to do and we appreciate the work you are doing.
-






Ipswich City Council  
PO Box 191, Ipswich QLD 4305, Australia


Phone (07) 3810 6666  
council@ipswich.qld.gov.au  
ipswich.qld.gov.au

---

**Join us online:**

 /ipswichCityCouncil

 /ipswichCouncil

 /ipswich-city-council

 /ipswichCityCouncilTV

# **APPENDIX C**

## **Proposed Determination Report**

Electoral  
Arrangement  
& Divisional  
Boundary Review

---

**2019 PROPOSED DETERMINATION**  
IPSWICH CITY COUNCIL

## Contents

INTRODUCTION .....	3
Endorsement of report.....	3
ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENT DECISION .....	4
Reasoning .....	4
DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW.....	5
Determining the quota .....	6
THE PROPOSED BOUNDARIES .....	6
Table 1 – Current and Projected Quota for Four Multi-Member Divisions .....	6
Table 2 – Current and Projected Enrolment for the Proposed Electoral Divisions .....	7
Division 1 .....	7
Division 2 .....	8
Division 3 .....	8
Division 4 .....	8
COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL INVITED .....	9
FINALISING THE REVIEW .....	9
IMPLEMENTATION .....	9

<b>APPENDIX A</b>	Minister’s Referral
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	Ipswich City Council Report
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	Maps

## INTRODUCTION

The *Local Government Act 2009 (Qld)* (the Act) provides for a Local Government Change Commission (Change Commission). The Change Commission is an independent body that assesses whether proposed changes to Queensland's local councils are in the public interest.

On 7 May 2019, the Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs, The Honourable Stirling Hinchliffe MP referred an electoral arrangement and divisional boundary review of the Ipswich City Council (the Council). The Minister's referral is available to view at Appendix A.

The Minister referred the *City of Ipswich Divisional Boundary Review Report* (the Report), commissioned by the Council's Interim Administrator, and requested the Change Commission review the recommended option from the Report (see Appendix B).

The change proposed was for the Council to have four multi-member divisions, instead of the current 10 single-member divisional arrangement. A single-member division has one councillor representing it, whereas a multi-member division can have more than one councillor per division.

The Change Commission for this review consists of:

- Mr Pat Vidgen, Electoral Commissioner; and
- Mr Wade Lewis, Casual Commissioner.

The Casual Commissioner was appointed by the Governor in Council on 1 November 2018.

### Endorsement of report

This report outlines the Change Commission's electoral arrangement determination and the proposed boundaries for the electoral divisions of the Ipswich City Council.



**Pat Vidgen PSM**  
Electoral Commissioner



**Wade Lewis**  
Casual Commissioner

## ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENT DECISION

The Change Commission has conducted an independent review of whether the Council's electoral arrangements should be changed from single-member to multi-member divisions. Following its assessment, the Change Commission considers the proposed change to multi-member divisions to be in the public interest.

The Change Commission recommends the Ipswich City Council be redivided into four (4) multi-member divisions with two (2) councillors representing each division. This means Ipswich would have nine (9) councillors in total (eight (8) councillors and a mayor).

Under current legislation, the voting system for this electoral arrangement is first-past-the-post. For information about this voting system, please see the Electoral Commission of Queensland's (ECQ) website.

### Reasoning

In reviewing the proposed change for the Ipswich City Council, the Change Commission was cognisant that it would represent a significant alteration to long-standing electoral arrangements. It was therefore of the view that there would need to be compelling reasons to assess such a change as being in the public interest.

In this regard, the Change Commission generally looked for evidence that:

- there was demonstrated community support for the proposed change;
- the proposed arrangement would be more workable than the existing one, especially when considering Council's current and projected enrolment, and the likely need to accommodate rapid growth in some areas; and/or
- the proposed change was consistent with the 'local government principles' set out in section 4 of the Act, such as decision-making in the public interest, and ensuring democratic representation, social inclusion and meaningful community engagement.

The Change Commission determined that while both single-member and multi-member divisions will provide the community-specific representation that is important to Ipswich residents, multi-member divisions are more likely to meet the criteria outlined above.

On the strength of the evidence presented in the *Report*, including the results from extensive public consultation, multi-member divisions were found to be the preferred option. While there was clearly support shown for both single-member and undivided electoral arrangements, there was also strong opposition to both systems. On the other hand, multi-member divisions were found to be supported by a greater number of people:

- nearly 90% of respondents ranked multi-member divisions as either their first or second preference;
- 75% of respondents who preferred undivided arrangements, voted multi-member divisions second; and
- nearly 90% of respondents who preferred single-member divisions, voted multi-member divisions second.

The Change Commission also noted that multi-member divisions provide greater scope to have more councillors representing rural areas within the Council area, offering the opportunity for more inclusive representation and engagement with the community. The Change Commission considers this relevant given its awareness that a key community concern in the region is a perceived lack of rural representation under current arrangements. The following points about rural representation paraphrase public comments in the *Report*:

- rural areas need their own representation;
- people living in urban areas, have little understanding of the reality of life in rural or semi-rural areas;
- small towns need a voice, if they do not have someone allocated to them that lives in the area, they will be forgotten;
- without divisional councillors, it's less likely that a councillor will be elected from the smaller communities and the urban councillors will not understand the needs of the rural sector; and
- Ipswich has a mix of country and city and needs divisions to meet everyone's needs.

Having fewer divisions enables the Change Commission to place larger amounts of rural areas within them and means that residents in these areas are being directly represented by more councillors. Indeed, under the Change Commission's proposed boundaries, rural communities in Ipswich will have half the divisional councillors directly representing their areas.

The Change Commission deliberated on whether four or five multi-member divisions would be in the public interest for the Ipswich local government area. It was decided that four divisions, with two councillors each, would cater for the current council size, while providing scope to add additional councillor/s to all or some of the divisions as communities expand and elector numbers increase.

## **DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW**

The Change Commission must ensure each division of the Council has a reasonable proportion of enrolled voters, herein referred to as 'quota'. Where possible, community interests, such as uniting entire suburbs within divisions and selecting easy-to-identify boundaries, have also been considered.

Assessments are conducted in any way the Change Commission deems appropriate, unless the Minister has provided specific directions.

The process for this review is as follows:

1. Publish the Change Commission's proposal
2. Invite comments on the proposal
3. Publish the Change Commission's final determination report
4. Final determination report provided to the Minister for Local Government, for implementation by the Governor in Council
5. New boundaries come into effect at the 2020 Local Government Quadrennial Election

### Determining the quota

A quota is determined by dividing the total number of enrolled voters by the number of councillors (other than the mayor), plus or minus 10%. The Change Commission also considers projected enrolment, so the divisions remain in quota for as long as possible.

Current enrolment data has been sourced from Queensland's electoral roll and projected enrolment data from the Queensland Government Statistician's Office of Queensland Treasury. Projections are based on the timing of future local government quadrennial elections.

Enrolment information is organised around 'Statistical Areas Level 1 (SA1)'. SA1s are geographical units used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) for the release of census data. According to the ABS most SA1s have a population of between 200 to 800 persons with an average population of approximately 400 people.

Current and projected enrolment data are available for download on the ECQ website.

### THE PROPOSED BOUNDARIES

The Ipswich City Council has 128,049 voters and will be divided into four multi-member divisions, with two councillors per division and a mayor.

Table 1 shows the Council's current enrolment quota as at 31 January 2019 and the quota projected for 31 March 2024 under a four division multi-member arrangement.

<b>Table 1 – Current and Projected Quota for Four Multi-Member Divisions</b>		
	<b>31 January 2019</b>	<b>31 March 2024</b>
<b>Number of divisions</b>	4	4
<b>Councillors per division</b>	2	2
<b>Enrolment</b>	128,049	165,213
<b>Quota per division</b>	32,012 <i>(16,006 voters per councillor)</i>	41,303 <i>(20,652 voters per councillor)</i>
<b>Quota (+10%) per division</b>	35,213	45,433
<b>Quota (-10%) per division</b>	28,811	37,173



Table 2 shows the current and projected enrolment for the proposed multi-member divisions. Maps are available to view in Appendix C and interactive maps are on the ECQ website.

<b>Table 2 – Current and Projected Enrolment for the Proposed Electoral Divisions</b>				
<b>Division</b>	<b>Enrolment as at 31/01/2019</b>	<b>(%) Deviation from Quota</b>	<b>Projected Enrolment as at 31/03/2024</b>	<b>(%) Deviation from Quota</b>
Division 1	28,854	-9.87	44,796	8.46
Division 2	33,189	3.68	43,297	4.83
Division 3	35,070	9.55	38,790	-6.08
Division 4	30,936	-3.36	38,330	-7.2

The Change Commission modelled several options and liaised with the Council regarding these scenarios, helping to develop a better understanding of community concerns and local experiences before settling on the proposed model.

The proposed boundaries bring enrolment in each division into quota for the 2020 Local Government Quadrennial Election, while also catering for the significant growth projected in certain parts of the region. The Change Commission has made a concerted effort to unite suburbs and their communities of interest within individual divisions and has used clearly discernible boundaries where practicable.

One of the key community concerns identified by the Council and in the *Report* was that rural communities did not believe they had the representation they required. The proposal has sought to address these concerns, with the proposed Divisions 1 and 4 including a mix of urban and significant portions of rural areas. In doing so, rural residents will have four councillors, or half of the divisional councillors, with some responsibility for rural suburbs.

### **Division 1**

Division 1 is the largest of the four divisions and amalgamates both rural and urban suburbs. It contains areas with significant projected growth, such as the Ripley and surrounding localities. The Change Commission has deliberately brought the current enrolment as close to the lower limit of the quota as possible, thereby creating boundaries that unite suburbs and that are more likely to support more than a single election cycle.

The Division is oriented in a west-east direction and includes the following suburbs: Grandchester, Mount Mort, Mount Walker West, Lower Mount Walker, Calvert, Ebenezer, Mount Forbes, Jeebropilly, Willowbank, Mutdapilly, Purga, Peak Crossing, Goolman, Deebling Heights, Raceview, Flinders View, Ripley, South Ripley, White Rock, Swanbank, Blackstone, and Redbank Plains.

**Division 2**

Division 2 is a mostly urban electorate that includes those suburbs towards the eastern end of the Council. The proposed boundary contains several well-established suburbs, so that both the current and projected enrolment is close to the quota. The Division has united all the suburbs in the area, except for Goodna and Redbank. It was not possible from an enrolment perspective to have Goodna or Redbank entirely contained in either Division 2 or Division 3, and therefore, prominent roads including the Ipswich Motorway, Stuart Street, Redbank Reserve / greenspace area and Kruger Parade have been selected as a boundary.

The Division is oriented in a north-south direction and includes the following suburbs: Spring Mountain, Springfield Lakes, Springfield Central, Springfield, Brookwater, Augustine Heights, Bellbird Park, Camira, Carole Park, Gales and some of Goodna and Redbank.

**Division 3**

Division 3 contains many of the central Ipswich suburbs. As suburbs are mostly well-established, the amount of growth projected is limited when compared to Division 1. The Change Commission has therefore deliberately brought the current enrolment as close to the upper limit of the quota as possible. In doing so, the boundaries unite suburbs and are more likely to support more than a single election cycle.

The Division is oriented in a west-east direction and includes the following suburbs: One Mile, Leichhardt, Coalfalls, Sadliers Crossing, West Ipswich, Woodend, Ipswich, Basin Pocket, East Ipswich, Newtown, Eastern Heights, Silkstone, Booval, North Booval, Bundamba, Ebbw Vale, New Chum, Dinmore, Riverview and Collingwood Park. It also includes a part of Wulkuraka that lies south of the railway line, most of Redbank excluding those houses situated east of Kruger Parade and includes part of Goodna that falls west of Stuart Street.

**Division 4**

As with Division 1, this Division amalgamates both rural and urban suburbs. It contains areas with significant projected growth, such as the Rosewood and Marburg suburbs.

The Division is oriented in a west-east direction and includes the following suburbs: Woolshed, The Bluff, Ashwell, Lanefield, Rosewood, Tallegalla, Marburg, Mount Marrow, Thagoona, Walloon, Haigslea, Ironbark, Pine Mountain, Blacksoil, Karrabin, Amberley, Yamanto, Churchill, Brassall, Muirlea, North Ipswich, Tivoli, Moores Pocket, North Tivoli, Chuwar, Karalee, Barellean Point and most of Wulkuraka that lies north of the railway line.

## COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL INVITED

Comments on the proposed boundaries for the four multi-member divisions are invited until 30 July 2019 and can be lodged through:

### Online Form

<https://ecq.qld.gov.au/lgr/ipswich>

### Email

[LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au](mailto:LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au)

### Personal Delivery (*Mon-Fri 9am – 5pm*)

Electoral Commission of Queensland  
Level 20, 1 Eagle Street  
BRISBANE QLD 4000

### Post

Local Government Change Commission  
GPO Box 1393  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Please note, the decision to change to four multi-member divisions is final and the Change Commission is not seeking comment regarding the Council's electoral arrangements.

Comments should focus on the boundaries being proposed for these divisions and it is recommended that those submitting comments:

- consider the enrolment requirements outlined in the Act and in this report;
- clearly state which division/s your comment relates to;
- provide supporting information for why you support or oppose the proposed change;  
or
- if you oppose the change, provide alternative boundary suggestions and reasoning.

## FINALISING THE REVIEW

After reviewing the public comments on the proposal, the Change Commission will make a final determination on the Council's divisional boundaries.

The results of a Change Commission review must be provided to the Minister for Local Government. A notice of results is published in a local newspaper, the Queensland Government Gazette and on the ECQ website.

A decision of the Change Commission is not subject to appeal.

## IMPLEMENTATION

A local government change can only be implemented by the Governor in Council under a regulation.

The regulation may provide for anything that is necessary or convenient to facilitate the change.

# **APPENDIX D**

**Comments on the Proposal Notice  
& Public Submissions**

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHANGE COMMISSION**  
**Electoral Arrangement & Divisional Boundary Review**  
**of Ipswich City Council**

A proposed change to the Ipswich City Council's internal boundaries (divisions) has been referred to the Local Government Change Commission (Change Commission) for independent assessment.

The Change Commission has determined that Ipswich should have four multi-member divisions, with two councillors representing each division. It has proposed boundaries for these four divisions and is now inviting comments on the proposal.

**INVITATION FOR COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL**

Comments on the proposed boundaries will be accepted until 30 July 2019. Late submissions cannot be considered.

To view the proposal and make a submission, please see the Electoral Commission of Queensland's website: <https://ecq.qld.gov.au/lgr/ipswich> or phone 1300 881 665.

When making a comment, please remember each multi-member division must have relatively the same number of voters (quota) to ensure each person's vote has the same value. The quota for each multi-member division in Ipswich is 32,012 with a lower limit of 28,811 (-10%) and an upper limit of 35,213 (+10%). This equals approximately 16,000 enrolled voters per councillor.

**Comments can be lodged through:**

**- Online Form**

<https://ecq.qld.gov.au/lgr/ipswich>

**- Email**

[LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au](mailto:LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au)

**- Personal Delivery** (*Mon - Fri, 9am - 5pm*)

Electoral Commission of Queensland  
Level 20, 1 Eagle Street, BRISBANE QLD 4000

**- Post**

Local Government Change Commission  
GPO Box 1393, BRISBANE QLD 4001

**Submissions will be made available for public inspection.** To discuss any privacy concerns, please phone 1300 881 665.

Pat Vidgen PSM

**Electoral Commissioner**

## ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENT & DIVISIONAL BOUNDARY REVIEW

---

Hello,

The Local Government Change Commission (Change Commission) is conducting a review of the Ipswich City Council's internal boundaries (divisions).

Currently Ipswich has 10 single-member divisions and it is proposed that it move to four (4) multi-member divisions, with two (2) councillors representing each division.

The Change Commission has prepared proposed boundaries for the four divisions and is inviting public feedback. Comments are invited until 30 July 2019.

To view the proposal or to make a submission, please see the [website](#) or call 1300 881 665.

We look forward to hearing from you,

**Local Government Change Commission**

- 
-  [www.ecq.qld.gov.au](http://www.ecq.qld.gov.au)
  -  [LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au](mailto:LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au)
  -  1300 881 665
  -  Local Government Change Commission  
GPO Box 1393  
BRISBANE QLD 4001



[Unsubscribe - Unsubscribe Preferences](#)


# Email to Ipswich Voters - Analytics

**LGCC Ipswich**

SENT Jul 9, 2019 12:02 PM

Export CSV

<b>DELIVERED</b> <b>94.42%</b> 45,840	<b>UNIQUE OPENS</b> <b>42.37%</b> 19,845	<b>UNIQUE CLICKS</b> <b>3.92%</b> 1,836	<b>REQUESTS</b> 49606 <b>BOUNCES</b> 5.05% <b>UNSUBSCRIBES</b> 0.29% <b>SPAM REPORTS</b> 0.01%
---	--	---	---



FILTERS

[Requests](#)
[Delivered](#)
[Opens](#)
[Clicks](#)
[Unique Opens](#)
[Spam Report Drops](#)
[Bounces](#)
[Unsubscribes](#)
[Spam Reports](#)
[Invalid Emails](#)

**Divisional Boundary Review of Ipswich City Council**  
**List of Public Comments on the Proposal**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Name / Organisation</b>
1	Ailsa Anderson	22	Veronica Belcher
2	Brendon Weber	23	Shane Ritchie
3	Lynette Lucas	24	Graham Thouard
4	LeRoy Murray	25	Trevor Fuller
5	Edward Gilmour	26	Messele Habtewolde
6	Benjamin	27	Bruce Skinner
7	Luis Mateer	28	Ty
8	Teresa Demmers	29	Terence Rankin
9	Nigel Lewis	30	Justin Gehrke
10	William J Freeland	31	Kiara Pocock
11	Robert Broady	32	Wayne Offer
12	Tim Hargreaves	33	Andrew Knight
13	Aidan Patrick Corrigan	34	Cindy Maree Gorton
14	Kimble Mensforth	35	Alan Walker
15	Tony	36	Brian D. Branch
16	Darren Lacey	37	Maxine Rose
17	Liza Etheridge	38	Les Gehrke
18	Christine Forrest	39	Paul Peacock
19	Kimberley Boike	40	Jason James
20	Wayne Carr	41	Suzanne Dick
21	E Hooper	42	Matthew Anstey



<b>Comment</b>	<b>Name / Organisation</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Name / Organisation</b>
43	Steven Hucker	66	Rachel Kaminski
44	Bernadette Ford	67	Tony Caswell
45	Geoffrey Stalker	68	David Pahlke
46	Jeffrey Kennedy	69	Ron Turner
47	Rochlitz and Alesia Maclean	70	Leigh Studdert
48	Karen Hughes	71	Scott Moore
49	Kylie Stoneman	72	Jim Thompson
50	Stephanie Shannon	73	George Hatchman
51	Alaina	74	Michael O'Donoghue
52	Kevin Pearce	75	Gary Molloy
53	Colin Pomery	76	Glenda Zammit
54	Peter and Barbara Byram	77	Des Jones ( <i>Late</i> )
55	Brian Murray	78	Chris Ryan, President, Pine Mountain & District Progress Association ( <i>Late</i> )
56	Aleesha Rilatt	79	Chris Ryan ( <i>Late</i> )
57	Mark Cresswell		
58	Rebecca Johnson		
59	Lee Norman		
60	De Vries		
61	Leone Smith		
62	Chris Figg		
63	Veronica Belcher		
64	Madonna Oliver		
65	Lynda Donohue		

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 9:14 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4591) Ipswich City Local Government Area - AILSA M ANDERSEN

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **AILSA M ANDERSEN**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** AILSA M ANDERSEN

**Submission Text :** I am not in favour of having 4 divisions in next year's local ICC elections with 2 councillors each. This will mean each division will have nearly as many residents (60 000) as our state government members. I believe we will lose the local face to face interaction that is required to re-build the confidence of the residents of Ipswich after the recent (mis)happenings in the Council with regard to corruption, etc.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 9:54 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4592) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Brendon weber

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Brendon weber**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Brendon weber

**Submission Text :** In regards to the divisions, are less people expected to do more and more. We need smaller divisions like what there used to be with more members on the ground. The more we have the better it is for the community. This is our city and our people can't be heard when there is only two representatives to look after around 30,000 people.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 10:06 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4593) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Lynette Lucas

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Lynette Lucas**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Lynette Lucas

**Submission Text :** I definitely do not agree to having only four (4) divisions. There needs to be only enough residents in each are for elected councillors to provide total attention to each resident's concerns. Having two counsellors attempting to cover large areas will not work. Leave boundaries as they are and stop attempting to short-change us as residents.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 10:11 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4594) Ipswich City Local Government Area - LeRoy Murray

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **LeRoy Murray**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** LeRoy Murray

**Submission Text :** I am against any changes made to either the Divisional Boundaries being changed in the Ipswich LGA area or the way we are represented. We should keep the 10 Divisions with 1 Councillor representig each Division As a life long Ipswich resident I am insulted at the way this has all been played out as from the start there was never any care given to what the residents (voters) of Ipswich wanred. We were never given a say about an administrator being appointed and now you are trying to force these boundary changes upon us. This whole episode has been undemocratic and will continue to do so until this has been put to a vote so every ratepayer has a say. Give us back our Council the way we voted for at the last Election

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 10:56 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4597) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Edward Gilmour

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Edward Gilmour**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Edward Gilmour

**Submission Text :** My submission is that two representatives in each division, isn't enough to ensure accountable democracy. It should be 4 or 5 but at least 3 per division. But to ensure rate payers money isn't wasted on salary indulgence. they only get paid at a maximum of 5 times the newstart allowance (aka Dole) (hourly rate) but only for the hours they sit in council or are on Council approved business only within the city boundary. but that salary is further reduced by KPI which are approved by the voters at the election but will include a minus for the percentage % of unemployed in the city; a minus the percentage % of homeless in the city; a minus the percentage % of empty shops or empty commercial buildings measured in floor space in the city; a minus for percentage % rate increases; a minus for any increase in commercial rent increases; a minus anything else the ratepayers agree on. The mayor or chairperson (speaker) can only be elected from the elected Councillors. unless the council requests the minister to appoint an administrator and council chair person; whose wages will be extracted only equally from theirs!.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 12:11 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4598) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Benjamin

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Benjamin**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Benjamin

**Submission Text :** Good idea. Party members absouletly need to be badged

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 12:23 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4599) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Luis Mateer

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Luis Mateer**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Luis Mateer

**Submission Text :** Local areas will not be concentrated on and only CBDs will be cared for. This is an obvious ploy for power. Ipswich will be used as a pawn for outside influence as well. Local, small, and minority communities will suffer while the council members benefit.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---



**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 12:26 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4600) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Teresa Demmers

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Teresa Demmers**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Teresa Demmers

**Submission Text :** Cannot understand why you would break up the boundaries and still have 2 councilors per area. Makes no sense unless the councilors are not getting paid as a salary and are sharing the workload. I am happy with the way the council is being run under an administrator. Sick of the politics in govt of all levels. Perhaps we should do away with local govt councilors altogether. Thanks

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 12:38 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4601) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Nigel Lewis

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Nigel Lewis**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Nigel Lewis

**Submission Text :** What a lot of We currently have no Councillor to talk to. We used to have one point of contact and now you are considering muddying the waters by providing two to choose from. Just put the Council back the way it was. Who raised the concern? I will bet it wasn't a rate payer. Don't fix what aint broke.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 1:05 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Comment on ICC area boundaries

To whom it may concern

1. I fully support the concept of more than one councilor in each electoral area
2. I think the number of areas proposed is appropriate
3. The limited number of areas proposed (4) unfortunately means that the electoral areas proposed are very diverse
4. This means that the two people elected in each area would somehow have to represent this total diversity. I do not believe this is necessarily possible i.e. the number proposed needs to account for the potential risk for serious issues to not getting recognised i.e. three per area seems a more risk averse approach.
5. One of the serious issues with the previous council model was individual councilors taking the view that they were only responsible to their electorate for things that happened in that particular electorate i.e. Ipswich wide issues were buried by the actions/inactions of individual councilors, and other Councillors tacitly agreeing, seeming on the basis of I leave you alone you leave me alone. The only cure for this is that all Councillors must be explicitly required to be actively involved in all issues confronting ICC, while they have a special responsibility for dealing with their electorate.

I hope these points are constructive

Dr Bill Freeland

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 1:21 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Ipswich City Divisions

I am a resident and rate payer in the Ipswich City Council area.

I believe the proposed changes to the division boundaries are unfair for a number of reasons.

The size of the divisions will be too large for the Councillors to manage, making it difficult for the residents to be able to communicate or meet with their representatives.

The smaller size of the current divisions means that a regular citizen may attempt to run for office, having the means to run a campaign, covering a reasonable size geographic area. A larger area will give political parties an unfair advantage. They will have the resources to campaign in a large area compared to an independent person who will have a hard time canvassing a large area.

A system that includes smaller divisions would be a fairer and more equitable one.

Regards  
Robert Broady

Sent from my iPhone

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 1:25 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4602) Ipswich City Local Government Area - TIm Hargreaves

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **TIm Hargreaves**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** TIm Hargreaves

**Submission Text :** increasing the size of the division and number of councillors per division will dilute the care that a councillor takes to certain areas within the division. More likely that the 2 people will forma coalition to focus on specific areas within the large division to the exclusion of other areas. This seems to be a retrograde step and knee jerk reaction to past issues. Changing the make up of the divisions and councillor allocation should not be able to happen without a democratic vote. We the rate payers should be heard - not bureaucrats.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 1:41 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4603) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Aidan Patrick Corrigan

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Aidan Patrick Corrigan**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Aidan Patrick Corrigan

**Submission Text :** Please don't change it. I like the way that it is now, sorry. I hope you understand. Have a nice day please :)

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 1:44 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4604) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Kimble Mensforth

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Kimble Mensforth**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Kimble Mensforth

**Submission Text :** The residents of [REDACTED] are in agreement with the proposed changes. We request further information regarding how the the two councillors for Division 3 would operate as a team to represent the Division.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 1:46 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4605) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Tony

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Tony**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Tony

**Submission Text :** In my opinion the less division with multiple councillors won't work.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---



**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 2:57 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4606) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Darren Lacey

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Darren Lacey**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Darren Lacey

**Submission Text :** Looks good. Agree with proposal.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 2:59 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4607) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Liza Etheridge

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Liza Etheridge**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Liza Etheridge

**Submission Text :** I totally agree with the new proposal reducing it to 8 councillors and hopefully when they are in positions, those councillors will do us good things unlike the present ones or the past ones, they only serve their friends and families better than their constituents. I have bought my property in [REDACTED] and nothing had been done to improve my street but the next streets nearby, kerbings have been placed. Why? Because they are related or have friends in higher places. I am happy that the last council had been sacked...served them right. Hopefully the next council will be free of corruption. #NoOffense

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 4:17 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4609) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Christine Forrest

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Christine Forrest**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Christine Forrest

**Submission Text :** I feel that both divisions 1 and 4 are far to large and two councilors would not be enough for these divisions. Division 4 needs to be divided so that both the rural and town areas are equally represented. same with division 1. Otherwise the rural areas would not have enough representation with only two councilors. More thought needs to be given into this matter to equalise the division of areas. Why not have smaller divisions maybe 6 would give both rural and town areas a better representation.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 5:14 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4610) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Kimberley Boike

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Kimberley Boike**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Kimberley Boike

**Submission Text :** Division 4 is far too large. There is no way suburban areas like Karalee and Brassall, which are within 20 minutes of the CBD, will have the same concerns and needs as rural areas like Rosewood and Marburg. Just looking at population size and growth, they are completely different. This division should be split at least in half to rural and suburban, so the members can accurately represent the needs of each area.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 5:41 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4611) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Wayne Carr

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Wayne Carr**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Wayne Carr

**Submission Text :** While I dont have an issue with the reduced number of Divisions, one of the reasons for the new Divisions was to have differing areas for rural and non rural areas. Division 1 just south of Division 3 on your proposal has a predominance of high density residential, specifically adjoining the Centenary Motorway towards its western end. I would suggest that maybe proposed Division 3 could take in these areas.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

I believe this Divisional arrangement will open the door for party politics as not many individuals will have the money or resources to fund such a large campaign. Unless someone is cashed up and supported by party faithful they will have no chance to become known in an election run-up. The overwhelming majority of Ipswich Resident/Voters especially did not want party politics.

There is a need to make the Electoral Divisions equitable for ordinary people to be represented within their community. This plan, 4 Divisions 2 Representatives, does nothing for that. Divisions, mostly, used to have some uniformity. I can't see people in the new and rapidly growing areas of Springfield and Ripley having the same issues and concerns as those in Grandchester and Mt Mort, but it will all be in one division.

I believe the existing model was ok, however other checks and balances were perhaps needed, but this new model won't bring about that, it will just pave the way for party politics. This is not what the ratepayers were looking for. Why should Ipswich residents be the guinea pig for this new model?

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 8:17 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4614) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Veronica Belcher

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Veronica Belcher**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Veronica Belcher

**Submission Text :** I like the idea of the four divisions but am concerned that only two councillors for such a large number of people might not be as effective. Three might work better

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 8:24 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4615) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Shane Ritchie

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Shane Ritchie**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Shane Ritchie

**Submission Text :** The size of the 5 proposed electorates seems too large and has areas with vastly different issues lumped together. Specifically the geographical size of div 1 means that all the outer regional (SW of Yamanto) areas are lumped in with Raceview. The issues of the more urban areas are going to be quite different to the more rural. 5 divisions with the western/rural having 2 of their own reps would make more sense, along with giving the 4 denser divisions better sized electorates to be able to build relationships with their local representatives.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---



**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 8:27 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4616) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Graham Thouard

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Graham Thouard**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Graham Thouard

**Submission Text :** The proposed divisions are too large in area to be effectively managed by two representatives. To put it bluntly, the two representatives in each will be ineffectual and will be figureheads unable to represent their constituents. Graham Thouard

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 8:32 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4617) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Trevor Fuller

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Trevor Fuller**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Trevor Fuller

**Submission Text :** Firstly your explanation is as complicated as hell. Anyhow Goodna division boundary should be Redbank plains road down to Eagle st. (Not Kruger Parade) Kruger School area should be in the Redbank Plains Division. This comment comes from experience of working the polling booth at Kruger School and also when you look at population figures as well. Sure the decision may be made on forecasted development, however how about working on real stats. As to having two Reps per division neither will take responsibility to make the hard decisions. Better to have the council run by an administrator and rely on our State elected representatives for Strategic Direction. Saves the rate payer a stack of money.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 9:41 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4618) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Messele Habtewolde

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Messele Habtewolde**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Messele Habtewolde

**Submission Text :** I personally agreed with all proposals that have put forward for the public, because it is very clear, and it has addressed concerns and issues that have been with us for a long time.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 9:54 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4619) Ipswich City Local Government Area - BRUCE SKINNER

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **BRUCE SKINNER**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** BRUCE SKINNER

**Submission Text :** I am in favor of the four division, eight councillor model.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 4:40 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4622) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Ty

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Ty**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Ty

**Submission Text :** I am happy with the work the current administration is doing. I do not want any elections to be held. Please abolish the Local Government system.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 7:43 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4623) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Terence Rankin

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Terence Rankin**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Terence Rankin

**Submission Text :** We are looking at dividing Suburbs into different Divisions this will cause confusion well into the future. IF THESE DIVIDES ARE UNAVOIDABLE MAYBE CHANGE THE BOUNDARYS OF THE SUBURBS NOT THE DIVIDING OF ANY SUBURB INTO DIFFERNT DIVISIONS.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 8:04 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4624) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Justin Gehrke

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Justin Gehrke**

---

### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Justin Gehrke

**Submission Text :** I have several concern with reducing the number of divisions and making them larger representing more people per electorate. Firstly I think it will be very difficult for independent candidates to be successful for several reasons. The cost involved in advertising and campaigning in a large area would be restrictive, the number of volunteers needed to man booths and act as scrutineers would also be restrictive and these issues may force quality candidates to not run. I feel that these size areas would also lend itself party politics playing a very big impact on the elections and I personally think that local government should be independent of political parties. The big "party machines" could fund these campaigns and provide large numbers of members to man booths. I know this is possible with smaller electorates but with smaller electorates it opens it to a wider cross section of candidates. I also feel that with large electorates successful candidates could loose the personal relationships with the electorate that is vital for local government and a strong sense of community. Finally I feel with 2 councilors per division it could cause conflict, division and competition within electorates.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 8:46 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4625) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Kiara Pocock

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Kiara Pocock**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Kiara Pocock

**Submission Text :** I LOVE THIS IDEA!! I think it will ensure that more people get the councillor that they want. It also means that the councillors will have to work together which might also ensure that corruption doesn't occur because someone is working closely with them and holding them accountable!

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---



**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 9:08 AM  
**To:** LG Boundaries  
**Subject:** Ipswich city Council submission

Hi,

Just a quick note to complement your ideas on the 4 divisions.

Although the mathematical calculations on boundaries are good more importantly the mixing if the old with the proposed new will do heaps to dissolve the toxic culture that existed in the previous administrations.

Expect exceptional whaling from the ones who's cartels will be disenfranchised from their providers but please do not walk away after the dust has been settled on the boundaries and elections.

We have to have the a rigorous checking and accountability process to prevent in lapsing back into the previous culture.

Ipswich is a close nit society which has its plus's and minus's and a watchdog is critical for all constituents.

All the best with this, it's is a good proposal Thank you

WAYNE Offer  
Thagoona

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 9:16 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4626) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Andrew Knight

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Andrew Knight**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Andrew Knight

**Submission Text :** The new divisional structure is an improvement but still not optimal. If you want a Council to operate at a strategic level they need to act like Board Members of a company. An undivided Council area would mean that a Councillor from Springfield, or Ripley or anywhere in the Council area acts in the best interest of all residents, regardless of where they live. Hopefully it wont happen, but if you get "backyard" focused Councillors it will not serve all of the residents well, only those in their Division who will vote for them.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 9:48 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4627) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Cindy Maree Gorton

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Cindy Maree Gorton**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Cindy Maree Gorton

**Submission Text :** My major concern would be the areas with both Rural and Urban suburbs. The larger amount of voters would be from the Urban areas and the likelihood of a Councillor who does not understand the Rural areas being elected is high. There is a high potential that the rural areas will not receive the attention and support they require with the elected representatives focussing on Urban areas and development.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 9:58 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Proposed Divisional Boundaries

Dear Sir,

I have just been looking at the proposed divisional boundary changes published in today's Queensland Times (July 10 2019).

I think that this could be a very good and highly workable solution.

My major concern is that while 2 councillors per division will bring more transparency to the electorate and will also enforce personal accountability.

While divisions 1 and 4 are quite significant areas.

Division 2 and 3 are significantly smaller, how are the elected representatives able to respond to the requests and demands of their communities?

Would it be possible for the elected representatives from divisions 2 and 3 to be assistants to the representatives of divisions 1 and 4, a form of nominated representation of the member themselves.

As you are no doubt aware the future elected representatives may be married with young families and with the amount of travel required with this position it can put undue pressure and strain on families.

I hope you can find time to read my concerns and will look at these problems.

I look forward to your reply and look forward to future conversations about our city.

Thank you for your time.

many thanks,

Alan.D.Walker

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 2:04 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4635) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Brian D. Branch

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Brian D. Branch**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Brian D. Branch

**Submission Text :** The proposed boundaries don't make a lot of sense, it's like somebody grabbed it and twisted the entire thing. Why is Redbank Plains with Willowbank? Leichardt with Collingwood Park? Or Karalee with Rosewood. It's as if whoever designed this wanted groups to conspire on joint party tickets, which the CCC had stated after the 2016 elections was resulting in a lot of corruption, so much corruption that the CCC declared in late 2017 there was too much of it to prosecute. At minimum, parts of Redbank Plains in Div1 should go to Div3; Div1 should gain Yamanto & whatever parts near Ipswich CBD makes up any population shortfall; Div4 should pick up remaining areas currently allocated to Div3 west of the CBD; and Karalee area goes to Div3. Local elections are supposed to be about allowing talented individuals to nominate with the possibility of getting into office. As it stands currently, the only people who could possibly stand in divisions 1, 2, or 3, are those affiliated in joint tickets, which is a bad plan if the goal is to seek a non-corrupt men's club.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 3:27 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4636) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Maxine Rose

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Maxine Rose**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Maxine Rose

**Submission Text :** I'm in support of the recommended changes to the Ipswich internal boundaries (divisions).

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 5:06 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4637) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Les Gehrke

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Les Gehrke**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Les Gehrke

**Submission Text :** Thank you for the details of the proposed changes to the boundaries of Ipswich Council . I am impressed by your details, but have concerns by the way the country areas have been included in with suburban areas . Obviously if a country resident put themselves up for election and say two from the suburbs nominate, it could arise that the country people could be left with little or no representation on council because of the sheer weight of suburban voters . The suggestion I would put to you would be that the country areas be completely be removed from the city and a new division formed . Although this would maybe interfere with the balance of numbers , I feel that this would give our country people the sense and feeling of belonging , as well as having representatives who hopefully would understand the needs of the country people . Thank you for allowing the people of Ipswich to submit their concerns . I would be happy at any time to meet and discuss this submission further , Les Gehrke .

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 6:49 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4638) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Paul Peacock

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Paul Peacock**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Paul Peacock

**Submission Text :** Would save a lot of money if we went without any, we have survived well enough without them.  
Could also go back to part timers like we used to have.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---



**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 7:38 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4639) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Jason James

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Jason James**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Jason James

**Submission Text :** Poorly thought out. The 4 divisions are split between primarily rural/semi rural in two divisions and CBD/suburban/industrial in the other 2 sectors. There is no fair representation of local best intersects across sectors in the four proposed boundaries. This will likely result in 2/2 split vote for the region and based on geographical catchment area (thus local worker population) and does not help represent the Ipswich region as a whole or as a majority. Suggest committee review catchment areas based on GDP average to ensure votes are apportioned according to the average meaningful income producing household and not based on geographical boundaries which are likely to polarise voters based on suburban trends.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 9:09 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4590) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Suzanne Dick

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Suzanne Dick**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Suzanne Dick

**Submission Text :** The corruption in the Ipswich City Council was not caused by the divisional boundaries. It is not necessary at this time to change divisional boundaries and considering the upheaval already experienced by the people of Ipswich this will only add further insult to injury and undermine any remaining sense of community in Ipswich. Furthermore, this proposal, making less divisions and less councillors will only give less representation to the people. Why not three councillors per division? It is important for the cultural integrity and sense of community to maintain boundaries and councillor representation as they are. Certainly any reduction in the number of councillors will result in poorer representation. Sincerely Suzanne Dick

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 3:31 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4608) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Matthew Anstey

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Matthew Anstey**

---

### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Matthew Anstey

**Submission Text :** As a pastor at Kruger Parade Baptist church, my church sits in perhaps the worst possible position on the intersection of three divisions. So this is obviously a significant issue for the community of people that we serve. I understand that you would like a similar number of people within these boundaries, however this forces the boundaries to be on numerical grounds and not on the more practical grounds of where communities are who relate to each other. It seems to me that there are clear regions within the ICC boundaries: Springfield (incl Augustine Heights & Brookwater), the fringe suburbs of Redbank, Redbank Plains, Riverview, Collingwood Park, Goodna, Bellbird Park, Camira and Gales, then the inner suburbs of Ipswich and then to the south, the Ripley development and surrounding outer suburbs. This to me would seem a better way to have representatives who are in areas where people have specific unifying issues and where they actually do community together. I don't have a strong feeling outside of the area I am in, however splitting it three ways doesn't seem to be a wise solution and actually makes me question why you would even have boundaries in the first place??? If they're only going to be done on numbers, then how would the representatives truly represent their region, if their region is so split??? Unless these counsellors aren't going to be representing a region and instead there is a centralised way for the community to engage, then I would imagine a rethink around communities would be required. Happy to discuss this further. I'm very interested in this process and have been following from the start. Thanks Matt Anstey

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 July 2019 2:05 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4620) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Steven Hucker

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Steven Hucker**

---

#### Submission Details

**Name:** Steven Hucker

**Submission Text :** And who and what political party is the going to benefit from this [REDACTED] ? I expect a answer since I'm paying your wages.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**From:** Jaysborough Pty Ltd  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 12:17 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Divisions

Good morning, my submission, we DON'T need all these Councillors,(waste of money) we need to get our Council back in the BLACK not The RED. Reduce dumping fees, so there isn't so much rubbish being dumped on private land/.

Thank you

Bernadette Ford

**Sent:** Thursday, 11 July 2019 4:55 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Ipswich divisional boundary changes

I have had a look at the proposed boundaries and can't see for the life of me how division 1 can operate with two dramatically opposite areas in Grandchester/Mt Mort and Deebing Heights/South Ripley in the same division. The majority of votes will come from the urban area and therefore the Councillors will probably come from this area thus leaving the rural area unrepresented.

Moreton Shire tried the two Councillors per division years ago and it didn't work so it doesn't appear that anybody learns from history.

In my opinion it would be better to increase the number of divisions, not to the extent of the last Council but to better to represent the various types of communities

Sent from my iPad

**Sent:** Friday, 12 July 2019 9:28 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4643) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Jeffrey Kennedy

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Jeffrey Kennedy**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Jeffrey Kennedy


**Submission Text :** My suggestion is that as well as 2 representatives for each division, that an independent mayor be either elected by the people or an administrator head of the local government be appointed via an interview process. This person will not be vote casting unless there is a result not being able to attained by the councillors elected. Also that there not be any bye elections held if a councillor retires or leaves, it should go to the next highest vote receiver in the previous election.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Friday, 12 July 2019 10:30 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Electoral Boundary Review - Ipswich City Local Government Area

NAME: Rochlitz and Alesia Maclean



#### COMMENTS

1. We agree in principle to the proposal to have four divisions, with two elected members in each of the four divisions (plus an elected mayor).
2. In terms of numbering, the previous Divisions 1 and 2 were always historically recognised by the whole Ipswich local government area as being in the East, and sequentially renumbered proceeding westward to Division 10. Therefore,
  - a. proposed Division 2 should be renumbered as proposed Division 1 (in the East),
  - b. proposed Division 3 should remain numbered as proposed Division 3 (in the North),
  - c. proposed Division 1 should be renumbered as proposed Division 2 (in the South); and
  - d. proposed Division 4 remains numbered as proposed Division 4 (in the West), all with adjusted boundaries.
3. We object to the proposed boundaries for all Divisions [more particularly proposed Divisions 1 (2) and 4] for the following reasons:-
  - a. The township of Rosewood is recognised as being the main township “centre” of the rural western districts of Ipswich City. Ipswich City Council is intending to establish, one of the three new Council Customer Service Centres in the new Rosewood Branch Library. It would therefore be most inappropriate to expect the voters and residents of the far eastern suburbs of Brassall, Karalee and Barellan Point, for example, to travel to or be familiar with the rural suburb communities closer to Rosewood.

It would be most unlikely that voters in the more residential eastern suburbs could ever be familiar with an elected representative from the more rural suburbs in the far West – and visa versa. The north and north eastern suburbs of Brassall, Muirlea, Chuwar, Tivoli and Karalee and Barellan Point would be better placed into, and would relate more equitably with the residential and commercial communities in Proposed Division 3 [to be renumbered as proposed Division 2], rather than into the far western division.
  - b. Proposed Division 4 should essentially run north-south commencing at the most western border suburb of Grandchester, to the most south-western border suburbs of Mount Mort and Mount Walker; to the most northern City boundary; and to the east to include the suburbs of Mutdapilly, Willowbank, Amberley, Karrabin, Blacksoil and Pine Mountain. This would position the township of Rosewood approximately in the centre of this proposed division.

Proposed Division 4 would probably contain about 50% of the total area of Ipswich City, but only 25% of the population – and these demographics would most likely remain relatively unchanged into the future, as the main future population growth is expected in Springfield and Ripley.
  - c. As mentioned above, the boundaries of proposed Division 3 [to remain numbered as proposed Division 3] the City Centre, should ideally be extended north to include the suburbs of Brassall, Muirlea, Chuwar, Tivoli and Karalee and Barellan Point .



To adjust the population back to about 25% of the total population, the suburbs of Collingwood Park and Redbank could be removed from Proposed Division 3 and included in proposed Division 1 [to be renumbered as proposed Division 2]

- d. Proposed Division 1 (to be renumbered as proposed Division 2) would commence in the west to include the suburbs of Peak Crossing and Purga, follow the proposed new boundaries to the north, and include the suburbs of Collingwood Park and Redbank.

This would place the growth suburbs of Ripley and Redbank Plains into proposed Division 1 (to be renumbered as proposed Division 2); and the growth suburbs of Springfield into proposed Division 2 (to be renumbered as proposed Division 1)

The boundaries of proposed Division 1 (to be renumbered as proposed Division 2) have created, not only a large fragmented division by area, but one that extends from the far east to the far west and the far south, making it most impractical and impossible to represent, travel, and unify vastly separated and differing communities. This is probably the worst suggested proposed division.

- 4. In terms of major identifiable natural or man-made boundaries, the separation of the “old” city areas and the “new” developing areas, the M15 Cunningham Highway is also an ideal divisional boundary to consider between proposed Division 3 (in the North) and proposed Division 1 (renumbered as proposed Division 2 (in the South) and between proposed Division 4 (in the west).

Regards,  
Rochlitz and Alesia Maclean

---

**Sent:** Friday, 12 July 2019 5:18 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4644) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Karen Hughes

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Karen Hughes**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Karen Hughes

**Submission Text :** For a start Rosewood is a town not a suburb. Lumping a rural area in with inter-city area does not make sense to me. You can't tell me that we will get a fair share. With a larger population in Brassall etc, our small area will go unheard. We haven't even got a council office in Rosewood anymore. It seems to me that the CEO has already made a decision. I just wonder who is pulling his strings. The leaking of information about council going-ons to the media. The sacking of the council, whether guilty or not. Sounds like a take over to me. I am quite happy with the boundaries the way they are. And telling me that we would be better off with a reshuffle, that we will be better represented is just a heap of HOOEY.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

Kylie Stoneman

To Whom It May Concern

RE: Divisional Boundary Review Ipswich City Council

In March 2019, Interim Administrator of Ipswich City Council launched a discussion paper regarding divisional changes. Suggesting that the process would entail a month-long engagement including a public forum on March 25 2019. \*

The report from the survey results released in April showed that only 1049 residents responded to the month long engagement. With 453 saying that they wanted no change to the divided single councilor model by making it their first preference. 325 respondents chose the divided multiple councilor model and 271 chose an undivided council.\*\* This survey then portrayed that the majority wanted the multiple councilor model by using a preference system which clearly did not follow a democratic process ignoring the primary vote and counting preferences in a way that allowed a result they wanted to equate – there was only one result required so therefore there was no need to use the preferencing of votes. This ignored a primary vote and referenced a second or third preference over their primary.

The current legislation as at 1 July 2019 states on page 31 under the heading Review of divisions of local government areas – A local government must, no later than 1 March in the year before the year of the quadrennial elections – review whether each of its divisions has a reasonable proportion of electors and give the electoral commissioner and the Minister notice of the results of the review.\*\*\* The review was handed over at the end of April 2019 with the Minister forwarding his request on May 7.

“In reviewing the proposed change for the Ipswich City Council, the Change Commission was cognisant that it would represent a significant alteration to long-standing electoral arrangements. It was therefore of the view that there would need to be compelling reasons to assess such a change as being in the public interest” \*\*\*\* “On the strength of the evidence presented in the Report, including the results from extensive public consultation, multi-member divisions were found to be the preferred option.” This statement came from a perception that 1049 residents represented 128,049 voters and in fact ignoring their primary vote.

For such a significant change in divisional boundaries and the structure of Ipswich City Council in regards to the representation through Councillors, I hearby suggest that it would be in the public interest for the residents of the Ipswich City Council LGA to choose and a referendum be sought before any changes made so those most affected are heard.

\*[https://www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/about\\_council/media/articles/2019/people-asked-to-ponder-future-of-ipswich-city-council](https://www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/about_council/media/articles/2019/people-asked-to-ponder-future-of-ipswich-city-council)

\*\*[https://www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0015/112308/Divisional-Boundary-Review\\_Results\\_Report.pdf](https://www.ipswich.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0015/112308/Divisional-Boundary-Review_Results_Report.pdf)

\*\*\*<https://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/pdf/inforce/current/act-2009-017>

\*\*\*\* [https://www.ecq.qld.gov.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0018/4473/2019-Ipswich-City-Council-Proposed-Determination-Report-without-appendices.pdf](https://www.ecq.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/4473/2019-Ipswich-City-Council-Proposed-Determination-Report-without-appendices.pdf)

**Sent:** Monday, 15 July 2019 3:32 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4843) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Stephanie SHANNON

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Stephanie SHANNON**

---

### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Stephanie SHANNON

**Submission Text :** Having pondered the new divisional boundaries and the rationale behind this change particularly re similar number of voters in each division with 2 Councillors to be appointed to each. My comments are founded in concerns ~ these being 1 the size of the geographic footprint with Divisions 1 and 4 2 I think there should be further consideration to appointing three Councillors to both 1 and 4 3 the community needs radiating from our rural neighbours need to be heard and considered 4 I believe there needs to be a 'dedicated' Councillor in 1 and 4 divisions to have the travelling access within his portfolio to 'really be in touch' with our rural sector and their special needs and also for the rebuilding of rapport, trust and respect which will generate a more robust outcome for all parties. For the numerous challenges ahead ~ good luck It has been my personal experience that since closure of the 'Community Offices' Council responses more generic than personal and less promptness in response. Go gently  
Steph Shannon

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 17 July 2019 9:41 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4872) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Alaina

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Alaina**

---

### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Alaina

**Submission Text :** I propose something more comprehensive for the formation of Council. A Council Member from each postcode area (eg. representing everyone of the 4340 area) with preexisting knowledge and extensive community work (at least 20 hours unpaid a week) within that area is required before they can run for the position. They are then elected by residents of that postcode area. These Council members can then elect 12 members amongst themselves to sit on the board who adequately represent the Ipswich community. And of those 12 can elect 2 Board Heads who will share the decision making process and ultimately sign off on Projects and decisions but answer to the Board, whom answer to the Council, whom answer to the needs and concerns of their individual communities. An external and independent body is required to immediately investigate any claims of corruption or concerns of the public on any Council Members, Board Members or Board Heads. Full transparency is required, especially with whose money is funding their campaigns. And where funds are going. The community has no faith in Council, therefore Council must work hard to earn it back. There will be scrutiny and criticism of every little thing, and honestly, who could blame them?

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Thursday, 18 July 2019 1:10 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Ipswich City Council redraft of boundaries

Hello,

I wish to submit the following re the proposed format of Ipswich City Council internal divisional boundaries for future elections.

My principle concern is with the proposed Division 1.

It is my belief the proposal is beyond belief; that there is little or very little common interest in the communities of Grandchester, Mount Mort etc and that of Redbank Plains, Blackstone, Raceview etc; while conceding all communities within the proposed Division 1 are within the boundaries of the local government area of Ipswich City Council, and that ultimately elected councillors will make decisions pertaining to the whole ICC local government area.


It would surely be far better for the interests of ICC local government area for there to be two divisions within the proposed Division 1 as outlined in the review papers.

One obvious danger is that city and urban residents have much more likelihood of being successful at a council election than would residents of the rural areas of, for instance, Grandchester, Mount Mort, Mount Walker, Calvert etc etc. This would surely lead to an imbalance of representation of city/urban dwellers than these rural areas.

That, surely, would not be in the best interests of the local government authority as a whole; and certainly not in the best interests of rural dwellers.

There is much I could say, but will restrict myself to the above; except to say the proposed boundaries of Division 1 are most unfair to rural ratepayers and residents.

Thank you,  
Kevin Pearce,



**Sent:** Thursday, 18 July 2019 2:27 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4875) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Colin Pomery

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Colin Pomery**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Colin Pomery

**Submission Text :** Although I welcome the new started council areas, there is one recent change that I strongly feel requires further explanation and or review. The new double dropping of emergency service rates being charged to my area. I am now being charged the rural fire levy as all a the urban fire levy. My "Land" is in a rural c living area with no House in it and on s dirt road. As an ex QFRS (now QFES) Fire Warden and senior fire fighter, who was one of the 2IC's for logistics in the QFRS Incident control command centre during the Lockyer Valley Grantham floods, I am well aware that urban fire vehicles are not permitted off the bitumen. With this being the case, and with no dwelling yet on the property, please explain why am being charged two levy's. Yours Patiently Colin Pomery

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Thursday, 18 July 2019 5:23 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Proposed boundaries

Dear Sir /Madam


We STRONGLY object to the proposed boundary changes for Ipswich, especially the boundaries for Division 1 and Division 4.

The sparse population and large areas of the rural areas will be neglected, compared with the condensed population and smaller areas of suburban Ipswich.

This arrangement is similar to the Ipswich-Moreton council amalgamation which put the rural community at a greater disadvantage, compared with suburban and central Ipswich, and now it is happening again.

The number one goal of these proposed division changes is to make roughly equal numbers in each division, with little or no consideration given to the differences between rural and suburban needs and requirements.

Please do not go ahead with these ridiculous boundary proposals.

Peter and Barbara Byram  


Sent from my iPhone



## SUBMISSION

### **BOUNDARY REALIGNMENT OF IPSWICH CITY COUNCIL**

**Reasons why** the former Division 10 split changed to **4 Divisions** and the change from One Councillor per Division to **Two Councillors** will not work and **how unfair it is to all electors** in the City of Ipswich.

**A**, On reading the **93 page reasons** why the split designed and delivered by the Administrator, one has to look at the number of Submissions that were delivered to Ipswich City Council against the number of Electors in the Ipswich City. There were **1049 Submissions against 128,049 Electors** which is **point 8192176 Percent of Electors** having a say on what they wanted. The **amount of Percentages** used through this **Document is ridiculous** and seems to be pulling the wool over the eyes of Electors.

**B**. How can a **split like this be pushed on the Electors** when less than One Percent has a say?

**C**. What have the **Electors have in common** when one looks at those in Rosewood and those in Karalee?

**D**. **Rosewood is gazetted as a Town** and not a Suburb of Ipswich.

**E**. **Rosewood has a Railway Station**, what do those other Suburbs on the other side of Ipswich Centre have?

**F**. **Rosewood has a Queensland Police Station** open five days a week.

**G**. **Rosewood has the Bremer Chamber of Commerce**, does Karalee have the same?

**H**. **Rosewood has an Agricultural Show in their Showground**, does North Ipswich?

**I**. **Rosewood has a Post Office** open 6 days a week, what of other areas?

**J**. **Rosewood has two Banks**, and three **Hotels**.

**K**. **Rosewood has a State High School**, what about Raymonds Hill or Tivoli?

**L**. **Rosewood has a Nursing Home**, what about other Suburbs on the opposite side of Ipswich Central?

**M**. Two councillors in each of the Four Divisions will lead to poor representation for Electors, as one could be elected from the Rosewood area and the other from Karalee area. When one is approached about a certain problem he could say that is not my problem the other Councillor is looking after that section. When the second Councillor is approached about the same problem that second Councillor could say the other (or first) Councillor is looking after that section. **Electors will get nowhere if this Division of Four with Two Councillors each is still enacted by the ECQ.**

**N**. If **two Councillors are elected from the Karalee** area then the **Marburg and Rosewood** areas will go into **decline**, and this is not what is required. **If two Councillors are elected from Rosewood, Karalee** will go into **decline!**

**O**. For the **ECQ to say these changes are set in cement** and there will be no changes, what happens when the new Councillors are elected with a Mayor, **will they have any say to the change of Boundaries** from Four to Eight, where one Councillor looks after one Division?

**P**. What **community interests** do the electors of Marburg and Rosewood areas have in common with the electors of Dinmore, North Tivoli, Moores Pocket, North Ipswich, Tivoli Hill, Raymonds Hill, Boreen Point, Yamanto, Brassall, Churchill and Karalee? Nothing what soever in common! This is a **country area!**

**Q**. How will this **decision** keep party **Politics** out of **Ipswich City Council**? I think there was hardly any Party Politics in the last Council. At least when one contacted the Councillor he came and looked at the problems.

**R**. The way the report has **been presented by the Administrator to the Electors** has been to **confuse the electors** with all the percentages presented, and the paltry number of Submissions received before this dreadful decision was made, and never to be changed by the ECQ.

**S**. The Government paid employee Administrator Greg Chemello, has stated that he expects elected councillors to understand the various communities in which they live, and who will of course advance the specific interests and issues



**Sent:** Friday, 19 July 2019 6:03 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4919) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Aleesha Rilatt

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Aleesha Rilatt**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Aleesha Rilatt

**Submission Text :** I feel the division are too large and too broad a demographic. How can one person have the best interest of the townies and the rurals at the same time if its good for one and not good for the other.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Friday, 19 July 2019 8:53 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4920) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Mark Cresswell

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Mark Cresswell**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Mark Cresswell

**Submission Text :** This is nowhere near enough representation. Four divisions need 4 councillors or 8 divisions with 2. The proposal will leave us underrepresented and poorly governed

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Friday, 19 July 2019 9:12 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4921) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Rebecca Johnson

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Rebecca Johnson**

---

### Submission Details

**Name:** Rebecca Johnson

**Submission Text :** I do not believe that teaming up the councillors and merging the divisions into four will appropriately reflect the needs of the people as their lifestyles, demographics, needs and backgrounds are so varied, and wonderfully so. To merge these into four divisions instead of 10 individual divisions will mean the needs of these very different areas of Ipswich will be condensed into four overarching campaigns/plans that will have a strong likelihood of failing to meet the very minute, grassroots needs of the people in our diverse communities. Having many individual councillors means a more diverse group of voices on behalf of the people, rather than four generalised plans. Please don't change our council representative system.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Saturday, 20 July 2019 12:44 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4922) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Lee Norman

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Lee Norman**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Lee Norman

**Submission Text :** I currently reside in Division 10, recently proposed to merge into Division 1. I would like to submit my support for these changes, after reviewing the reasoning and proposed boundaries the proposal is a sound one. By 2024 it would allow a good balance of voters across divisions that offer a voice for both rural and urban voters,  
**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Sunday, 21 July 2019 8:18 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4923) Ipswich City Local Government Area - De Vries

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **De Vries**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** De Vries

**Submission Text :** Just wanted to say that this is so fantastic!! You have done a great job!! This is excellent!!

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, 23 July 2019 10:59 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4940) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Leone Smith

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Leone Smith**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Leone Smith

**Submission Text :** Thank you for your submission form but we are only new residents up here so don't think we qualify to give an opinion. And yes we like living here.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---



**Sent:** Tuesday, 23 July 2019 11:33 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Ipswich City Local Government Area - Electoral Arrangement and Divisional Boundary Review

Good morning,

I write in response to an email notification from ECQ on 9 July 2019 concerning this review. I write as a private citizen and constituent of Ipswich with my own views on this issue, as follows:-

1. Appalling lack of notification – I am deeply concerned that the LGA Change Commission has failed to adequately notify residents of Ipswich about such a broad branch review. I, for example, live in household with 3 eligible constituents and only myself has been notified. I have heard from many others this has not been an uncommon occurrence. The length of the time for submission is appalling, and in my own view about the most limited community engagement exercise I have seen from the State Government in many years. If this were the Brisbane Boundary Review, I am sure this significant lack of consultation and time for engagement would have hit the newspapers.

Your obligation is more than rush to notify residents under the legislation. With such significant changes it should be better advertised in the media, more on the ground consultation occurring with residents by the Commission and the state government, workshops, community meetings and the like. Given the languishing state we have been in here in Ipswich without a Council, this consultation should have occurred much sooner than now. What should have been done is on the ground meaningful and effective consultation with residents before even putting this out to more public comment.

2. Lazy change management – To reduce the number of divisions and the number of councillors is lazy change management, and does not reflect the demand for services and nuisances in service delivery in such a large catchment area. Its like cutting the wages bill in order/vain hope you might achieve quick efficiencies. Some multi divisions if merged (slapped together) will be fraught with planning (social and hard infrastructure) problems into the future. Division 1 a classic example. It's not about carving up the pie to get equal numbers of voters in each multidivision, again this is a very lazy change management approach. Over governing seems to be the next result for divisions such as 2.
3. Suspension in active and robust democracy and governance in Ipswich – Many residents are frustrated by the suspension of the elected council and what feels like the suspended democracy and an ability to move forward. We should not have to wait until the 2020 elections to decide our future direction. This is not good for community and not good for business. The State's ability to move these matters forward in the best interest of Ipswich residents is wanting. A suspended long state of administration in Ipswich is having an effect on voter and business confidence. I am sure this will play out in the next state election too.

Please take this as my written feedback on the review in the limited time you have offered me and the residents of Ipswich time to respond adequately.

Yours sincerely

(Ms) Chris Figg



**Sent:** Tuesday, 23 July 2019 2:31 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4946) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Veronica Belcher

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Veronica Belcher**

---

#### **Submission Details**

**Name:** Veronica Belcher

**Submission Text :** I agree with the submission for larger divisions with 2-3 councillors which will enable a more diverse and honest approach to that division. Previously sacked councillors should also not be permitted to apply as they will continue then to try and force their agendas on newer councillors.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

23 July 2019

Local Government Change Commission  
GPO Box 1393  
BRISBANE QLD

Dear Commissioners

## **IPSWICH CITY LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA REVIEW**

I seek to make a submission in relation to the Electoral Arrangement and Divisional Review, 2019 Proposed Determination, Ipswich City Council.

I support the notion of a multi-member divided Council. I do not think there will be any boundary division option that will please all of the people. If anything, I would have preferred to see three divisions with three to four Councillors. But that is not for consideration. Instead I wish to raise an issue that has been overlooked in this process. That is genuine representation.

The Ipswich City Council's Divisional Boundary Report (listed in the website as appendix B) gave a number of reasons for the change to multi-councillor divisions in the Executive Summary on page three:

*For the various communities of Ipswich, multi-councillor divisions will effectively deliver the local representation they are seeking at the same time as avoiding a return to the significant governance pitfalls experienced in the past.*

The current "first-past-the-post" (FPTP) system does not provide a genuinely representative outcome, particularly when there are multiple positions. This result becomes less representative as the number of candidates increase. There are a lot of people discussing their availability to run in Mayoral and divisional races. They are discussing this openly in person, through the media and certainly on social media. It is highly likely there will be a large field of candidates in each division.

The FPTP system means that a candidate may be elected with a small number of votes, albeit more than the other candidates. Given that there are multiple positions I believe we need to utilise a far more democratic means of election. In essence, voters rank the candidates in order of their choice. That way, candidates need to build an absolute majority of support.

With two vacancies per division, it would be possible to develop a quota system of one-third the number of votes plus one. So if a division had 30,000 votes cast, the quota for election is 10,001. This allows voters to indicate their preference in order for the candidates. Otherwise, a system by which the preferences from the candidate with the fewest first preferences are distributed, until there are two distinct winners.

At any rate, it is important for there to be a transparent and clear method to ensure voters can be confident that their representatives are indeed truly representative. That will go a long way to achieving a greater sense of true representation.

It is important too to keep electoral messaging and guidelines consistent. With the State and Federal elections all having compulsory preferential voting, it seems logical to maintain consistency in local government elections. The changes to the Senate voting were reflected in the high number of informal votes at the 2019 Federal election. As someone who participated in scrutineering at a Pre-Poll booth with over 10,000 votes counted, I was astonished by the number of House of Representative ballot papers where voters had numbered one to six, in spite of there being nine candidates. There were new instructions where voters only needed to number one to six above the line in the Senate. To avoid confusion, simple messaging such as "number every box" would assist voters in casting a formal vote.

Another issue raised by the Ipswich City Council's review was the quality of candidates. This is something a boundary review cannot address, but it is an important issue and certainly something I would hope the Commission would forward to the Government. As local governments outside of Brisbane do not have political parties involved, there is no organisation measuring candidate suitability. It is vital that as part of nominating for a Council election, candidates undertake suitability checks and some sort of training. The last thing this city needs is further mismanagement, poor governance or by-elections.

If we are to indeed have Councillors who operate as per the Local Government Act 2009, then we need to ensure they are suitably qualified to focus on policy development and strategic delivery of services in the public interest. There needs to be a transparent system for ensuring candidates who nominate are indeed fit and proper people. This means, potential candidates should be required to undertake suitability and fitness assessments prior to formal nomination. In addition, they should be required to undertake some for formalised training whereby election rules, campaign finance, the electoral system even is outlined. This may weed out some candidates.

Following their election, all Councillors should undergo further training and induction. This training could be similar to corporate governance training undertaken by directors of companies and charities etc. But clearly it would have a local government flavour. Councillors would be taught about meeting procedures, their roles under the Act, functions of the Council and its Committees / portfolios, and the separation of powers (an issue raised throughout this process).


Ipswich has had its share of "colourful" characters. I sense the city is ready for Councillors who can provide strategic vision and leadership, while effectively and honestly representing their constituents. There has never been a better opportunity to address the issues that are far too common across local governments everywhere. I ask for more democratically elected Councillors; a consistent approach to elections; candidates who have been screened and taught the basics; and better support and education for new Councillors.

Thank you for your service to the community. I look forward to seeing the final outcomes.

Yours sincerely



**MADONNA OLIVER**



**Sent:** Wednesday, 24 July 2019 8:30 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4957) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Lynda Donohue

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Lynda Donohue**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Lynda Donohue

**Submission Text :** I would prefer that there are 10 councilors and a Mayor who would work for the whole of Ipswich. My reasons are that 8 councilors are not enough for a city the size of Ipswich and with 2 councilors per division it could prove detrimental to the city and particularly to that division if the two councilors were in conflict with each other. Thank you for including the people of Ipswich in your submission.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 24 July 2019 4:19 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (4964) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Rachel Kaminski

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Rachel Kaminski**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Rachel Kaminski

**Submission Text :** I think Ipswich needs to maintain the 10 single-member divisions system. No changes should be made. Reducing the number of divisions will be of detriment to Ipswich residents. Each area is unique and has its own concerns and issues. By lumping them together will be neglectful.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---

**Sent:** Friday, 26 July 2019 7:29 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Ipswich City Council Boundaries

To  
Whom it may concern

I disagree with the idea of having 2 Councillors in one area as this could leave to “passing the buck” from one Councillor to the other

These larger Divisions could result in those living in “non-fashionable” suburbs such as Goodna, Gailes, Redbank, Riverview etc. missing out on representation to the more upmarket suburbs such as those of the Springfield & area development & Ripley etc.

In my dealings with Councillor Paul Tully for Division 2 I found he took great pride in representing his area and had a good knowledge of his constituents and was always available. His staff also had these qualities. I believe this “hands on” qualities will go missing with what is planned for Ipswich.

I also found these qualities in David Palkhe (Division 10) in my dealings with him via the Ipswich Poetry Feast group

I compare the planned larger Divisions to those of the State Government’s closing down of smaller schools in favour of larger ones where those students not in the spotlight, will fall through the cracks and will be ignored

Thank you for this opportunity to express my concerns

Tony Caswell  


**From:** dpahlke  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 30 July 2019 10:07 AM  
**To:** ECQ User; dpahlke; LG Boundaries  
**Subject:** SUBMISSION TO ELECTORAL COMMISSION on the PROPOSED IPSWICH CITY COUNCIL DIVISIONAL BOUNDARIES  
**Attachments:** img20190712\_08511814.jpg; img20190712\_08521293.jpg; img20190712\_08525877.jpg; img20190716\_15410437.jpg; img20190716\_15485984 (2).jpg; img20190718\_11513614.jpg; img20190721\_17521472 (2).jpg

**I wish to lodge a submission concerning the new Ipswich - 4 Divisional Boundaries**

**Whoever has drawn these boundaries has simply no idea of communities of interest and how they relate to each other. I am advised by Administrator Chemello that he did not draw the boundaries but you guys did, without any guidance from Greg Chemello.**

**The Make Up/Boundaries of the 4 Divisions is ill conceived.**

**Who drew these boundaries – who put the lines on the map??????**

**From a Community interest point of view:**

- . How can Grandchester have anything in common with Ripley/Redbank Plains
- . How can Rosewood have anything in common with Barellan Point

**COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST: An extreme example you simply would not draw a line down the main street of Rosewood or Marburg or Grandchester or Walloon - OR EVEN down the main street of the Ipswich CBD - Too me that is ludicrous. Grandchester relates back to Rosewood as does Mt Walker and Ebenezer for the last 150 years. I am of the personal opinion you need to keep communities of interest together as much as possible**

**You have drastically split the rural communities of interest. You need to put Grandchester/Ebenezer/Willowbank/Mt Walker back into the same Division as Rosewood. The keeping of Historical communities of interest, whether it be Rural or Urban is fundamental as a starting point in the drawing of any electoral boundaries.**

**I SUGGEST you call for real Public Consultation/input and start again.**

**Someone has got it wrong!!!!!!!!!! Very Wrong!!!!!!!!!!**

**David Pahlke**

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- . Story in the local paper Moreton Border News
- And various Letters to the Editor



# moreton border news

Advertisement  
Working For  
Our Local  
Community



**Shayne Neumann MP**  
Federal Member for Blair

P: (07) 3201 5300  
E: Shayne.Neumann.MP@aph.gov.au  
f Shayne Neumann MP  
t @ShayneNeumannMP


AUTHORISED BY SHAYNE NEUMANN, 68 HUNTER ST BRASSALL QLD 4305

• Our 22nd Year of Publication

Friday, July 12, 2019

## Rural-urban divide

# FORMER DIVISION 10 SPLIT BETWEEN TWO URBAN-WEIGHTED ELECTORAL DIVISIONS



The red outline marks the proposed divisions for Ipswich City Council, the blue lines mark the old divisions.

□ Story page 2

**WALLOON HOTEL**  
EAT, DRINK & BE LOCAL  
★★★

1 Queen Street, Walloon  
5464 5163

**MEXICAN**  
**Monday Madness**

Nachos, Burrito, Tacos (4) or Mex Tostada (Mex Pizza)  
Choose Beef or Vegetarian

**MONDAYS**  
**DINNER 6.00-8.00pm**  
CORONA DRINK SPECIALS

**T-BONE TUESDAYS**

Dinner from 6.00pm  
Served with chips, salad and a sauce or mash, veg and sauce

**\$15**

**WEDNESDAYS**

BUY ONE meal from our main meal menu and receive your second meal or the lesser value meal for \$5  
With main meal only  
Promotion does not include entrees or kids meals

**THURSDAY NIGHTS**  
**PARMA NIGHT**

All parmas served with either crispy fries and garden salad or creamy mash & vegetables, plus your choice of topping  
TRADITIONAL, HAWAIIAN, MEXICAN OR TEXAN

**Lunches Monday to Friday from \$4.95**

## Rural-urban divide

# FORMER DIVISION 10 SPLIT BETWEEN TWO URBAN-WEIGHTED ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

by DREW CREIGHTON

RURAL Ipswich has been split between two local government electoral divisions in a decision by the State Government to reduce the former 10 divisions to four with each to be represented by two councillors.

And the decision is final.

According to a paper released by the Queensland Electoral Commission Change Commission on Tuesday, submissions from the public are invited to address the new boundary alignments, but the break up of the Ipswich City Council area into only four divisions, each with two councillors, will not be changed.

The map of the four new divisions shows the former Division 10 divided between Division 1 and 4 - two areas running from east to west of the Ipswich City Council area - pitting urban growth areas in the east with the comparatively sparsely populated rural areas in the west.

The Electoral Commission's Change Commission sub committee based its decision on the recommendation put forward by the Ipswich City Interim Administrator, Greg Chemello.


This is despite the survey results showing the majority voted for keeping the status quo with council divisions, administrators went with the second most popular option.

However, it was noted in the Electoral Commission report that the Change Commission ... "decided that four divisions, with two councillors each, would cater for the current council size, while providing scope to add additional councillor/s to all or some of the divisions as communities expand and elector numbers increase".

Under the changes Division 10 will be split between north and south:

Division 1 will take in areas such as the rural towns of Marburg, Rosewood and Walloon and the heavily populated areas of Redbank Plains, Raceview and Blackstone.

Division 4 will encompass the rural areas of Grandchester, Mt Walker, Willowbank, Purga and Peak Crossing and the Ipswich suburbs of Brassall, Tivoli and Karalee.



The proposed Division 4 boundaries.

The voting population of the Ipswich City Council area as of January this year, numbers 128,049 and under the new boundaries, the enrolled voters in each of the new Divisions are:

- Division 1 - 28,854
- Division 2 - 33,189
- Division 3 - 35,070
- Division 4 - 30,936

Former Division 10 councillor, David Pahlke, who was ousted when the council was dissolved by the State Government, said after reading the ECQ report he was "stunned but not surprised ... and very angry".

"This is the worst draw of boundaries since the 1995 amalgamation of Moreton Shire and Ipswich City," Mr Pahlke said.

"What is the community of interest between Grandchester and Redbank Plains? None.

"Yet they have put them together in the proposed Division 4. The same goes for Rosewood and Karalee in the proposed Division 1."

He said the redrawing of boundaries would destroy the communities of interest that have been in place for more than 100 years.

"And I notice they are calling places like Rosewood and Marburg 'suburbs'. These are not suburbs of Ipswich, they are gazetted townships.

"Whoever drew up these boundaries - whether it's the Minister, the Interim Administrator or the ECQ - they have got it wrong and it's the rural people of Ipswich who will pay

the price.

"If this is what is going to happen then the Interim Administrator Greg Chemello needs to come and talk to all the people in these rural areas and explain how it is going to work so well for them."

Member for Scenic Rim, Jon Krause, said the state government was bringing party politics back to Ipswich City Council.

"It's taken 24 years, but Labor is finally gagging rural Ipswich residents of the old Moreton Shire, who will be completely outnumbered - to the verge of being disenfranchised - by urban centres on all fronts," Mr Krause said.

"A quick look at the proposed Division 1 - incorporating Willowbank, Ebenezer, Purga and most of the Ipswich area I represent in the State Parliament - tells you that one councillor will be elected from Redbank Plains, one from Raceview / Flinders View, and the rest of the division will have to look after themselves.

"Ipswich City Council needs more accountability through their representatives, not less - and that's what this is delivering.

"Less representation all-round, especially in rural areas, and less accountability for Council bureaucrats."

He said the chosen proposal was the most extreme option of the multi-councillor possibilities.

THE ROYAL GEORGE HOTEL

PHONE 5464 1105

DINNER ONLY

T-BONE TUESDAY

\$14.50

PARMA WEDNESDAY

\$14.50

Key Draw \$2,541

# We must adjust to this new reality

THE first rule of the change process in Ipswich is to inform the people involved what is the new direction intended and then to listen to the usually negative arguments as they usually highlight underlying often personal reasons of why change cannot be achieved.

For too long, Ipswich has been culturally divided by areas and demographics. It is time we matured into a city of one direction where transparency of the ratepayers' rates distribution should be seen as fair and calculated.

As stated by the Administrator, the newly-elected councillors will have to have broader skills and adaptability.

As a resident, I too have to adjust. From a place where our one streetlight was a cause for a party to a place where our population is increasing that much the infrastructure cannot cope, the days of town and country are reluctantly, but factually, over.

The city expansion and all its ugly traits are here and we not only need good councillors on the ground, we need good, competent administrators to provide ongoing advice and support across the entire spectrum of our local council areas.

Like it or not, local governments are not stand-alone entities and are arms of state governments and when the dust has settled, we will still need the oversight of statutory authorities like the CCC and press freedom and vigilance to ensure we never revert to our previous state of disfunctionality.

**WAYNE OFFER**  
Thagoona

## Make the future better than our inglorious past

NONE of the previous councillors should run for council.

Did any of them ever ask any questions about what a lot of the public suspected and the CCC found of wrongdoing?

They were happy to sit back and watch as Ipswich unravelled and huge amounts of money were spent elsewhere.

Did the so-called newly elected members ask questions about any of the dealings? Quiet as mice they were.

Ask yourselves, does Ipswich really want to go back down that secretive and narrow path where even the fundamental requirements were overlooked like footpaths and public toilets in parks?

Or do we want to bring in fresh-thinking people whose only aim is to restore Ipswich to its former glory.

Don't wind back the clock Ipswich, look to the future.

**GARY REID**  
Raceview

### Extra councillor would boost connectedness

HAVING pondered the four new electoral divisions with forthcoming appointments for two councillors to each division, I would have concerns regarding the operational outcomes.

I have read the rationale in relation to the approximate number of voters in each of these divisions.

The demographic footprint of both Division 1 and 4 is vast and marries both the provincial and rural sectors.

Both these sectors would have specific social and infrastructure needs.

Consideration to an appointment of a third councillor to these defined areas would allow for incorporation of travelling distances and mobile offices to allow residents a voice and the hearing of their needs.

It would allow the renewed building of rapport, trust and mutual respect between communities and council representatives.

With very significant change will come challenges to be negotiated and solved.

Since the closure of the community offices within the previous 10 divisions, I feel responses are now more "generic" and are leading to a fracture of the respectful connectedness that existed

previously.

May we all be aware of the room for comments on websites so we can achieve the best outcomes for our Ipswich city as we sail into different waters.

**STEPH SHANNON**  
Flinders View

# Prime Minister needs to halt the gravy train

I WRITE in relation to Douglas Young's letter "Drain the Aussie Swamp" (QT 10/19) and his comments on the enormous perks and benefits politicians and public servants receive.

The challenge is for Prime Minister Scott Morrison to rein it in.

The Labor governments has clearly not been up to it.

Far too many polities are either incredibly ignorant or simply choose to milk the taxpayer, including you and me, for what they can get.

**NAME WITHHELD**

**Leichhardt**

## Service lacking in the community

DOES Queensland Rail give a "hoot" about its service to its customers?

It certainly seems it doesn't care, judging by the the way it has cut services with its trains. Plus, there are insufficient buses when its trains are cancelled.

I would expect any business, whatever the service it provides, to be up to scratch.

Queensland Rail seems to not be bothered.

It is not on its own.

I wonder when I make an appointment to see a doctor or specialist at the hospital, why is it that they are not punctual?

I accept that sometimes appointments are delayed due to more involved dealings with patients, however, I end up waiting in excess of an hour.

Service is expected at all times, so start making an effort to give service because it is expected.

Here thank you to those who give service.

**CHARLIE FROST**

**Farley**

## 'Outrageous plan' must be rejected



MAINTAIN the rage.

The dog's breakfast served up in the shape of four divisions for future Ipswich City Council's is simply incredible.

It appears my residence will be in Division 1, extending from Grandchester to Redbank Plains and who



QT  
16/7/19

knows where in between.

What a farce.

Division 1 is simply too large for two people to properly serve its residents and covers too large a geographical spread for there to be any community of interest suggestion.

I have yet to hear/see any outrage from sitting state members who ought to be screaming from the tree tops.

They obviously cannot serve two masters, therefore the people of Ipswich come second.

This is an outrageous plan and one residents must surely reject, but if it has been forced upon them.

Residents must not forget, and must "reward" their state representatives appropriately at the next state election.

Tell these turkeys what you really think.

It has been said to me that my contributions to the letters page merely state the view of the silent majority.

Sadly, the majority remains silent whereas it should be actively participating in open debate to ensure community needs are met.

We, obviously, cannot rely on current elected representatives to meet our expectations.

**KEV PEARCE**

**Raceview**

Please include your name, address and a daytime telephone number on letters for verification. Preference will be given to letters of 200 words or less for reasons of space. You can also SMS your views on 0428 634 025. You must start your text "QT" and include your name and suburb.

# Palhke's thinking appears outdated

QT 16/7/19

IN YOUR story "Change Hurts Sacked" (QT 12/07), former Ipswich City councillor David Pahlke is reportedly upset by the proposed divisional boundaries because "communities of interest" should be put together and "Grandchester has no relationship to Redbank Plains".

Mr Pahlke's thinking is outdated.

Ipswich is no longer a group of unconnected villages called Redbank Plains, Rosewood and Eastern Heights.

It is an organic whole, it is a city.

People from every part of the city use council-provided services in every other part of the city.

Mr Pahlke only has to go to Rosewood's Anzac Park on a Saturday during the Rugby League season and he will see people from Redbank Plains, Springfield and every other part of the city.

They all have a community interest in the upkeep of Anzac Park and every other council-owned sports ground.

They get to Anzac Park along roads not only traversing Division 1, but every other proposed division in the city.

Administrator Greg Chelmo has pointed out that modern councillors need to be board directors responsible for council activities all over the city and not village chieftains only interested in their own patch.

If Mr Pahlke would find the heat in this job onerous then maybe he should stay away from the kitchen.

**KEN ALDERTON**  
One Mile



**FRESH START:** Reader Margie Barker says Ipswich needs a new direction next year. Photo: File

## Our council must now start with a new slate

I READ the news article "A Council Divided" on pages 1 and 2 of the newspaper (QT 12/07).

I have no idea if the proposed new boundaries were drawn up with even the partial aim of discouraging sacked councillors from standing for election in March 2020.

Actually, I doubt it. But I do believe two councillors for each division will go a long way towards preventing divisions from becoming the "personal fiefdoms" of single councillors, as has happened in the past.

But, if these are the results of these new boundaries, I for one am cheering.

It amazes me that any of the former councillors would think it was a good idea to run again after the bad taste that has been left in the mouths of us Ipswich folk.

It also amazes me that if any of them are considering running again, they have learned nothing.

I hope that when we elect a new council and mayor next year, Ipswich can start with a completely clean slate, and a new direction and one that puts the people of Ipswich first, and not the interests of developers, super dump businesses and councillors.

**MARGIE BARKER**  
Ipswich

## Letters to the Editor

### Acting in the best interests of all citizens

AFTER reading some commentary about proposed changes to Ipswich City Council divisional boundaries, I think it's worth pointing out some of the legal responsibilities of councillors.

While it is true that councillors are elected every four years to a particular division, their legal obligation is to always act in the best interests of all citizens of Ipswich.

As your readers know, the State Governments Change Commission has reviewed the internal boundaries (divisions) of the Ipswich local government area and has determined that Ipswich should be divided into four multi-member divisions, with two councillors representing each division. The Change Commission has invited public comment on the proposed revised divisional boundaries by July 30.

I encourage residents to review the proposal. In doing so, it's important to understand a fundamental issue.

Divisional arrangements are simply the means of electing councillors; they are not the geography of councillor behaviour and council decision-making for this city going forward. Those days are over.

Section 12(b) of the Local Government Act states it clearly. Since December 2018, across Queensland all councillors are also obliged to make a formal declaration of office that they will abide by a new Code of Conduct that they understand and commit to their obligations under the law, including that they "must serve the overall public interest of the whole local government area".

The revised divisional arrangements create the foundation to elect councillors who will understand the various communities in which they live, and who will of course advance the specific interests and issues of those communities they are elected by. However, they will also be working within a legal framework which clearly requires councillors to act in the best overall interests of the entire Ipswich local government area; at all times.

While multi-councillor divisions might be unusual to Queensland in recent years, 30 percent to 60 percent of councils in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia and the Northern Territory already operate this way.

To be elected by your communities as an Ipswich City councillor is an honour and a privilege. It will be a challenging role that requires each councillor to understand and appreciate the many and

various views of people across diverse communities within their divisions and the broader city area. And it requires them to provide high quality leadership to the local government and for the overall Ipswich community.

— Ipswich City Council  
Interim Administrator  
Greg Chemello.

### Rural communities need to speak up now

OVER the last year and half, inflammatory and biased rhetoric has seen the City of Ipswich consistently whipped into a frenzy of distrust, with campaigns to discredit all former councillors as a result of the actions of a few and the devaluation of the community aspect of local government as a whole.

The proposed new divisions can easily be read as a surreptitious means of further dislodging the support bases of the former councillors, and, with the majority of the population contained within the urban areas of the proposed divisions, it is not outrageous to conclude that there will be a lack of rural representation on future Ipswich City Councils.

In their rush to disparage and devalue the work of all former Ipswich City Councillors, many seem to be forgetting Council isn't just a business, as our current administration would have us believe.

Council is also about community, as clearly outlined in the Local Government Act 2009.

The notion of 'fifedoms', that political opponents of the former councillors and certain members of the current administration like to imply was commonplace, is little more than a propagandist way of devaluing and essentially demonising community building, engagement and advocacy for constituents, which are all essential elements in the role of an effective councillor.

By seeking to ensure that rural areas are represented by rural councillors, no one is suggesting that any elected council representatives should engage in decision-making that contravenes the Local Government Act's requirement that decisions be made in the best interests of the local government area as a whole.

However, it is important to remember that in the real world, people want to have their interests represented by a person with whom they identify, not by someone who has no real frame of reference for their way of life or the intricacies of the problems which they face.

People from rural areas will not receive the same level of understanding and advocacy from urban-dwelling councillors with limited or no rural experience as they would from a member of their own local community. The same would be true in reverse.

To form a fair and truly democratic local council within the extremely diverse City of Ipswich, there must be a balance between the rural and the urban.

Therefore, divisional boundaries must be drawn up to ensure that all areas of the city are proportionately represented. Without representatives being drawn from within their local areas, the rural communities are destined to become underrepresented, disengaged and disenfranchised.

People need to speak up now and tell the Change Commission that the proposed divisions are unacceptable and do not adequately represent the needs of our diverse communities.

Now is not the time to be silent.  
— Madeliene McGarrigal, Haigslea.

### Divisional Break-up of Ipswich City Council

ONE administrator one Government approval – One final decision.

You can now raise your objection, but the decision will not be overturned. So much for the democratic process we believe in.

With two councillors per division we are to believe that they will make impartial decisions for the greater good while 'naval gazing' about the future in their offices in Ipswich Central (with no personal bias or experience).

With little regard for the past performances we appear to believe that giving more direct control to the CEO (a paid employee) will be beneficial for us all.

What community support will the next Council receive given the fact that they were elected under a system which was rejected outright by the community?


It would appear that bureaucracy and political expediency will take precedence over the wellbeing of our communities. Making small townships into Ipswich suburbs with the stroke of a bureaucratic pen is already showing that the current lifestyles people enjoy are under threat.

Given recent circumstances it is appropriate to review poor performances and the procedures that allow it. However taking the right of people to decide their own future away with bureaucratic decision making is a step too far!

— Barry Gratton,  
Marburg

## Rural-urban divide

# FORMER DIVISION 10 SPLIT BETWEEN TWO URBAN-WEIGHTED ELECTORAL DIVISIONS



The proposed Division 1 boundaries.

□ Continued from page 2

“It seems deliberately designed to concentrate power in urban areas and to silence other, dissenting voices,” he said.

“Some would say Ipswich is too big and diverse right now, and this proposal will make issues of representation worse across such a big and diverse area.

“What do Mount Mort and Redbank Plains have in common? There is no community of interest there at all.

“People should register their objections to these proposed boundaries by 30 July.”

Under the survey carried out under the auspices of the Interim Administrator, Ipswich City residents were given a period in which they could choose from an undivided council region with 8 to 12 representatives (Option 1), a council divided

between 8 to 12 electoral divisions with as many councillors (Option 2) or a third option.

The third option, 4 to 6 divisions with two to three representatives each, was chosen.

Option 3 was the one recommended by the Council Administration after what it said was an “analysis of the survey data and preference results from 1,049 respondents as well as a review of 450 written comments provided.”

The results of the survey show that Option 2, a council divided between 8 to 12 regions with as many councillors, was the most preferred choice at 43 percent.

Option 3 was the secondary preference with 57 percent of respondents making it their second choice, which, according to the survey report, made it the “least disliked” option.

In the report, one of the reasons

given for why it was the best model was a claim about divisional budgets.

“A common criticism of divisional budgeting is that it encourages a ‘pet and populist’ approach to project and community support, with divisional needs, as perceived by the councillor, often prioritised over wider community needs,” it read.

“The impact of this divisional-based approach can be seen across the city.”

• Submissions on the boundary realignment will be accepted by the Electoral Commission of Queensland up until the end of this month.

### TRUST OUR ANIMAL INSTINCTS

From large to small - we give quality care to all

- Vaccinations • Worming • Desexing
- Medical Advice • Preventative Health
- Herd Health • Bovine & Canine Reproduction

OPEN TIMES: Monday to Friday 8.30am-6.00pm; Saturday 8.30am-11.30am

**ROSEWOOD VETERINARY SERVICE** **RVS**  
 14 Walloon Road, Rosewood  
 Ph 5464 1607

**ROSEWOOD Hardware**

### For all your Gardening needs

Plant Food      Raised Garden Beds  
 Soil      Mulch  
 Seeds      Tools

Like us on Facebook      Phone/Fax 5464 1899  
 Opening Hrs - Mon-Fri 7.30am-5.00pm, Sat 7.30am-12.30pm, Sun Closed

**Nissan**

# DRIVE

**3 YEARS FREE SERVICE - \$3,000 DEPOSIT ON US**  
 WHEN YOU FINANCE WITH NISSAN

**Ipswich Nissan**  
 5 Brisbane Rd, Bundamba

Ph 3817 3800  
 www.ipswichnissan

\*Offer available on new and demonstrator vehicles purchased by 30/9/2019 and delivered within 30 days of end of month in which vehicle is ordered. 3 years free service valid for up to 3 standard scheduled services for Navara, or 3 years from the date of registration, whichever occurs first. Free servicing and finance bonus for approved applicants of Nissan Financial Services (Australian Credit Licence Number 391464). Excludes Government, Rental and National Fleet customers. Nissan reserves the right to vary, extend or withdraw this offer. Not available in conjunction with any other offer. Premium paint available at additional cost. See Nissan.com.au for eligible models and warranty T&Cs

**Sent:** Saturday, 27 July 2019 9:53 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (5018) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Ron Turner

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Ron Turner**

---

**Submission Details**

**Name:** Ron Turner

**Submission Text :** This will not provide a better government. The reasoning for this change is shaky at best. Only 10% of respondent is not a convincing approval for your plan. Your zoning way to light for instance zone 1. There is no way even two councillors can stay abreast of the issue in this zone. It will also have the largest growth in council and according to your rule of even distribution will be out of whack in 12 months. I would also like to know how two councillors would work. If they have opposing views or options then you can only imagine what will happen (nothing). This whole process has been a rail road by the labor government from the work go. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] So in summary I'm opposed to these changes.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---



## Electoral Decisions Ipswich

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing today to lodge my objection to the proposed changes to the Ipswich divisional changes.

I believe that this is a poor choice seeing that only approximately 1500 people replied to the survey, whereas the Ipswich division has approximately 128,000 people. Why is it that only a small number of people replied, is it because they could not be bothered or is it a protest vote against the local and state governments.

Do they believe, that this has already been decided, just like the hospital renaming or the children's hospital fiasco.

As the results are now been released, why is it not the first choice, that being option 2 (a council divided between 8 and 12 regions) been recommended? Instead of the second choice of option 3, which had a higher approval but not the first choice.

Add to this the spitting of division 10 into other areas, which will make the country areas unrepresented. As the larger population of the new area will mostly be the Redbank, Raceview and Blackstone, while the other part of this division will be dominated by Brassall, Tivoil and Karalee. With no true representation of the whole area. If you believe this will stop the pet and populist approach to local projects, I believe you are very misguided or naive.

This has been a poorly designed restructure, allowing the city to decide what is best for the rural population. We will be unrepresented and pushed aside if with no one looking after our interests. As the rural areas have different set of needs to the general city areas.

In conclusion I believe that this decision has already been made and that this is only a public relations exercise to allow the state government to say that they followed the process and that the people made this choice. I would like to draw your attention to the following newspaper article which I believe states our concerns much better than I can. Rural-urban divide by Drew Creighton in the Moreton boarder new July 12 2019.

Yours faithfully

Leigh Studdert

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Sent:** Tuesday, 30 July 2019 11:01 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (5022) Ipswich City Local Government Area - Scott Moore

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **Scott Moore**

---


**Submission Details**

**Name:** Scott Moore

**Submission Text :** i have reviewed the current subission and fully agree with the boundrarys and the need for two councillors per each area. it is imperitive that the new councillors are only a infomation conduit for the people and have no decision making responsabilitys. coucillors are only there to take the residents issues and requests to the council for larger items ( new infastructurer, upgrades' or were the reident does not think they are getting listen to from council.)the normal everyday issues the resident should go directly to the council o have fixed as per its piority.(pot holes, rubbish pick ups, broken park fixtures, etc.) the issue is these councillors need to be only the conduit for the people not the person whodecides whether the request is right or wrong or worthy. they need to raise the issue on behalf of the resident and report back to the resident the outcome. nothing more the days of the demanding self promoting coucillors is now over.

**File Upload:** No file uploaded ()

---



Tuesday, 30 July 2019

Local Government Change Commission  
GPO Box 1393  
BRISBANE Q 4001  
By email to: LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au

Submission regarding:  
**Electoral Arrangement & Divisional Boundary Review of Ipswich City Council**

Dear Madam / Sir

It is my understanding that the Change Commission of the Electoral Commission of Queensland in preparation of the current proposal was guided to a substantial degree by the City of Ipswich Divisional Boundary Review Report to the Minister for Local Government dated 30 April 2019.

That Report was based in turn on the results of a survey made available in Ipswich during March 2019.

### **A conclusion built on an unsound foundation**

Whether accidental or intentional, the design of that survey was predestined to deliver the conclusion "Option 3 Divided Multi-Councillor".

Respondents were offered one of two poles "Option 1" or "Option 2". Those two poles collectively attracted the first preference of just over 70% of respondents. Respondents were instructed to list their three preferences. As their second preference the overwhelming majority of respondents would naturally choose the option which most closely resembled their first preference.

The result being that the respondents would coalesce in that middle ground between the two poles – the hybrid of the two opposing poles. Thus the survey's result flowed from the survey's design.

The raw data has not been published nor made available by Ipswich City Council. Labelled "4.1 The Raw Data" the Council has published 'rare' data: rare in the sense that the data presented had been slightly cooked (i.e. massaged).

In addition the relatively small number of respondents at 1049 (*just 1.6% of voters*) also casts doubt on the validity of the foundations for the current proposal. Consider, too, that those respondents were self-selected 'concerned citizens'. The margin of error must be significant for the results of that survey.

### **The boundaries of the divisions as currently proposed**

For effective representation it is important that the divisional boundaries enclose communities of common interest. Wisely, some recognition of this has been shown by the boundaries as drafted in the current proposal in that the proposed boundaries do not divide suburbs or localities.

But the division of the large western rural area is a gross departure from that principle. The rate payers and residents of those rural localities are entitled to be represented by a common voice. Their divisional boundary ought to embrace the whole of those rural areas.

The current proposal to divide those rural areas in two yields the absurd result that the small percentage of residents of those areas are to be represented by half of the incoming councillors. Those four councillors have plenty of travelling ahead of them to familiarise themselves with their electorate and their constituents: a significant expense on the city's budget.

On the other hand, for example, residents of Grandchester in the far west and its surrounding district have little common interest with those of Redbank Plains well to the east. Redbank Plains is much closer to Brisbane CBD than it is to Grandchester: yet residents of inner Brisbane view Redbank Plains as quite remote.

Are the councillors representing Division 1 to be provided with a helicopter and pilot to cover the extremities of their electorate?

Similar observations but somewhat less extreme may be made regarding proposed division 4.

I acknowledge that the relatively small population in the western rural areas creates as challenge when trying to balance the number of voters (quota): it would be prudent to give consideration to a further division (under this current proposal, a fifth division) represented by a single councillor to address this challenge. In that case that fifth divisional boundary would be drawn to embrace approximately 7111 voters and the quota for the other 4 divisions reduced accordingly.

Consideration must be given to the possibility that the numerous communities of interest cannot be addressed by just 4 divisions. Perhaps the multi-councillor model is an example of attempting to put a square peg in a round hole.

### **Political implications**

There have been suggestions that the multi-councillor proposal by the City of Ipswich and the drafting of the current boundaries has been a deliberate attempt to impede or prevent the previous councillors being elected once again. If that were so, those actions would be an example of manipulating or attempting to fix the political process – an action which Ipswich City Council ought not to have taken – and an action that the Electoral Commission of Queensland must not take under their duty to remain impartial.

I look forward to an improved future proposal for the community's consideration

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of James B Thompson.

James B Thompson

**Sent:** Tuesday, 30 July 2019 2:51 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** (5024) Ipswich City Local Government Area - George Hatchman  
**Attachments:** Electoral-boundaries-online-submission-ICC.GH-30Jul2019.pdf

Online submission for **Ipswich City Local Government Area** from **George Hatchman**

---

## Submission Details

**Name:** George Hatchman

**Submission Text :** Willowbank & RAAF Amberley's Associated History - In 22nd Dec 1938, 882 acres of land in the Parish of Jeebropilly were gazetted for Defence purpose at Amberley and RAAF Base Amberley commenced operations on 17th June 1940. This land was located on the overflow floodplains at the confluence of the Warrill Creek and Bremer River which was known as "Jeebropilly" by our First Australians, an indigenous name translated as 'Swamp of the Flying Squirrels' and overlay two main land holdings; the north portion being part of the original pioneer family Collet's property of "Amberley" named after their county of origin in Sussex England, and the southern portion overlaying the banks of the Warrill Creek rural subdivision of "Willow Bank", a brief history of which is inscribed on the Willowbank Entrance Statement Historic Data Plaque: "Willowbank" was the name given to a large Sheep & Cattle Station land holding established in the early 1800's on the NW side of Warrill Creek. This property was established by pioneer developer, Mr. Darby McGrath. The homestead was located on what is now Amberley Air Force Base near the banks of Warrill Creek which was prolific with willow trees - hence the name .. "Willow Bank". In Feb 1890 his property was sold to a Mr. S.W. Gray who surveyed the estate into smaller parcels and auctioned them off to the public. This was historically the 'First' subdivision of rural portions in Queensland and continued to be known as the "Willow Bank" Estate. The name 'Willowbank' was used by the Postmaster Generals Department in 1956 when they sought the approval of the Land Administration Board to name a new telephone office in the district 'Willowbank' similar to the name of the area. Willowbank as a name was officially named by the Governor in Council on 15 October 1983. The official locality boundaries were gazetted by the Minister for Natural Resources on 8 September 2000. This followed local community consultation led by Willowbank resident George Hatchman. An original cadastral poster advertising the auction sale of "Willow Bank" Estate is located in the Harrisville Pioneers Museum. (Of note is that the original Amberley State School was known as the "Warrill Creek" school and was located near where the RAAF base 25 meter Rifle Range now exists). In essence, Amberley is more parts than one might realize of Willowbank. To construct RAAF Amberley circa WW2 to a solid base strip elevated above the surrounding flood plain, up to two meters of alluvial topsoil soil was excavated from the surrounding area, especially from the paddocks and hills of what is now known as the locality of "Willowbank", and consolidated into the airfield. The boundaries of RAAF Amberley and Willowbank align along O'Neils Road and Willowbank also rises to an elevation of 85 meters above the airstrip elevation of 26 meters and lays approximately two kilometres south west directly under the approach flight path of the airfield cross runway. The new Amberley Aviation Precinct will also be established on what was the south-east portion of the early "Willow Bank" Estate land holdings. On the 11th November 2011, the custodianship of the "Amberley Boy" Honour Stone was transferred to the perpetual care of RAAF Amberley by the Willowbank/ Amberley community and to commemorate this event, a plaque was affixed to note the history of the Honour Stone. On this plaque is also inscribed the image of a Flying Squirrel (Sugar glider), to establish the transitional historic links with the original First Australians who knew this land as "Jeeebropilly", the early settlers who pioneered this rural community and its current tenure as RAAF Base Amberley. George Hatchman Historian RAAF No. 23 (City of Brisbane) Squadron Assn.

**File Upload:** Electoral-boundaries online-submission - ICC.GH 30Jul2019.pdf (560.2 KB)

---

<https://www.ecq.qld.gov.au/electoral-boundaries/local-government-boundary-reviews/online-submission>

30<sup>th</sup> July 2019

George Hatchman

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Mob. [REDACTED]

E. [REDACTED]

**INVITATION TO COMMENT – LGCC Electoral Arrangement & Divisional Boundary Review  
Of Ipswich City Council**

On review of the 2019 proposed LGCC Electoral Arrangement & Divisional Boundary Review of the Ipswich City Council (ICC), I am concerned with the determination of the proposed Divisional One Boundaries.

My background:

I am a resident of the Ipswich Suburb of Willowbank which will be included in the 'new' ICC Divisional 1 (Div.1) ward and also the elected President (15+ years) of the Willowbank Area Residents Group Inc. which is a residents action group that acts to advocate for the 'wellness & advancement' of the social & environmental amenity of Willowbank & surrounding areas of Amberley, Jeebropilly, Ebenezer, Mt. Forbes, Mutdapilly and Purga West.

Additionally with the amalgamation of the Moreton Shire Council (MSC) into the ICC circa Year 1995, I had the unique privileged, on request from the ICC, to determine the boundaries of the 'new' ICC 'Suburb of Willowbank' given that it was just generalised as an undefined 'Locality' when the area was part of the MSC. To undertake this determination, I considered the elements of area's history, residential & industry demographics, the then current perception of locality boundaries & the verbal comments of surrounding area locals. The finalised boundaries I had determined were adopted and gazetted as the Suburb of 'Willowbank' by the ICC and also set the framework for the ICC to determine the likewise boundaries of Amberley, Jeebropilly, Ebenezer, Mt. Forbes Mutdapilly & Purga. I was also a member of the ICC City Country Consultative Committee which provides for my historical knowledge and demographics understanding of this area in which I reside.

Considerations:

I fully appreciate the scope of the ECC considerations to balance rural with urban communities to give fair representation to the rural constituents but I do have concern with the proposed Div.1 boundaries in respect to stated objectives to '*unite suburbs and their communities of interest within individual Divisions*'.

Division 10 (Div.10) of the current ICC encompasses approximately 60% land area of the full estate of the ICC region and yet it would seem this is to be replicated again by the proposed Div.1 (although marginally smaller) being approximately 50% of the total area of ICC.

This would still mean a lateral distance of 50+ kilometres from the west of to the east of Div.1 which would certainly preclude a similar community of interest between the communities at each extremity?

It would further question the feasibility and logistics of Div.1 elected Councillors to have an everyday overview of all areas of this ward!

The largeness of this area would also retain all the hallmarks of the original Div.10 situation and continue to compromise effective administration in attempting to contain all these unique localities with their independent social and infrastructure requirements, and what would be the proposed ICC budget allocation for social & infrastructure services .. 25% of the ICC year's fiscal expenditure for 50% of the shire?

Historically, all the wards of the proposed Div.1 west of Yamanto were contained within the boundaries of the previous MSC with the centre of their community's administrative, social & commercial interests being focused on the township of Rosewood. With MSC amalgamation into the ICC, suburbs west of Willowbank still maintained this relationship but Willowbank and east Div.10 elements drifted their social & commercial interests focus towards Yamanto and CBD Ipswich while still retaining administrative connections to the Rosewood Div.10 office. Willowbank also has historical links with Amberley which still remains given the close geographical location and the number of Defence families in residence (refer attachment).

**However, no such community of interest connections were established with suburbs east of Yamanto.**

In this respect, the proposed Div.1 amalgamation of the suburbs of Mount Mort & Grandchester distant with the suburbs of Redbank & Swanbank does not opt for the synergy of common community interest. Indeed, by this very process in attempting to balance out rural vs urban representation, it would effectively create a voting 'gerrymander' to bias urban interest's dominant over rural interests and ensure voting outcomes that would almost certainly result in elected councillors being from the urban suburbs and not having an active engagement (or understanding) with their rural constituents, particularly given the geographical distance to daily encounter.

Further to this is the that the proposed Div.1 will incorporate no less than 5 separate Post Code areas; 4301, 4304, 4305, 4306 & 4340 which each having their separate commercial realities and hardly contributing to a common community of interest. No other proposed ICC Ward would have this community diversity!

In the case of our suburb of Willowbank, our local Post Office was Amberley 4306 but with the foreclosure to the public with the expansion of the RAAF Base Amberley perimeter, our mail services have now been allocated to Ipswich West Post Office (Post Code 4305) yet this will be outside the proposed Div.1 boundary and hardly contributing to supporting our community of interest!!



My recommendation therefore is:

**REDUCE the footprint of the Proposed Div.1 electoral area.**

This could be achieved by incorporation of the suburbs Yamanto, Amberley and possibly Liechhardt into Div.1 and transferring the suburbs east of Deebing; Heights, Goolman & Peak Crossing, to be absorbed into both Div.2 & Div.3. This would require Div.4 to absorb the west components of Div.3 to balance the electoral numbers and Div.3 to be expanded in to the south in conjunction with Div.2 to absorb the eastern suburbs of proposed Div.1.

Obviously there would need to be a more analytical calculation in balancing electoral quota numbers in the revision of the 4 new Divisions, but I feel this essential to ensure a more effective concept of 4 equal Divisions, not only in population but **also in area footprint**.

Conclusion:

With the amalgamation of the MSC into the ICC in the year 1995, the original **12** part time Councillors were replaced by a **single** full time Div.10 Councillor.

This then created a situation of one Councillor being responsible for 60% of the total land area of the ICC which contained many separate smaller communities in which **12** Councillors had effectively administrated. This move obviously reduced ICC administration costs but effectively established the need for these smaller community groups to establish their unique active Community Committees to advocate for their fair representation within the ICC. The incumbent Div.10 Councillor also recognised the value of these Community Groups to support Div.10 administration and as such further acted to establish the interactive medium of the ICC City Country Consultative Committee.

Essentially the proposed area size of the 'new' Div.1 is just realistically impractical for *"to elect Councillors who will need to understand the communities in which they live and who will naturally advance to council the interest of these communities"*. This could only be achieved by the continuance and engagement with established unique community groups!

Many good community people, inclusive of myself and the other Willowbank Area Residents Group Committee members, have given our extensive voluntary time without remuneration to advocate for the recognition and wellbeing of our individual communities within the ICC. The proposed Div.1 will continue to exacerbate this situation as there is little change to the current Div.10 area size situation but will no doubt certainly continue to save ICC significant Administration expenditure at the personal cost of volunteer time and the hip pockets of we concerned citizens .. **not a fair deal!**

It would therefore be a disappointment for all us residents who make significant effort of our personal time to compile these submissions not to see sensible aspects of these submissions considered and appropriate amendments effected to the currently proposed new 4 ICC Division boundaries.

**We as residents do want a cohesive City/Country City of Ipswich and also importantly, the recognition that we do have a voice in the direction of our future.**

I support the proposed divisional boundary changes. My reason for supporting the changes is that the proposed changes will facilitate renewal, something very necessary if local government is to rehabilitate itself in the Ipswich local government area. The 'balance' appears to be as good as anyone could achieve. I was born in Ipswich and I am very fond of the place and its surrounds.

This is possibly outside of your scope; however, I would like to see the council renamed the Ipswich Regional Council because the future of the Ipswich local government area needs to be formed based in reality. That reality is that the council is responsible for an area of over 1,000 square kilometres and with a population of approximately 200,000 people. It is much more than a city.

I suggest that the council's title reflect accurately that it covers more than a city e.g. Ipswich Regional Council or the Ipswich Shire Council. It would also make for a refreshing change to be rid of the title Ipswich City Council.

In the past elected officials have used the media promote Ipswich as a city. Such promotion is probably a good thing. However, naming the council the Ipswich City Council creates the sense that, for people outside of Ipswich (the city) their interests are secondary.

It also leads to towns, officially gazetted as towns by the State, being described as suburbs in official documents such as the Divisional Boundary Review Report of 30 April 2019 and the Local Government Change Commission's report. For example, Rosewood and Marburg are officially towns. These towns are not suburbs of Ipswich. These are towns within the Ipswich local government area.

And now for a bit of nitpicking – the report refers to Krugar Parade and Kruger Parade. Kruger is the correct spelling. As someone who has spent much time living and working there, I have a deep appreciation of the legacy of Stan and Perc Kruger. The misspelling of the street named in their honour in the report jarred with me.

**From:** Gary Molloy  
**Sent:** Thursday, 11 July 2019 4:42 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** ProposedDivisions Electoral

I agree with 4 divisions and 8 councillors

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**From:** Glenda Zammit  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 9 July 2019 12:47 PM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Re Change of divisions

I think that spreading the divisions is a good idea, as long as the individuals taking on that roll, are willing to stay in the area they are elected into and work for the people!!

For too many years, it has just been a job where they are paid a wage for little work. Does this mean, less Councillors, less outlay, and a cut in the rates?? One would hope, that would be the case!!

Regards,  
Glenda Zammit

**Sent:** Wednesday, 31 July 2019 8:59 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Electoral Arrangement and Divisional Boundary Review of Ipswich City Council

This is a "late submission". Therefore I expect it will not be considered, not only because it is late but also because it does not fit the Queensland Government's agenda of promoting party politics into local government.

Mr Chemello has on numerous occasions stated that the divisional boundary system in Ipswich had to change because: *"While it is true that councillors are elected every four years to a division, their legal obligation is to always act in the best interests of all citizens of Ipswich, not just their division.*

*This may not have been the case in the past, and it may not reflect some residents' views on what they would like "their" councillor(s) to do, but it's the law.*

*Divisional arrangements are the means of electing councillors; they are not the geography of councillor behaviour and council decision-making for this city.*

*Those days are over."*

What absolute rubbish! If Ipswich councillors were not representing all citizens of Ipswich, then what makes the council individual division system any different to the Queensland Government electoral system where local individual candidates are elected to state government. Moreover, Queensland Government doesn't even have an upper house to ensure all Queenslanders are adequately represented!

Apart from the rhetoric, where is Mr Chemello's evidence that Ipswich councillors did not serve the overall public interest of the whole local government area?

The Divisional Boundary Survey was promoted as a means for residents to have their say about how they would like their new council to perform. Publicity around the survey suggested that the failings of the old council stemmed from the existing divisional structure and that a new structure that decoupled councillors from their respective divisions would correct the faults claimed to be caused by locally elected representatives being too closely associated with their communities.

Consequently, the survey was designed in such a way as to produce a predetermined outcome that supported a hybrid of multi-councillors in multi-divisions. This outcome was then used by Mr Chemello to justify getting rid of divisional councillors and local council offices.

The survey was an absolute sham. Even Blind Freddy and his dog could see that, by relying on second preferences, options were limited to the hybrid model which was the fallback position between the other two opposing all-in or all-out models. The way the results were manipulated by compulsory second preferencing gave a skewed account of residents' views. In fact, the results were so skewed that residents could not even participate in the survey unless they preferenced very undesirable alternatives. All of this was Mr Chemello's means to justify the end.

If he was really honest about representing the views of Ipswich residents, he would have allowed participants to state their "Yes to mean Yes and their No to mean No!"

Let me give you the extreme example: If 80% of survey participants chose the divided model of one councillor per division and the remaining 20% chose the undivided model, then the multi-councillor model would have received no votes at all. But, by manipulating the process by requiring second preferences to

be considered, most if not all second preferences would have flowed to the hybrid model. Hence, on a count of first and second preferences, the multi-councillor model would have received 100% of the votes even though no survey participant wanted it. This had to be the outcome regardless of how participants cast their first preference. How was Mr Chemello allowed to play such a scam on us?

Sincerely

Des Jones

**Sent:** Wednesday, 31 July 2019 11:33 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Ipswich City Council Proposed divisional Boundaries

The Electoral Commissioner Qld

Sir/madam

Members of the Pine Mountain and District Progress association have expressed the following dissatisfaction with the proposed divisional boundaries for Ipswich City Council

- As a Rural and semi-rural area, Residents feel they are being disenfranchised by being put in a division with a large urban population
- The divisions have totally disregarded communities of interest
- There will be no voice to represent the rural and semi-rural areas within the Council as councillors will give preference to areas where they can attract the greatest number of votes
- The divisions do not deliver greater accountability/equity as was the premise for dismissing the council in the first place
- It appears to be designed to introduce party politics and special interest groups into Local Government, acting against the interests of local communities

Regard

Chris Ryan  
President  
Pine Mountain & District Progress Association




**Sent:** Wednesday, 31 July 2019 11:44 AM  
**To:** LG CC Submissions  
**Subject:** Ipswich City Council boundary review

Sir /Madam

The proposed boundaries for the Ipswich City Council divisions is of great concern as it

1. Has put the area of Pine Mountain, a rural and semi-rural area and other rural areas in with urban areas with a large population, a community we have nothing in common with
2. I feel that I no longer have a vote that will count as candidates will be more concerned with gaining the votes of the urban community
3. The whole system appears to be designed to facilitate party politics and large industry groups gaining control of council, this is not in the interests of the community
4. I do not believe this proposal delivers the equity and accountability we were told were the reasons for the review
5. I believe the electoral system has been compromised

Chris Ryan  




---

**From:** Greg Chemello [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 21 August 2019 12:22 PM  
**To:** Pat Vidgen [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Division names

Pat

I'm not sure of the legalities, but there would be substantial value in describing Ipswich's four division by name, not a number.

We are thinking about North, South, East and Central as the names.

Avoids confusion with the comparable numbers of former divisions but more importantly conveys to residents a broad representative base...

Regards



**Greg Chemello** | Interim Administrator

[REDACTED]  
**Greg Chemello** | Interim Administrator  
Office of the Interim Administrator

IPSWICH CITY COUNCIL [REDACTED]

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHANGE COMMISSION

---

W: [www.ecq.qld.gov.au](http://www.ecq.qld.gov.au)

E: [LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au](mailto:LGCCsubmissions@ecq.qld.gov.au)

T: 1300 881 665

P: Local Government Change Commission  
GPO Box 1393  
BRISBANE QLD 4001