



Suggestion 161

Alan Mayne

2 pages

From: Alan Mayne [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2017 2:30 PM
To: FedRedistribution - SA
Subject: Federal Seat Redistribution in South Australia

Mayo: I submit below a general text that you will already have received from many Mayo electors, and which you may discount because it is based upon a shared template.

However I want to emphasise here at the beginning that Mayo should not be abolished because the region it represents has historical, geographical, cultural and economic coherence and unity (AND ongoing vitality) which it would be foolish to unravel.

At a time when this region is attracting world interest for its collective signature in premium-quality agricultural and viticultural production, and when its bid for UNESCO world heritage recognition is slowly gaining traction, it would be heart-rending to residents for the region to be removed from the nation's electoral map. The region would be reassigned to the margins of formal political activity (which is surely the antithesis of sensible planning for a healthy democracy?).

I speak from the heart not only as a rural constituent of this complicated electoral mix of rural and city-fringe residents, but as a long-term volunteer member of the Oakbank-Balhannah CFS brigade. In the CFS (region 1) we give our all for this place, and I would expect that commitment to be considered seriously as you rework the federal electoral map of South Australia.

To the Redistribution Committee for South Australia,

I write to make suggestions to the South Australian Federal Redistribution currently being undertaken by the Australian Electoral Commission.

I am a constituent of the Federal Division of Mayo.

I do not believe that the Division of Mayo should be abolished in this redistribution process. I note that the committee responsible for managing the redistribution must consider;

1. Communities of Interest within the proposed electorate, including economic, social and regional interests.
2. Means of communication and travel within the proposed federal electorate
3. The physical features of an area of the proposed federal electorate.

With these criteria in mind, I do not believe that the Division of Mayo should be abolished.

Communities of Interest

As a constituent of Mayo, I know that the collaboration between Federal and Local Government is incredibly important. Mayo includes the entirety of the Adelaide Hills Council, Mount Barker District Council, Alexandrina Council, Victor Harbor Council, The District Council of Yankalilla and the Kangaroo Island Council. To abolish Mayo and split these councils between two or three electorates would mean that my local community is not represented consistently.

The community of Mayo has shared interests and passions. Mayo has the highest percentage of volunteers in Australia, which speaks to our shared community spirit. Many of us like to attend local country shows or gather to watch the local sporting teams play on the weekend.

In an economic sense, Mayo contains the vast majority of South Australia's horticulture industry and seven distinct wine regions. I believe it is better that these important businesses in our community are represented by someone who understands the issues they are facing, rather than being represented by someone based in the metropolitan area.

At the recent election, the results from the ballot boxes show a consistent vote for our current independent Federal Member. I believe this shows a want across the region for an independent voice in Federal Parliament, and it would be disappointing if this voice was silenced due to the electorate being abolished.

Physical features of Mayo

There are distinct physical features that define Mayo from the metropolitan electorates and the rural electorate of Barker, including the Hills Face Zone, the Onkaparinga River and the Lower Lakes.

The Hills Face Zone is a large planning zone in South Australia that restricts development in the Adelaide Foothills and Mount Lofty Ranges. As a result of this zone, there is an effective barrier between metropolitan Adelaide and the communities of the Adelaide Hills. It does not make sense for these two distinct areas to be represented by a metropolitan based electorate.

The Lower Lakes separate riverside communities including Goolwa, Milang and Currency Creek from the Division of Barker. This creates a true physical barrier between Mayo and Barker.

Population Growth in Key Areas

I know that the AEC must attempt to make sure all of the remaining ten electorates have a similar population. Mayo currently has 3 fast growing communities in Mount Barker, Victor harbor and Strathalbyn. Mount Barker in particular currently has a population 34,000, but this is projected to increase to 55,000 by 2036. It would not be fair for an area of this size to be included within a metropolitan seat boundary, as the needs and experiences of the voters would be considerably different.

I hope you will consider my submission, and that you will see fit to keep the Division of Mayo as one of the ten electoral divisions in South Australia.

Yours sincerely, Alan Mayne [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]