



Suggestion 17

Dr Mark Mulcair

22 pages

SUGGESTIONS FOR 2020 WESTERN AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL REDISTRIBUTION

Dr Mark Mulcair

Please accept my Suggestions for the 2020 Western Australian federal redistribution.

I am an independent person with no affiliation to any political party, and no interest in engineering a partisan outcome for any side. At recent redistributions, a small group of interested independent contributors have emerged, and I encourage the redistribution Committee to take our suggestions on board.

While I am a resident of Victoria, I have contributed to many state and federal redistributions over the years, including in Western Australia, so I have a fairly clear idea of community of interests and previous boundaries in the WA seats.

I hope my suggestions can be of benefit to the Committee .

Mark Mulcair

ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS AND GENERAL STRATEGY

Enrolment projections continue to show a marked disparity in the state; very strong growth in the outer suburbs, weaker growth closer to the city, and even decline in some of the rural areas. With the abolition of a seat, a number of Divisions are predicted to be significantly below quota.

An interesting feature of this redistribution is that virtually all the excess, and a large part of the predicted growth, is bottled up in a single seat: Pearce. Currently, the Division of Pearce takes in both of the major northern growth corridors, blowing out its enrolment way over quota, while all the neighbouring seats have much lower enrolment. Clearly, there will need to be significant changes throughout the northern suburbs, to unlock the growth in Pearce and spread it around neighbouring Divisions.

To this end, I am proposing the abolition of Pearce.

Abolish Pearce??

On the surface, abolishing Pearce may seem an odd choice, given it has the highest enrolment and strongest growth in the state. However, my issue with Pearce is more the nature of the Division itself.

Successive redistributions have turned Pearce into a 'bits and pieces' Division, taking in a variety of different areas without much connection between them. Currently, Pearce takes in a slice of northern Wanneroo, the Ellenbrook area, some rural shires immediately north of the metropolitan area, and the Avon Valley. These areas do not have much in common, and would fit better with neighbouring areas in other Divisions:

- The rural components of Pearce have a greater connection to seats such as Durack, than with metropolitan Perth.
- Ellenbrook fits well with Midland and the remaining Swan Valley areas currently in Hasluck.
- Northern Wanneroo would be a good fit in Moore and/or Cowan.

Making these changes would then allow very natural flow-on adjustments to top up all of the other seats:

- Moore and Stirling are pulled northwards, which begins opening up room for Curtin and Perth to expand.
- Hasluck can consolidate on the Swan Valley, shedding areas around Gosnells and southern Kalamunda to help top up Swan, Burt, and Tangney.

- Durack can expand naturally within its existing configuration, without flow-on impacts to O'Connor or Forrest.
- Brand and Fremantle can be left relatively unchanged.

I think this is the best way to manage the necessary changes at this redistribution. While some Divisions are forced to undergo significant change, I think the community of interest in seats such as Hasluck actually improves with these adjustments. Instead of straddling multiple corridors, they can focus more clearly on one distinct area.

NAMING

Since Pearce is the seat that is being redistributed among all its neighbours, I am proposing that the name 'Pearce' is the one that is removed. I think that neighbouring seats (Durack, Moore, Cowan, Hasluck) retain enough of their existing electors, or identify clearly with a particular area, to retain their existing names.

However, the option is there if the Committee wished to retain the name 'Pearce'. They could easily rename my proposed Moore or Hasluck as 'Pearce', and possibly rename other seats accordingly.

Another possible option could be to retire the geographic names of Fremantle or Perth, if the Committee wanted to retain 'Pearce' and all of the other existing names.

BOUNDARIES

I have tried to use strong and clear boundaries wherever possible. In rural areas, I have been guided by LGA boundaries or SA2 boundaries, and/or natural features such as mountain ranges. In urban areas, I have tried to use major roads, freeways, rivers and creeks wherever possible. In some cases, suburb or LGA boundaries can make useful boundaries in urban areas, but I have tried to avoid these boundaries when they run along minor streets or split built-up areas.

As well as changes that are necessary for quota, I have also tried to tidy up existing boundaries that are less-than-ideal where possible (e.g. the boundary between Fremantle and Tangney in the O'Connor area).

POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

A number of traditional marginal seats such as Hasluck, Cowan, Canning, and Perth see some significant change under my proposals, but these do not seem to have much partisan impact. In many cases, the changes seem to balance each other out politically.

One Liberal seat (Pearce) is abolished, but a marginal seat (Stirling) becomes safer for the Liberal Party, so there is some balance there in the longer term. Other traditional marginals such as Swan would see only small changes with almost no political impact.

Consolidating more clearly on the inner north and north-east might improve the Greens' position in the Division of Perth.

SUGGESTIONS

DURACK

The existing Division of Durack is well under quota, and needs to gain around 20,000 electors. However, it is also a geographically enormous seat, so there is the need to boost Durack's numbers without drastically increasing its area.

I suggest that all of Pearce's existing rural territory be transferred to Durack. This includes the Shires of Gingin, Chittering, Toodyay, Northam, York, and Beverley. These are all Wheatbelt communities, and fit well with the existing northern Wheatbelt shires currently in Durack. Being closer to Perth, these are relatively small shires; around 22,000 electors are added, but the area of Durack only increases by ~12,000 sq km. This is less than a 1% increase in the total area of the seat.

Arguably, having a Division extending from the fringes of Perth to the Northern Territory border is not ideal. However, the only other option would be to return to the previous Kalgoorlie/O'Connor arrangement, which would result in an even more enormous and diverse electorate being created. I think the current arrangement, splitting the remote rural parts of WA between two seats, is better.

The Brand, Great Northern, and Great Eastern Highways would provide strong north-south and east-west links between these new areas and the rest of the seat.

DURACK		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		98382	95524
+ Northam SA2	From Pearce	7349	7228
+ York/Beverley SA2	From Pearce	4017	4000
+ Toodyay SA2	From Pearce	3326	3453
+ Chittering SA2	From Pearce	3920	4408
+ Gingin SA2	From Pearce	3582	3658
PROPOSED		120576	118271

O'CONNOR

O'Connor is the other large rural seat that is well under quota. With the O'Connor/Durack boundary set, the only option now is for O'Connor is to expand to the west.

I suggest that O'Connor gain Donnybrook-Balingup, Nannup, and Augusta-Margaret River from the Division of Forrest.

All of these Shires fit quite well with the western parts of the existing O'Connor. The Division already contains south-western Shires such as Bridgetown-Greenbushes, Manjimup, and Boyup Brook, so pushing further into this area is a fairly logical extension. At state level, Augusta-Margaret River are linked with areas further east in the District of Warren-Blackwood, so there is plenty of precedent for this arrangement. Some major highways would link these new areas to Albany and other areas currently in O'Connor.

As with Durack, these gains also help transfer a significant number of electors without greatly increasing O'Connor's physical size. The Division would increase by around 7500 sq km, less than 1% of the total size of the current seat.

O'CONNOR		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		101985	101703
+ Pemberton SA2	From Forrest	1019	1043
+ Donnybrook SA2	From Forrest	4333	4502
+ Augusta SA2	From Forrest	4321	4891
+ Margaret River SA2	From Forrest	6245	7019
PROPOSED		117903	119158

FORREST

Currently within tolerance, the loss of over 17,000 electors to O'Connor leaves Forrest needing to make significant gains. Practically, this can only come from Canning in the north.

As much as possible, I have tried to avoid too much dislocation around Mandurah. However, since Forrest requires a significant boost, and there are not enough electors in the rural parts of Canning to make up the numbers, it seems some transfer of the outer parts of Mandurah is necessary.

I recommend moving the northern boundary up to the Peel Estuary, transferring Waroona Shire as well as all of the coastal communities south of the Estuary (including Dawesville itself). I also suggest that Boddington Shire, plus most of Murray Shire (Pinjarra and everything south of it) be transferred.

This transfers most of the more outlying or semi-rural areas surrounding Mandurah, while leaving Mandurah itself united with most of its suburbs in Canning. Forrest is left towards the low end of tolerance, but I think this is justifiable to prevent any serious encroachment on the main parts of Mandurah.

Forrest becomes somewhat more urban and coastal with this change, but remains a Division based clearly on Bunbury and surrounding areas.

FORREST		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		107326	113971
+ Waroona SA2	From Canning	2961	3045
+ Murray SA2	From Canning	1644	1616
+ Dawesville – Bouvard SA2	From Canning	5786	6489
+ Pinjarra SA2 (generally sth Murray River and South Dandelup River)	From Canning	5923	6126
- Pemberton SA2	To O'Connor	1019	1043
- Donnybrook SA2	To O'Connor	4333	4502
- Augusta SA2	To O'Connor	4321	4891
- Margaret River SA2	To O'Connor	6245	7019
PROPOSED		107722	113792

BRAND

Before deciding on the final configuration of Canning, I suggest that the boundaries of the more geographically constrained Divisions further north be established.

Brand is within tolerance, but since it is at the high end, I suggest that it donate as many electors as possible to top up the under-quota Divisions. Rather than breach the strong northern boundary with Fremantle, or split the Singleton/Golden Bay area, I suggest Brand could lose electors in the east.

I recommend adopting the Kwinana Freeway as the new eastern boundary for Brand. This transfers 4500-5500 electors in Wandi, Anketell, Casuarina, and the eastern parts of Wellard and Baldivis to the Division of Canning. These areas are part of Rockingham and Kwinana LGAs, but they fit well with nearby suburbs currently in Canning, and the Kwinana Freeway is a strong boundary. This arrangement also ensures that Brand's strong northern and southern boundaries remain intact.

Brand is left towards the lower end of tolerance, which is appropriate given it has stronger projected growth than many other seats.

(The transfer from Baldivis is an estimate, as SA1s cross the freeway)

BRAND		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		110508	119561
- Casuarina – Wandi SA2 (east of Kwinana Fwy)	To Canning	4478	5638
- Baldivis SA2 (east of Kwinana Fwy)	To Canning	431	467
PROPOSED		105599	113456

FREMANTLE

Fremantle is reasonably close to quota, and does not require any significant change. Its boundaries could be left as is, although I think a small adjustment could be made to the boundary with Tangney in the O'Connor area. Instead of following the municipal boundary along minor streets, I suggest straightening the boundary along South Street and Stock Road. This involves only a small number of electors, but allows the use of major roads.

FREMANTLE		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		109269	115628
- Fremantle South SA2 (nth of South Road, east of Stock Road)	To Tangney	206	226
- O'Connor SA2 (east of Stock Road)	To Tangney	3	3
PROPOSED		109060	115399

TANGNEY

Tangney is one of the most under-quota Divisions in the state, and also one of the more geographically constrained. The Swan and Canning Rivers provide strong natural boundaries to the north and east, and I would not recommend expanding across them. Having established that there should be very little change to the boundary with Fremantle, the only real option for expansion is to the south.

I suggest that the entire suburb of Canning Vale be transferred from Burt. This is a large suburb that contains nearly 20,000 electors, which is sufficient to bring Tangney back up to quota. Canning Vale has previously been part of Tangney, and has some reasonable growth prospects to help boost the numbers in this slow-growing Division. I think this is the most sensible way to top up Tangney without causing major disruption to neighbouring Divisions.

TANGNEY		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		94827	95804
+ Canning Vale East SA2	From Burt	12913	13771
+ Canning Vale West SA2	From Burt	6533	6707
+ Canning Vale Industrial SA2	From Burt	1	1
+ Fremantle South SA2 (nth of South Road, east of Stock Road)	From Fremantle	206	226
+ O'Connor SA2 (east of Stock Road)	From Fremantle	3	3
PROPOSED		114482	116511

CANNING

The exchanges with Forrest and Brand leave the Division of Canning around 10,000 votes below quota. Having established the boundaries of Brand, Fremantle, and Tangney, there are basically two options:

- Expand northwards to take in further parts of Kalamunda Shire from Hasluck. This extends the existing north-south stretch of Canning, but has less impact on the neighbouring Division of Burt.
- Take in electors from the southern parts of Burt, such as around Forrestdale and Brookdale. This has the benefit of reducing the northern ‘tail’ on Canning, but causes greater disruption to Burt, and brings the boundaries very close to Armadale itself.

I have explored both options, but I think the first one is superior. Applying the second option tends to cause messy boundaries around Armadale, and forces Burt to push significantly northwards and away from its Gosnells/Armadale core. In contrast, parts of the Darling Range area are already within Canning, and probably fit better with the existing Division’s semi-rural nature instead of the more urban Burt.

Therefore, I suggest the Lesmurdie area (Lesmurdie, Walliston, and Bickley) be transferred from Hasluck. This is a modest expansion that adds around 8000 electors and brings Canning within tolerance.

The north-eastern ‘tail’ on Canning is extended with this change, but at the same time, it helps reduce the north-south stretch of Hasluck. I think there is a strong community of interest between southern Kalamunda and the eastern semi-rural parts of Armadale, and these areas have been linked with each other at state and federal level at different times in the past.

Canning remains a Division based on Mandurah and the semi-rural areas south east of Perth.

CANNING		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		110091	117835
+ Lesmurdie SA2 (Lesmurdie, Walliston, Bickley)	From Hasluck	7285	7587
+ Casuarina – Wandie SA2 (east of Kwinana Fwy)	From Brand	4478	5638
+ Baldivis SA2 (east of Kwinana Fwy)	From Brand	431	467
- Waroona SA2	To Forrest	2961	3045
- Murray SA2	To Forrest	1644	1616
- Dawesville – Bouvard SA2	To Forrest	5786	6489
- Pinjarra SA2 (generally sth Murray River and South Dandelup River)	To Forrest	5923	6126
PROPOSED		105971	114251

BURT

With the boundaries of surrounding Divisions established, Burt can expand very naturally to take in all of Maddington, Kenwick, and Wattle Grove from the Division of Hasluck. I suggest using Welshpool Road and the Tonkin Highway as clear boundaries in the area.

Kenwick and Maddington are part of Gosnells LGA, and fit much better with Gosnells and Thornlie than with the remainder of Hasluck, while Tonkin Highway is a strong boundary in the Wattle Grove area.

My changes would leave most of the areas that relate most closely to Gosnells and Armadale united in Burt.

BURT		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		109053	116511
+ Beckenham - Kenwick – Langford SA2	From Hasluck	8243	8538
+ Maddington - Orange Grove – Martin SA2	From Hasluck	6989	7299
+ Forrestfield - Wattle Grove SA2 (sth Welshpool Rd and Tonkin Highway)	From Hasluck	3577	4042
- Canning Vale East SA2	To Tangney	12913	13771
- Canning Vale West SA2	To Tangney	6533	6707
- Canning Vale Industrial SA2	To Tangney	1	1
PROPOSED		108415	115911

SWAN

Like Tangney, the Division of Swan is both under-quota and geographically constrained as to where it could expand. Assuming the Swan and Canning River boundaries are not going to be breached, this limits Swan's options to expanding to the north or east.

I suggest an adjustment to bring two areas into Swan:

- All of Hazelmere and South Guildford, using the Helena River and Roe Highway as the new boundary.
- The entire suburb of Forrestfield.

Both of these areas fit well with the existing character of Swan, and allow it to retain its character as a mostly riverside Division. Both Hazelmere and South Guildford were previously part of Swan, and Forrestfield fits quite well with the existing eastern parts of the Division such as High Wycombe. At state level, all of these areas are joined to communities currently within the Division of Swan.

I have explored other options such as expanding further north towards Guildford, or placing much more of Kalamunda Shire in Swan, but these arrangements tend to cause too much disruption to the boundaries of Hasluck. I think my suggestion is a good way to top up Swan without causing too many flow-on effects to Hasluck, Burt, or Tangney.

SWAN		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		102932	105211
+ Forrestfield - Wattle Grove SA2 (nth Welshpool Rd and Tonkin Highway)	From Hasluck	8768	8584
+ Hazelmere – Guildford SA2 (west Roe Hwy)	From Hasluck	3389	3537
PROPOSED		115089	117332

HASLUCK

Hasluck is one of the Divisions that I propose undergo significant change, to take in electors from Pearce. Fortunately, these changes also help improve community of interest; instead of extending as far south as Gosnells, Hasluck can now focus more clearly as a Swan Valley and Swan Hills based seat.

In summary, Hasluck gains from Pearce all of its share of Swan LGA, including:

- All of the Ellenbrook area, including Aveley and The Vines
- Bullsbrook, Upper Swan, and the remaining semi-rural areas within Swan LGA
- Dayton, West Swan, Herne Hill, Henley Brook, and other communities between Midland and Ellenbrook.

These areas all fit extremely well with Midland, which is currently a major focus of the Hasluck Division. The Great Northern Highway provides a very strong link back to Midland and surrounding areas. The Swan Valley also fits well with the hills area to the east; these communities are joined at state level, and have previously been part of the same federal Division.

In the south, Hasluck loses all of the urban area around Gosnells to the Division of Burt, and parts of Kalamunda Shire to Canning and Swan. The northern part of Kalamunda Shire, including Maida Vale, Gooseberry Hill and Kalamunda itself, remains in Hasluck.

These changes all leave Hasluck slightly outside tolerance, so I suggest that Bennett Springs be added from the Division of Cowan. This is also part of Swan LGA, and would allow the use of strong boundaries in the Tonkin and Reid Highways in this area.

All these changes leave Hasluck clearly focussed on Swan and Mundaring LGAs, as well as the parts of Kalamunda that relate most closely to them.

HASLUCK		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		100732	103715
+ Bullsbrook SA2	From Pearce	3618	3993
+ Ellenbrook SA2	From Pearce	25183	29845
+ The Vines SA2	From Pearce	7604	9100
+ Beechboro SA2	From Pearce	2915	3722
+ Middle Swan – Herne Hill SA2	From Pearce	1509	1529
+ Avon Valley NP SA2	From Pearce	5	5
+ Melaleuca Lexia SA2	From Pearce	2	2
+ Walyunga NP SA2	From Pearce	1	1
+ Beechboro SA2 (Bennett Springs)	From Cowan	3201	3136
- Forrestfield - Wattle Grove	To Swan	8768	8584
- Hazelmere – Guildford SA2 (west Roe Hwy)	To Swan	3389	3537
- Lesmurdie SA2 (Lesmurdie, Walliston, Bickley)	To Canning	7285	7587
- Beckenham - Kenwick – Langford SA2	To Burt	8243	8538
- Maddington - Orange Grove – Martin SA2	To Burt	6989	7299
- Forrestfield - Wattle Grove	To Burt	3577	4042
PROPOSED		106519	115461

MOORE

Moore is the other Division that I propose make significant gains from Pearce. I recommend that most of Pearce's share of Wanneroo Council (excluding Banksia Grove, Carramar and surrounds) be added to Moore. This includes over 50,000 electors in Two Rocks, Yanchep, Alkimos, Butler, Quinns Rocks, Clarkson, and Mindarie. These areas all fit well with the existing coastal suburbs currently within Moore; in fact, many of these areas have previously been in this Division.

This creates a large excess in Moore, and this can be transferred to either Stirling or Cowan. Given the strong eastern boundary of Lake Joondalup and Wanneroo Road, I think the best option is to transfer to Stirling in the south.

I suggest adopting Whitfords Avenue as the new southern boundary; transferring Sorrento, Duncraig, Kingsley, Padbury and Hillarys into Stirling. This removes around 41,000 electors and brings Moore back within tolerance.

MOORE		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		102441	104031
+ Two Rocks SA2	From Pearce	2294	2672
+ Yanchep SA2	From Pearce	6076	7410
+ Alkimos – Eglinton SA2	From Pearce	5958	8274
+ Mindarie – Quinns Rocks – Jindalee SA2	From Pearce	13412	15017
+ Butler – Merriwa – Ridgewood SA2	From Pearce	14075	14965
+ Clarkson SA2	From Pearce	8313	8998
+ Neerabup NP SA2	From Pearce	4	4
+ Carabooda SA2	From Pearce	522	587
- Sorrento – Marmion SA2	To Stirling	7694	8031
- Duncraig SA2	To Stirling	11125	10875
- Hillarys SA2	To Stirling	8305	8455
- Padbury SA2	To Stirling	5822	5823
- Kingsley SA2	To Stirling	8722	8476
PROPOSED		111427	120298

STIRLING

Stirling makes the above gains from Moore. To round out the boundary and make full use of Wanneroo Road in the east, I suggest also adding Warwick, Greenwood, and the balance of Kingsley from the Division of Cowan.

With these gains, Stirling now needs to donate its new excess to neighbouring seat(s). Basically, there are 3 options:

- 1) Donate electors in the south to Curtin.
- 2) Contract towards the coast, transferring inland areas to Cowan and/or Perth.
- 3) Remove its territory closest to the Perth CBD, to the Division of Perth.

I have explored several options, and in the end I decided to apply a combination of (1) and (3).

I suggest adopting Morley Drive, Karrinyup Road, and the Trigg Bushland Reserve as the new southern boundary for Stirling. This transfers ~31,000 electors in Stirling, Osborne Park, Tuart Hill, Yokine, Joondanna, and Dianella to the Division of Perth, and ~6500 electors in Scarborough and Karrinyup to the Division of Curtin.

Morley Drive/Karrinyup Road is a significant traffic corridor and would be a strong boundary in the area. The areas proposed to be transferred to Perth are those parts of Stirling that are closest to the CBD, and would fit very well with the existing north-western parts of Perth. The transfers to Curtin allows all of the area south of Trigg Bushland to be united in a single seat, and removes current split of Scarborough.

Stirling continues to push inland to take in Balga and Mirrabooka, but its boundaries are now much stronger and clearer in this area. This arrangement also allows for very sensible boundaries for Perth, Cowan, and Curtin.

STIRLING		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		103123	104440
+ Sorrento – Marmion SA2	From Moore	7694	8031
+ Duncraig SA2	From Moore	11125	10875
+ Hillarys SA2	From Moore	8305	8455
+ Padbury SA2	From Moore	5822	5823
+ Kingsley SA2	From Moore	8722	8476
+ Kingsley SA2	From Cowan	780	763
+ Greenwich – Warwick SA2	From Cowan	9619	9747
- Stirling SA2 (south of Morley Dr)	To Perth	5291	5245
- Tuart Hill Joondanna SA2	To Perth	8189	8080
- Yokine Coolbinia Menora SA2	To Perth	8374	8158
- Dianella SA2 (south of Morley Dr)	To Perth	9205	9276
- Morley SA2	To Perth	533	531
- Scarborough SA2	To Curtin	3652	3762
- Karrinyup – Gwelup – Carine SA2 (sth of Karrinyup Rd and Trigg Bushland)	To Curtin	2,281	2,416
- Trigg SA2 (sth Trigg Bushland)	To Curtin	388	426
PROPOSED		117277	118716

CURTIN

The gain from Stirling straightens the northern boundary of Curtin, and leaves Karrinyup Road and Trigg Bushland as clear divides between the two Divisions. Curtin is still under quota after this gain, and since the boundaries of Stirling and Fremantle have been established, its only option is to gain from Perth in the east.

I suggest adopting the Mitchell Freeway as a very strong new eastern boundary for Curtin. This transfers 2200 electors in West Perth and Kings Park, both of which have previously been in Curtin.

This gain leaves Curtin within tolerance although at the low end. It would be possible for Curtin to expand further (e.g. into Leederville or Mount Hawthorn), but I think the Freeway is the best boundary in the area. However, the option is there for the Committee if they want to better balance the numbers between Curtin and Perth.

CURTIN		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		101848	105373
+ Scarborough SA2	From Stirling	3652	3762
+ Karrinyup – Gwelup – Carine SA2 (sth of Karrinyup Rd and Trigg Bushland)	From Stirling	2281	2416
+ Trigg SA2 (sth Trigg Bushland)	From Stirling	388	426
+ Perth City SA2 (west Mitchell Freeway)	From Perth	2260	2427
+ Kings Park SA2	From Perth	27	27
PROPOSED		110456	114431

COWAN

The remaining 11,000 – 12,000 electors from Pearce (Banksia Grove, Carramar and surrounds) are transferred to this Division. Both of these suburbs lie east of Wanneroo Road, and fit well with the existing parts of Wanneroo that are currently in Cowan.

On its own, this gain is enough to bring Cowan within tolerance; however it also loses around 10,500 electors to Stirling and just over 3000 electors to Hasluck to leave it under quota. Having established all of the other neighbouring boundaries, the only option is for Cowan to gain from Perth in the south.

A very neat boundary can be formed by using Morley Drive, Tonkin Highway, Walter Road West, and Camboon Road. This transfers ~15,000 electors in Noranda and Morley, which is enough to bring Cowan within tolerance.

I acknowledge that the Beechboro/Morley area does form a south-eastern ‘tail’ on Cowan. I have experimented with a few different arrangements, and this area always seems to end up as the final piece of the puzzle between Cowan, Perth and Hasluck. Possibly a complete redraw of this area could give the Divisions more regular boundaries, but this would involve a lot of additional change. The boundaries in this area would at least be strong, making greater use of major roads.

COWAN		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		100543	104250
+ Carramar SA2	From Pearce	10561	12010
+ Tapping – Ashby – Sinagra SA2	From Pearce	613	647
+ Noranda SA2	From Perth	5901	5676
+ Morley SA2 (nth Morley Dr, Tonkin Hwy, Walter Rd W, Camboon Rd)	From Perth	10119	10192
- Beechboro SA2 (Bennett Springs)	To Hasluck	3201	3136
- Kingsley SA2	To Stirling	780	763
- Greenwich – Warwick SA2	To Stirling	9619	9747
PROPOSED		114137	119129

PERTH

Previously described changes bring Perth back within tolerance, and uses Morley Drive for large parts of its new northern boundary.

My changes consolidate Perth as more an inner suburban Division; most of the suburbs immediately north and north-east of Perth CBD are now consolidated in this seat, with more distant areas such as Noranda and Beechboro removed to Cowan. I think this is a very sensible and logical arrangement for Perth.

PERTH		CURRENT	PROJECTED
Existing		104026	106518
+ Stirling SA2 (south of Morley Dr)	From Stirling	5291	5245
+ Tuart Hill Joondanna SA2	From Stirling	8189	8080
+ Yokine Coolbinia Menora SA2	From Stirling	8374	8158
+ Dianella SA2 (south of Morley Dr)	From Stirling	9205	9276
+ Morley SA2	From Stirling	533	531
- Noranda SA2	To Cowan	5901	5676
- Morley SA2 (nth Morley Dr, Tonkin Hwy, Walter Rd W, Camboon Rd)	To Cowan	10119	10192
- Perth City SA2 (west Mitchell Freeway)	To Curtin	2260	2427
- Kings Park SA2	To Curtin	27	27
PROPOSED		117311	119486