



Suggestion 201

Dr Mark Mulcair

13 pages

SUGGESTIONS FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL REDISTRIBUTION 2017

Please accept my Suggestions for the 2017 South Australian Federal Redistribution.

I am an independent person with a strong interest in the redistribution process, with no affiliation to any political party or organisation. I am from Victoria, but I have been preparing redistribution submissions for nearly a decade now, and am very familiar with the electoral geography of South Australia and other states.

At recent state and federal redistributions, a small group of independent contributors has emerged (which seems to be growing with each redistribution) who are not associated with any political party but have a strong interest in the redistribution process. While we often don't have the same ideas or approaches, we share the common ideal of drawing boundaries purely on merit and not to further any partisan agenda.

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

Dr Mark D Mulcair

Enrolment Projections:

With the need to abolish one Division out of only eleven in South Australia, it is clear that virtually all existing seats will come in below the new quota. Only Wakefield and Port Adelaide (just) are predicted to be within the 3.5% tolerance at the projection time.

The projections continue to show a relatively strong growth in the outer suburbs (especially Wakefield), and some urban renewal areas (Adelaide and Port Adelaide). In contrast, the rural Divisions and some of the established suburban areas are predicted to undergo relative decline. Four Divisions are even below the current 10% tolerance, and will clearly need a major injection of electors.

General Strategy:

Clearly, with a reduction in the number of Divisions, there will need to be some rearrangement of the existing seats. However, I believe it is possible to keep major changes to a minimum, and for all of the seats to keep roughly their existing character.

I am recommending that the Division of Hindmarsh be abolished, although it is more accurate to say that I am consolidating the Divisions of Hindmarsh, Port Adelaide, Adelaide, and Boothby into three seats instead of four.

The existing Division of Hindmarsh can be split fairly logically in three ways:

- The Grange, West Lakes, and Semaphore Park areas have a strong connection to Port Adelaide and surrounds, and fit well in the Division of that name.
- The Glenelg and Morphettville areas (Holdfast Bay and Marion Councils) fit extremely well with the Division of Boothby, which already contains large parts of these council areas.
- The area around the airport, including Henley Beach and most of Hindmarsh's "inland" component, can be placed in the Division of Adelaide.

These changes then allow natural flow-on effects to top up the remaining Adelaide seats. Port Adelaide can logically lose its eastern 'tail' to Wakefield and Makin, Boothby can shed its south-eastern component to Kingston and Mayo, and the westward contraction of Adelaide provides sufficient numbers to top up Sturt.

To bring the rural Divisions up to quota, I suggest that Wakefield shed all of its rural territory and consolidate as a purely urban seat. This improves the community of interest in Wakefield, while allowing Barker and Grey to gain electors while still retaining their rural character.

Boundaries:

I have tried to use strong and clear boundaries wherever possible. In rural areas, I have been guided by DC boundaries, or major natural features such as rivers and mountains. In urban areas, I have tried to follow major roads, freeways, suburb boundaries, or natural features wherever possible.

Suburb and LGA boundaries can make good electoral boundaries when they follow major natural or man-made features. However, I have tried as much as possible to avoid using suburb boundaries that run along minor back streets or split established areas.

Quota:

All of my proposed Divisions would fall within the required 10% tolerance at the present time. As some of my proposed boundaries do not match exactly with SA1s, there are a few Districts for which I have had to estimate the population. However, any small discrepancies would still leave all the Divisions well within tolerance.

I have made maximum possible use of the tolerance when drawing my Divisions, in order to achieve strong boundaries and improve community of interest. I have left the two rural seats, especially Grey, at the low end of tolerance. Partly this is to ensure that they don't need to take in any urban territory, and partly this is because these seats are already geographically enormous. I think this is an acceptable outcome.

Naming:

On paper, I am proposing that the Division of Hindmarsh be abolished, although the Committee has the option of renaming my proposed Port Adelaide as 'Hindmarsh' if they wish to retain the name.

All other Divisions are generally similar to their existing character, so I recommend retaining the other 9 names.

Political Implications:

Unlike at state level, there is no requirement for "political fairness" for federal redistributions in South Australia, and I haven't made any detailed analysis of the partisan impact of my proposals, but I don't think they favour either side to any significant extent.

The consolidation of Wakefield as an urban seat would make it even safer for Labor, but this is a relatively safe seat anyway. It would seem to me that Makin would become safer for Labor, while Adelaide would become more winnable for the Liberals, and other seats would not see much change.

DIVISION OF BARKER

As mentioned in the Introduction, I am recommending that the two country Divisions should be topped up with the rural parts of Wakefield. While there is a case for pushing Barker westwards into the Fleurieu Peninsula, this would cause significant flow on effects to Mayo and the city seats.

To this end, I simply suggest transferring the balance of Barossa DC from Wakefield and Mayo, and the rural parts of Light DC (Kapunda and surrounds) from Wakefield. The Barossa Valley is currently split three ways, and this change would unite all of this area into a single seat.

I suggest that those parts of Gawler in Light DC should remain in Wakefield. It makes sense to me to keep Gawler united in a single, metropolitan seat.

BARKER			
EXISTING		106,009	108,383
+ Barossa DC (Lyndoch SA2)	From Wakefield	4182	4443
+ Barossa DC (Barossa-Angaston SA2)	From Mayo	1299	1316
+ Light DC (Light and Nuriootpa SA2s)	From Wakefield	6534	7029
PROPOSED		118,024	121,171

DIVISION OF GREY

Grey can be brought up to quota by including the remaining rural parts of Wakefield. This comprises all of Clare and Gilbert Valleys DC, all of Mallala DC, and the balance of Wakefield DC.

This brings Grey right up to the fringes of metropolitan Adelaide, which is probably not ideal for such a vast outback seat. However, there is really no other place for Grey to gain electors. The urban fringe is at least a relatively compact area, as opposed to having Grey gain a huge expanse of rural territory from Barker. Being close to Adelaide, this area also probably has some growth potential, so could help provide a boost to this generally declining Division.

Grey is left at the very bottom of tolerance under my proposals. I think this is very reasonable given the seat's enormous size.

GREY			
EXISTING		102,264	102,612
+ Clare and Gilbert Valleys DC (Clare SA2 and Gilbert Valley SA2)	From Wakefield	6522	6576
+ Wakefield DC (Wakefield-Barunga West SA2)	From Wakefield	3484	3519
+ Mallala DC (Mallala and Lewiston SA2s)	From Wakefield	5849	5982
PROPOSED		118,119	118,689

DIVISION OF WAKEFIELD

With the loss of its rural territory, Wakefield can logically consolidate as a completely northern suburbs Division. I recommend gaining as much of the Salisbury area from Port Adelaide as possible, to reduce the eastward ‘tail’ on that Division.

I suggest adopting Little Para River, Kings Road, and Main North Road as the new southern boundary. This transfers all of Salisbury, Salisbury North, Salisbury Downs, Burton, and Paralowie from Port Adelaide, plus the small remaining parts of Salisbury and Salisbury South from Makin. Kings Road is a fairly strong boundary in the area, serving as the suburb boundary between Salisbury and Parafield for most of its length.

This change unites the vast majority of Salisbury in a single Division, which is logical since Salisbury is a significant centre. Salisbury East and Salisbury Heights, with their greater connections eastwards, remain within Makin.

WAKEFIELD			
EXISTING		114,533	121,533
+ Salisbury City (Salisbury, Salisbury North, Paralowie, Virginia-Waterloo SA2)	From Port Adelaide	29,084	30,838
+ Salisbury City (Salisbury SA2)	From Makin	41	46
+ Light DC (Light and Nuriootpa SA2s)	From Wakefield	6534	7029
+ Barossa DC (Lyndoch SA2)	From Wakefield	4182	4443
+ Clare and Gilbert Valleys DC (Clare SA2 and Gilbert Valley SA2)	From Wakefield	6522	6576
+ Wakefield DC (Wakefield-Barunga West SA2)	From Wakefield	3484	3519
+ Mallala DC (Mallala and Lewiston SA2s)	From Wakefield	5849	5982
PROPOSED		117,087	124,868

DIVISION OF MAKIN

Makin is backed up against the Adelaide Hills to the north-east, so can realistically only expand south or west.

One option would be to push Makin southwards to the Torrens River, taking in the Highbury/Hope Valley area from Sturt. The Torrens is a strong boundary, and this transfer would allow all of Tea Tree Gully to be united in Makin. However, I have experimented with a number of different arrangements, and all of them end up causing too many flow-on effects to Sturt, Adelaide and Boothby.

Instead, I suggest expanding westwards, to take in the remaining parts of Salisbury City currently in Port Adelaide. Following Kings Road and the Little Parra River, all of Parafield Gardens plus the mostly unpopulated Globe Derby Park area are transferred. These areas fit quite well with the western parts of the existing Makin.

MAKIN			
EXISTING		107,636	109,253
+ Salisbury City (Parafield Gardens and Parooka SA2)	From Port Adelaide	11,704	12,759
- Salisbury City (Salisbury SA2)	To Wakefield	41	46
PROPOSED		119,299	121,966

DIVISION OF STURT

Assuming no changes to the Sturt/Makin boundary, then the Division of Sturt only needs fairly minor adjustments. I suggest that the best approach is to adjust the western boundary with Adelaide.

I recommend moving the boundary in the north-west to follow Hampstead Road and Lansdowne Terrace. This transfers all of Northfield, Northgate, Manningham, Greenacres, Hampstead Gardens, and the balance of Vale Park (currently split between Sturt and Adelaide). Hampstead Road is a major traffic corridor that would form a strong boundary in the area, and Lansdowne Terrace forms the suburb boundary of Vale Park.

This still leaves Sturt under quota, so I suggest that it should also gain the block bounded by Fullarton Road, Greenhill Road, Portrush Road, and Kensington Road. This transfers Toorak Gardens, Dulwich, and Rose Park from Adelaide. Part of the existing boundary runs along Fullarton Road, which is also the Burnside Council boundary, so this is simply a matter of extending it slightly northwards.

I also recommend a small change in the south, to transfer Fullarton and Myrtle Bank to the Division of Boothby. This straightens the boundary along Glen Osmond Road, which also serves as the municipal boundary in this area.

STURT			
EXISTING		104,727	106,669
+ Port Adelaide – Enfield City (Northgate and Windsor Grdns SA2)	From Adelaide	9436	11120
+ Walkerville City (Suburb of Vale Park)	From Adelaide	1682	1739
+ Burnside City (Toorak Gardens SA2)	From Adelaide	4723	4807
- Unley City (Unley Parkside SA2)	To Boothby	3,782	3,816
PROPOSED		116,786	120,519

DIVISION OF PORT ADELAIDE

The existing Port Adelaide is certainly a less-than-ideal Division. The current seat excludes areas such as West Lakes that relate closely to Port Adelaide, while extending eastwards in a long ‘tail’ as far as Salisbury, taking in areas that have little connection to the Port area. However, the loss of this eastern ‘tail’ to Wakefield and Makin allows Port Adelaide to consolidate clearly as a more clearly on the port and coastal suburbs north-west of the city.

The loss of over 40,000 electors means that Port Adelaide will need to make major gains. I suggest that the starting point should be to gain the Enfield and Prospect areas from the Division of Adelaide. I suggest that the new eastern boundary should follow Hampstead Road, the LGA boundary, Main North Road, Fitzroy Terrace, and Torrens Road. Around 28,000 electors in Enfield, Prospect, Blair Athol, Kilburn, Croydon Park and Dudley Park are transferred.

This still leaves Port Adelaide under quota, so I suggest straightening the southern boundary to run along Grange Road. This transfers Grange and Seaton, plus all of West Lakes and the remainder of the Semaphore area to Port Adelaide. These areas all relate well to Port Adelaide itself, and there are good links to other areas such as Woodville and Alberton. At previous redistributions, there were strong Objections to splitting West Lakes and surrounds off from Port Adelaide, so this change finally allows all of this area to be united in a single seat.

PORT ADEALIDE			
EXISTING		115,227	119,176
+ Port Adelaide Enfield City (Enfield and The Parks SA2s)	From Adelaide	17,521	18,114
+ Prospect City (Prospect SA2)	From Adelaide	10,225	10,283
+ Charles Sturt City (part north of Torrens Road)	From Adelaide	1134	1177
+ Charles Sturt City (West Lakes and Seaton SA2s)	From Hindmarsh	19,997	19,981
- Salisbury City (Salisbury, Salisbury North, Paralowie, Virginia-Waterloo SA2)	To Wakefield	29,084	30,838
- Salisbury City (Parafield Gardens and Parooka SA2)	To Makin	11,704	12,759
PROPOSED		123,316	125,134

DIVISION OF ADELAIDE

The loss of its northern territory around Enfield and Prospect, leaves Division of Adelaide needing to make significant gains. The eastern boundary with Sturt has already been decided, so the most logical gain to make is from Hindmarsh in the west.

I suggest expanding westwards to the coast, generally between Grange Road and the tramway/Patawalonga Creek. This transfers the balance of Mile End and Hindmarsh, all of the Richmond and Plympton areas, Lockleys, Fulham, Henley Beach, and West Beach (essentially, everything around the airport).

Adelaide's orientation thus changes to a more east-west alignment, straddling the CBD from the coast to the eastern suburbs. There are some good east-west links through the western suburbs, leading from the coastal areas back towards the city. My proposed Adelaide would contain all of the city's major transport links, including both major railway stations plus the airport.

ADELAIDE			
EXISTING		110,351	114,268
+ Charles Sturt City (south of Grange Road)	From Hindmarsh	22,765	23,433
+ West Torrens City (all)	From Hindmarsh	35,456	36,090
- Port Adelaide – Enfield City (Northgate and Windsor Grdns SA2)	To Sturt	9436	11,120
Walkerville City (Vale Park)	To Sturt	1682	1739
Burnside City (Toorak Gardens)	To Sturt	4723	4807
- Port Adelaide Enfield City (Enfield and The Parks SA2s)	To Port Adelaide	17,521	18,114
- Prospect City (Prospect SA2)	To Port Adelaide	10,225	10,283
- Charles Sturt City (part north of Torrens Road)	To Port Adelaide	1134	1177
PROPOSED		123,851	126,551

DIVISION OF BOOTHBY

Boothby can logically expand north-west along the coast to take in all of the remaining parts of Hindmarsh that haven't been transferred to Adelaide or Port Adelaide. This includes all of the Glenelg area, plus Morphettville, South Plympton, Edwardstown, and the balance of Somerton Park. This change straightens the northern and western boundaries of Boothby, and brings together all of Holdfast Bay and most of Marion Council in a single seat.

These gains, plus the small transfer from Sturt, take Boothby over quota, so I suggest that it lose electors at its south-eastern end.

The Flagstaff Hill/Aberfoyle Park area is somewhat cut off from the rest of Boothby, so this seems a logical place to start. I suggest that this area be transferred to the Division of Kingston, as it fits very well with the other suburban parts of Onkaparinga Council currently in that Division.

This still leaves Boothby over quota, so I suggest that most of its 'Hills' component, including Blackwood and the balance of Coromandel Valley, be transferred to Mayo. These areas are less suburban and more semi-rural than the rest of Boothby, and fit very well in the Hills-based Division of Mayo.

For quota purposes, the remaining small part of Happy Valley currently in Boothby is also placed in Mayo. While this is a suburban area, the eastern part of Happy Valley is already within Mayo, so this is simply a logical extension.

BOOTHBY			
EXISTING		107,939	109,835
+ Marion City (Edwardstown and Morphettville)	From Hindmarsh	20,410	21,377
+ Holdfast Bay City (Glenelg SA2)	From Hindmarsh	13,883	13,835
+ Unley City (Unley Parkside SA2)	From Sturt	3782	3816
- Onkaparinga City (Flagstaff Hill SA2 ex Darlington)	To Kingston	7808	7809
- Onkaparinga City (Aberfoyle Park)	To Kingston	8777	8614
- Onkaparinga City (Happy Valley)	To Mayo	1455	1452
- Mitcham City (Blackwood and Coromandel Valley SA2s)	To Mayo	11,008	11,432
PROPOSED		116,966	119,556

DIVISION OF KINGSTON

The gains of Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park bring Kingston back within tolerance, and I recommend no further changes.

There is a case for adding the McLaren Vale area, and/or rural territory further south, to Kingston, given the good north-south links in the area. However, I think it makes more sense to keep Kingston as a purely “urban” seat, and Mayo as a “semi-rural” one, instead of having two mixed urban-rural seats.

KINGSTON			
EXISTING		107,643	110,793
- Onkaparinga City (Flagstaff Hill SA2, except suburb of Darlington)	From Boothby	7808	7809
- Onkaparinga City (Aberfoyle Park SA2)	From Boothby	8777	8614
PROPOSED		123,864	126,849

DIVISION OF MAYO

Mayo consolidates as a Hills-based Division, losing the last parts of the Barossa Valley, and gaining further 'Hills' territory around Blackwood. The exchanges with Boothby and Barker bring it back within tolerance, and I suggest no further changes.

There has been some speculation that Mayo may be the seat that is abolished. I must say that I don't see any logic at all in abolishing Mayo. The seat has a very clear focus on the Adelaide Hills, an area that should be kept together in a single seat instead of being split multiple ways. The hills face and coastline provide strong and clearly defined boundaries for Mayo, and crossing them would harm rather than improve community of interest.

MAYO			
EXISTING		106,191	110,072
- Onkaparinga City (Happy Valley)	From Boothby	1455	1452
- Mitcham City (Blackwood and Coromandel Valley SA2s)	From Boothby	11,008	11,432
- Barossa DC (Barossa-Angaston SA2)	To Barker	1299	1316
PROPOSED		117,355	121,640