



# Suggestion 15

Michael Woods

2 pages

**From:** Michael Woods [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 7 November 2017 8:40 PM  
**To:** FedRedistribution - SA  
**Subject:** South Australian Federal Redistributio

To the Redistribution Committee for South Australia,

I am writing about the South Australian Federal Redistribution currently being undertaken by the Australian Electoral Commission. I am a constituent of the Federal Division of Mayo.

My understanding is that the committee responsible for managing the redistribution must consider three points – communities of interest within electorate, means of communication and travel within proposed electorate, and physical features of an area of the proposed federal electorate. With these criteria in mind, I do not believe that the Division of Mayo is suitable for consideration to be abolished.

Here I address each aspect individually.

- 1) Communities of Interest – collaboration between Federal and Local Government is 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. Further, it would mean that our rural needs may not get fair representation or opportunity.
- 2) 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. The electorate as it currently stands shares interests and passions. Economically speaking, Mayo contains the vast majority of South Australia's horticulture industry and seven distinct wine regions. It is critical that these important businesses in our community and SA are represented by someone who understands the issues they are facing, rather than being represented by someone based in the metropolitan area.
- 3) 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. Unique issues are faced by this zone including fire considerations that do not impact metropolitan Adelaide to the same extent. 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.

Further, population growth needs to be considered. I am aware 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 be unreasonable for this community to be combined within a metropolitan seat boundary, as the needs and experiences of the voters are considerably different. Having lived in both metropolotian Adelaide, and more recently in the Adelaide Hills I feel confident in stating this.

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, Michael Woods

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]