



Comment on objection 5

Martin Gordon

5 pages

[REDACTED]

From: Martin Gordon [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 15 May 2018 5:00 PM
To: FedRedistribution - SA
Subject: comments on objections
Attachments: SA 2018 redistribution comments on objections.docx

Attached is a comments on objections for the SA redistribution.

Could you confirm receipt?

Martin Gordon

[REDACTED]

Augmented Redistribution Committee for South Australia

The Committee,

I wish to comment on objections to the commissioners proposals for the state of South Australia announced on 13 April.

I had previously proposed a full statewide redistribution, and subsequently a lengthy comments on proposals. A significant number of my suggestions have been Incorporated some in very minor part, or more substantially. I appreciate those aspects that the committee has taken up.

Non Victorian Australians

I have raised this issue several times and the identification of those not resident in a jurisdiction needs to end. As a primary principal, all Australians should be treated equally, the worth of them should not vary simply because they live somewhere else in Australia.

Naming

I appreciate that the commissioners adopted the name Spence, notwithstanding it honours a proponent of proportional representation. An irony that the Proportional Representational Society and I note.

Proposals

I had not made any objection at the objection stage.

Grey, Barker, Sturt, Port Adelaide

I have no objection to the boundaries for the first three Divisions and had advocated the abolition of Port Adelaide and appreciate the commissioners have agreed.

I had proposed that Grey expand further south and some objectors note how slow growing Grey is, in time Grey will need to expand southwards. I note with Sturt that parts of the Adelaide Hills Council which are for all appearances metropolitan are proposed to be added to Sturt. I had suggested much the same thing previously, but it was not adopted then.

I had proposed that Gawler be included in Barker, noting it would be less disruptive than its inclusion in the metropolitan area, which I note has as a consequence substantial changes to many Divisions and ultimately given rise to many of the objections. Having recently been in Adelaide and revisiting Gawler I was struck how separate Gawler is from the rest of Adelaide, a wide band of rural land, trees, rural businesses and clearly defined local council signage highlighting the Playford and Gawler boundaries. Placement in Barker would have given rise to far less displacement.

Makin and Spence

I note that in objection 285 that Mark Mulcair proposes a self contained change for One Tree Hill or more broadly the rural areas of eastern Playford Council. From Spence to Makin. Given Spence's high growth and Makin's low growth this might be worth considering. This would reflect a recent state boundary adoption for the state District of King. In the past I had suggested similar ideas to boost numbers in Makin, and to minimize flow on impacts on other divisions.

I note the commissioners had made an adjustment for 7 electors in Playford which I suggested, if the One Tree area broadly is moved this is accommodated anyway.

On viewing the boundaries proposed and Mark Mulcair's objection, I would suggest my initial proposal for Makin be revisited. Essentially the existing Makin boundary on the west is strong, together with the use of the Adelaide-Gawler Railway line to the Playford City boundary (which has been used as boundary previously) and inclusion of One Tree Hill would seem to be sufficient to avoid the messy inclusion of Parafield Gardens in Makin. The Parafield Airport is a major divider of communities in the north of Adelaide. Parafield Gardens is sort of on 'the far-side' from the rest of Makin.

I had proposed a north east-south west orientation of Makin and Wakefield (Spence) this reflects the road and transport links and Salisbury Park, Salisbury Heights, Brahma Lodge and One Tree Hill in Makin looks and is tidier and combines more logical communities than the proposed east-west orientation of Makin and Spence.

Hindmarsh, Boothby, Adelaide

Two objections contain elements that would reduce the elongation issue with Hindmarsh identified by some objections. Mark Mulcair (285) proposes that Adelaide be given a east west orientation, essentially using the area south of Grange Road and south of Mullers and Regency Road. I had proposed such a solution in the past when a federal Division was to be abolished in South Australia. Using such strong Road boundaries as Grange Road and Regency Road, a compact inner city Division can be created with a high degree of community of interest. The commissioners might wish to consider it.

The second objection was that of the Liberal Party (318) which proposes the use of Cross Road, Stonehouse Avenue, Morphett Road and Brownhill Creek as a boundary. Such a boundary would certainly be clear, reflecting a largely existing boundary, and Novar Gardens has generally been included in Glenelg based districts, and is clearly more part of Glenelg notwithstanding it is part of the West Torrens Council. In the past Morphett Road and Brownhill Creek have been used as boundaries.

In combination the use of Cross Road together with Grange Road and Regency Road would create for a very sound set of boundaries for Adelaide.

If an adaptation of Mark Mulcairs objection could be accommodated for Adelaide, the remainder would form Hindmarsh. I note the comments from the City of Port Adelaide Enfield. Until comparatively recently these were two separate councils, and one consequence of the Mulcair concept is that the vast bulk of the City of Port Adelaide Enfield would be in one Division (albeit Hindmarsh). This would be a popular solution for the north western suburbs. I am less concerned about portions of Divisions forming divisions to determine names, Hindmarsh should be retained, it is a near Federation Division, it should be kept.

Kingston, Boothby, Mayo

I had originally proposed comparatively fewer elector movements than the commissioners have. A one way movement of electors from Mayo to Kingston been sufficient to avoid movements to Boothby and so on.

I note the Liberal Party in objection 318 has proposed that Aldinga and Sellicks Beach be restored to Kingston and Flagstaff Hill be included in Boothby. Judging by the reaction of the Labor Party in objection 312, the local MP Nicole Flint has very effectively mobilised local opinion (much to the irritation of the Labor Party). The addition of those parts of Boothby south of the Sturt Creek into Kingston mean that communities which are largely separated by the Happy Valley Reservoir will be

combined with Kingston. For decades the reservoir has served as a boundary between the federal Divisions. In the same way that Major Road and the O'Halloran Hill Escarpment is a major barrier, a water body that requires a 12 kilometre Road trip to get around much be considered somewhat of a barrier in a urban setting! In the same way that Adelaide Airport and Parafield Airport are substantial in size and separate communities.

To some degree the Liberal Party objection and my original proposals could lead to a tidier outcome. Kingston if as I had originally proposed would take in all the areas down to the Willunga escarpment and take in those parts of Happy Valley north of Cox Hill Road and south of Chandlers Hill Road. This would enable Mayo to expand into Boothby retaking Aberfoyle Park which until a few years ago was in Mayo. I am not sure that Flagstaff Hill should be separated off, but it might be viable if numbers require it. The Liberal Party propsoed division of the Mitcham Hills is possibly more sensible than that of the commissioners with Hawthordene and Craighburn (which looks quite ragged).

Conclusions

I wish the commissioners well in their deliberations.

Martin Gordon

16 May 2018