



# Objection 287

Jeff Waddell

4 pages

Comments on the

---

SA Redistribution

---

Committee's proposal

---

April 2018

---

Author: Jeff Waddell

Address: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Disclaimer: Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the data provided in this submission, there may be unintended instances of calculation or raw data errors. As the author, I make no attempt to intentionally mislead the reader, nor for the reader to draw incorrect conclusions should any error of calculation be found in this submission. I have performed all calculations in good faith, assuming my work to be 100% correct.

## **To the Augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia**

As the author of 1 of the 16 original submissions that addressed more than just Mayo; I will make a brief comment on the boundaries proposed by the Redistribution Committee.

Unlike my Victorian submission at this stage of the process, I haven't crunched any numbers to back up any suggested improvements.

### **Approach**

As was the case for the Victorian Redistribution; the report on proposed Divisions (pages 32 – 43) is detailed in Divisional Alphabetical Order rather than the order in which the Redistribution Committee would have assessed the Divisions.

I again add my voice to those who have noted this approach in other recent Redistributions and encourage Redistribution Committees for future redistributions to return to the old process of detailing each Division as assessed.

### **Boundary changes in line with my original submission**

I acknowledge the Redistribution Committee adopting a couple of non-LGA boundaries that were made in my proposal:

- Adopting the Horrocks Highway as the new boundary between Barker and Grey through much of the Light LGA
- Adopting Maslin Beach's southern locality boundary as the new boundary between Kingston and Mayo, west of Main South Rd.

### **Divisional Name Changes**

The abolition of the Divisional Name Port Adelaide was one I also advocated so I fully support the Redistribution Committee's proposal to take this decision.

I have no objection to the adoption of the name Spence as a replacement for Wakefield.

I was, however, disappointed that the Redistribution Committee did not also rename Adelaide in line with the guideline on the AEC website which states that Commonwealth Divisional Names should not duplicate existing State District Names.

### **Observations on the remaining 10 Divisions**

#### **Grey**

Much of the Redistribution Committee's proposed new boundary for Grey matches mine and other submissions in many aspects. I note the proposed boundary follows SA1 boundaries through the locality of Ward Belt; dividing this locality between the Divisions of Grey and Spence.

#### **Barker**

I was disappointed that the Redistribution Committee did not take the opportunity to unite the entire Barossa LGA in Barker. Especially after there was much discussion around this LGA being divided between 3 Divisions at the previous Redistribution. Apart from excluding the localities of Concordia, Kalbeeba in Barossa LGA and the

balance of Gawler Belt in Light LGA; the Redistribution Committee's proposed Barker reflects my original submission.

As the Surveyor-General for South Australia is a member of the Redistribution Committee and the Augmented Electoral Commission, he may be interested to note that Gawler Belt's north-eastern locality boundary between the Horrocks Highway (A32) & Sturt Highway (A20) does not align with any property boundaries. I'm not sure if this is an issue in SA, but it certainly is in at least 1 other mainland State.

It's interesting to change from map to satellite view using Google Maps and see the locality boundary run straight through the middle of a couple of paddocks!

### **Wakefield – now Spence**

Again, the Redistribution Committee has adopted part of my proposal by continuing Spence's southern boundary further SW along Main North Rd into Kings Rd and the Little Para River. Though I acknowledge that the Redistribution Committee's proposed boundary continues to follow the Little Para River west of Port Wakefield Rd where as mine did not.

After I the close off of the proposal stage, I wished I'd revisited that part of my original submission.

### **Makin**

Obviously Grand Junction Rd is recognised as a solid and logical CED boundary even though very little of it aligns with any LGA boundaries. And on viewing a map of the Redistribution Committee's proposed Makin that makes a lot of sense. This is a well composed proposed Division with very strong boundaries.

### **Mayo**

The Redistribution Committee has proposed that Mayo push into the Mitcham LGA to complete its numbers. I would have thought that Mitcham LGA would have been better left united in Boothby with Aberfoyle Park transferring to Mayo instead. This would push Kingston further north along the coast as per my original submission.

### **Kingston**

Following on from above, the impact of moving Aberfoyle Park from Kingston to Mayo is that Kingston gains the balance of coastal Marion LGA from Boothby.

Though it appears that the Redistribution Committee was loathe to alter the existing Boothby – Kingston Divisional boundary west of Main South Rd. Whilst I understand that for the greater part, there is a clear gap between residential properties on either side of this boundary; this gap is blurred at the coast.

### **Boothby**

At this point, the Redistribution Committee's proposal diverges from mine with its intention to retain the Division of Adelaide.

In isolation, the proposal to transfer the balance of both the Holdfast Bay and Marion LGA's from the old Hindmarsh to Boothby makes for a solid new Divisional boundary in Boothby's north-west.

### **Sturt**

The unification of the Norwood Payneham and St Peters LGA in Sturt is a logical progression. The boundary changes in Sturt's west are simple, solid and easily identifiable.

In the east, there is logic in uniting all of the locality of Rostrevor in Sturt. However, transferring the more developed western parts of both Teringie and Woodforde from Mayo to Sturt seems to make less sense, as it not only divides both localities between Divisions, but also further fragments the Adelaide Hills LGA between Divisions.

### **Adelaide**

Adelaide's western boundary was never its strongest, and I believe its strength has been further diluted with its expansion further west into the existing Divisions of Hindmarsh and Port Adelaide along what is a series of roads now forming its western boundary.

### **Hindmarsh**

I think it would be safe to say that the new Hindmarsh comprises about 50% of the old Hindmarsh and 50% of the old Port Adelaide.

In looking at both Adelaide and Hindmarsh together I'm wondering whether communities of interest may be strengthened by both Divisions orienting more east-west over time. This would mean Adelaide would push west taking the part of Hindmarsh that is south of the River Torrens in exchange for the part of Port Adelaide Enfield council currently in Adelaide.

### **Closing Comments**

All in all, the proposal by the Redistribution Committee for South Australia is solid. It will be interesting to see how many objections are lodged.

I look forward to reading the objections – well, most of them if the Victorian objections are anything to go by.

Once I get through them, I will then submit my final observations at the Comments on Objections phase.

+++ End of Document +++